

Agenda



Contact Officer: Paul Bateman, Democratic Services Officer

Tel: 07895 213740

E-mail: democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk

Date: 11 August 2020

Website: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

WILL BE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 19 AUGUST 2020 AT 5.00 PM

THIS IS A VIRTUAL MEETING

You can watch this meeting via this weblink (copy and paste into your internet browser):

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCTj2pCic8vzucpzlaSWE3UQ>

This link will take you to the Council's Committee Meetings page on You Tube.

Members of the Committee:

Val Shaw (Vice-Chair)
Jerry Avery
Ron Batstone

Eric Batts
Diana Lugova
Robert Maddison

Janet Shelley
Max Thompson
Vacancy

Substitutes Councillors

Paul Barrow, Dr
Nathan Boyd
Andy Cooke
Eric de la Harpe

Amos Duveen
Hayleigh Gascoigne
David Grant
Simon Howell

Mike Pighills
Elaine Ware

Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email and easy read. For this or any other special requirements (such as access facilities) please contact the officer named on this agenda. Please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.

MARGARET REED
Head of Legal and Democratic

1. Election of Chair

To elect a chair for the remainder of the municipal year.

2. Chair's announcements

To receive any announcements from the chairman, and general housekeeping matters.

3. Apologies for absence

To record apologies for absence and the attendance of substitute members.

4. Minutes (Pages 4 - 7)

To adopt and sign as a correct record the Planning Committee minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 29 July 2020.

5. Declarations of interest

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting.

6. Urgent business

To receive notification of any matters which the chairman determines should be considered as urgent business and the special circumstances which have made the matters urgent.

7. Public participation

To receive any statements from members of the public that have registered to speak on planning applications which are being presented to this committee meeting.

Planning applications

All the background papers, with the exception of those papers marked exempt/confidential (e.g. within Enforcement Files) used in the following reports within this agenda are held (normally electronically) in the application file (working file) and referenced by its application number. These are available to view at the Council Offices (135 Milton Park, Milton) during normal office hours.

Any additional information received following the publication of this agenda will be reported and summarised at the meeting.

	Site Address	Proposal	Application No	Page.
8.	Land South of Steeds Farm, Coxwell Road, Faringdon	Outline planning application for up to 125 dwellings and associated public open space. All matters except access reserved. (as amended by plans and documents received 2 May 2018, 3 May 2018 and 31 October 2018). Viability assessment submitted 10 April 2019, amended viability assessment submitted 18 June 2020.	P18/V0259/O	8 - 42

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 29 July 2020 at 5.00 pm

This was a virtual live event

Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Bob Johnston (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Jerry Avery, Ron Batstone, Eric Batts, Diana Lugova, Robert Maddison and Max Thompson,

Officers: Paul Bateman, Holly Bates, Adrian Butler, Sarah Green, Bertie Smith and Stuart Walker

Also present: Councillor Margaret Crick, Councillor Andy Foulsham and Emily Smith (Oxfordshire County Councillor)

PI.128 Chair's announcements

The Chair had no announcements but ran through housekeeping arrangements appropriate to a virtual meeting.

PI.129 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Janet Shelley.

PI.130 Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on Wednesday 8 July 2020, were agreed to be a correct record of the meeting. It was agreed that the Chair sign them as such.

PI.131 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

PI.132 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

PI.133 Public participation

The committee noted the list of members of the public registered to speak at the meeting.

PI.134 P19/V0169/RM - Land North West of Dunmore Road, Abingdon

Councillor Jerry Avery encountered technical communication problems during the presentation of this item. He was unable to participate in or hear the whole debate and did not vote on this application.

The committee considered application P19/V0169/RM for a Reserved Matters application following Outline Approval P17/V1336/O for residential development for 200 dwellings, together with associated access, landscaping and public open space, infrastructure (utilities) and biodiversity enhancements on land north west of Dunmore Road, Abingdon.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer reported that as this was a reserved matters application, the Committee was requested to consider scale, appearance and layout and were not required to revisit the original outline planning permission itself. He advised the Committee that the proposal had undergone eight sets of amendments in revising the scheme and in taking account of objections. As a result, a 2020 noise survey had been conducted and a revised noise assessment submitted.

The planning officer provided updates on the landscape officer's comments, including the provision and location of a noise barrier on the north western part of the site, tree planting and the number of street trees. As the landscaping plans had not been updated to reflect the current layout and given the comments expressed by the landscape officer, landscaping would be addressed by a planning condition requiring details to be submitted to, and agreed by, the council.

Georgina Naish, on behalf of David Wilson Homes, the developer, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Emily Smith, in her capacity as an Oxfordshire County Councillor, spoke to the application, expressing concerns about traffic generation with the southern Lodge Hill slip roads not in place, no account given to future A34 widening, and the apparent lack of funding from the developer to the clinical commissioning group for health services. Councillor Smith also highlighted the problem of parking on verges and asked about the possibility of installing bollards at some locations. The planning officer confirmed that this was possible through an additional planning condition. Councillor Smith also expressed concern over enforcing proposed condition 10 which related to preventing garage conversions without the need for planning permission.

Councillor Andy Foulsham, a local ward councillor, spoke to the application. He generally welcomed recent improvements to details on the application but requested a higher standard of play equipment to include baby swings and full provision for disabled children. He also considered that the lawn and picnic area adjacent to the bund should receive better protection from traffic. He requested noise monitoring next to the A34 and a construction management plan.

Councillor Margaret Crick, a local ward councillor, spoke to the application. She emphasised the wider environmental impact of the development, especially the benefits of reduced use of vehicles and improved opportunities for walking and cycling. Councillor Crick also highlighted the need to encourage the developer to install further environmentally friendly measures, such as solar panels and water collection points.

In response to questions from the Committee, the planning officer confirmed the proposed Condition 10, 'garage retention for parking' was enforceable by the Council. In respect of funding for health provision, he confirmed that Section 106 monies were not available, but the medical centre could apply to the Council for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding. The planning officer also responded to a query raised on paragraph 5.26 of the report, regarding the existence of a biodiversity report. He confirmed that such a survey had been undertaken, which was supported by the countryside officer and that conditions existed on the outline permission for a construction environmental management plan and landscape environmental management plan. In respect of mitigating noise nuisance, the planning officer confirmed that according to the submitted noise report, all properties were to be fitted with double glazing.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application with the proposed landscaping condition revised relating to the installation of bollards, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P19/V0169/RM, subject to the following conditions

1. Approved plans

Pre-Occupancy or Other Stage Conditions

2. Parking provision before occupancy of each dwelling
3. Electric car charging points for each house with on plot parking
4. Boundary treatments provision
5. Implementation of noise mitigation
6. Provision of five secure cycle parking stands beside the MUGA before its first use
7. Landscaping scheme to be approved before any development above slab level

Post Occupancy Monitoring and Management Conditions

8. Implementation of landscaping
9. Any piling to be first agreed
10. Garage retention for parking

Informative

1. Superfast broadband

PI.135 P20/V0550/O - Stonehill Farm (Riding School) Stonehill, Drayton, Abingdon, OX14 4AA

The Committee considered application P20/V0550/O for the provision of a covered horse-riding arena on equestrian land (Additional justification received from agent on 16 May 2020) at Stonehill Farm (Riding School) Stonehill Drayton, Abingdon.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

The planning officer, referring to paragraph 6.2 of the report, reported that the proposal would have economic and social benefits by supporting a business and providing training and lessons to people. Officers had acknowledged that the proposal was a large building. Consideration of this was however weighed against its intended use and external appearance. Its size represented a known arena size for equestrian uses. Its agricultural barn-like appearance was appropriate for its rural setting. Therefore, in balancing the environmental impact, officers were satisfied that it would not result in harm to the visual amenity of the area or the setting of Abingdon or Drayton. The application was therefore recommended for approval, as it would accord with the relevant development plan policies.

Mr. Henry Venners, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Responding to questions from the Committee, who cited Drayton Parish Council's concerns regarding ridge height and visual intrusion, the planning officer confirmed that it would be of a suitable height and scale for its use and the site context, and would not appear out of keeping with its rural surroundings or overly visually intrusive.. Referring to paragraph 5.8 of the report, the planning officer confirmed that the proposal complied with Core Policy 37 (high quality design and responding positively to the site and its surroundings).

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant outline planning permission for application P20/V0550/O, subject to the following conditions;

1. Commencement - Outline with Reserved Matters
2. Approved plans
3. Surface water drainage details submitted prior to commencement of development
4. Details of external materials submitted prior to construction above slab level
5. Details of any external lighting to be submitted prior to installation

The meeting closed at 6.05 pm

PI.1

APPLICATION NO.	P18/V0259/O
SITE	Land South of Steeds Farm Coxwell Road Faringdon
PARISH	FARINGDON
PROPOSAL	Outline planning application for up to 125 dwellings and associated public open space. All matters except access reserved. (as amended by plans and documents received 2 May 2018, 3 May 2018 and 31 October 2018). Viability assessment submitted 10 April 2019, amended viability assessment submitted 18 June 2020.
WARD MEMBERS	Simon Howell Elaine Ware David Grant Bethia Thomas
APPLICANT OFFICER	Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP Penny Silverwood

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that authority to grant outline planning permission is delegated to the head of planning subject to:

1. A section 106 legal agreement being entered into to secure: financial contributions towards local infrastructure, 24.8% affordable housing and an affordable housing tenure mix of 52% affordable rented and 48% shared ownership, the market housing mix and size of dwellings, public open spaces and play areas to be transferred to a management company, and inclusion of an overage clause to clawback the shortfall in affordable housing and S106 contributions to a policy compliant level.
2. The following planning conditions:

Compliance

1. Submission of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access within the site) within three years
2. Commencement of development – two years after last reserved matters approval
3. Approved plans
4. No more than 125 dwellings to be constructed
5. Approved details of site access

Concurrent with reserved matters applications

6. Biodiversity Enhancement Plan demonstrating that the development will meet a net gain for biodiversity
7. Details of external lighting

8. Scheme for acoustic insulation and ventilation
9. Details of wastewater network upgrade completed required by the development or submission of a phasing plan to agreed in consultation with Thames Water
10. Details of water supply network update completed required by the development or submission of a phasing plan to be agreed in consultation with Thames Water

Details to be submitted prior to commencement

11. Slab levels to be agreed
12. Dust management plan
13. Construction Traffic Management Plan
14. Full details of foul and surface water drainage
15. Submission of a Community Employment Plan

Details to be submitted prior to occupation

16. Travel Plan

Informatives

Housing Mix

Land required for visibility splays that lies outside the existing highway boundary should be formally offered for adoption as public highway

Private water discharge would not be accepted into the highway drainage system

Ordinary Watercourse Land Drainage Consent is required prior to works commencing irrespective of planning permission.

Broadband provision

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This application is presented to planning committee due to an objection from Faringdon Town Council. In April 2019 parish boundaries in the vicinity of the site were changed and the application site now falls within the Faringdon Town administration boundary. The application site does however remain within the designated area of the made Great Coxwell Neighbourhood Plan, therefore it is this neighbourhood plan that forms part of the Development Plan to which the application will be assessed against, along with the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (LPP1) and Part 2 (LPP2).
- 1.2 This is an outline application for up to 125 dwellings and associated public open space on land allocated in the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (LPP1) as part of a strategic housing site. The application relates to the southern part of the housing allocation. Outline planning permission for up to 200 dwellings was granted on the northern part in May 2016. Subsequent Reserved Matters approval was granted in June 2017 and construction is underway. The site location plan is **attached** at Appendix 1.
- 1.3 Only access into the site is to be considered at this stage. Appearance, layout, scale and landscaping are all reserved for future consideration. Access is proposed via a new junction onto Coxwell Road in the south east corner of the

site with a right-hand turn lane into the site from Coxwell Road. The access plan along with other application drawings are **attached** at Appendix 2. Pedestrian access points to connect to the adjacent development on the northern part of the allocation will be provided at Reserved Matters stage.

- 1.4 The site currently comprises agricultural land with the existing access road to Steeds Farm located to the north and housing under construction beyond (the northern part of the strategic site allocation). To the east of the site is Coxwell Road and to south and west there is further agricultural land.

2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

- 2.1 A full summary of the responses received to the current proposal is below. A full copy of all the comments made can be seen online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

Faringdon Town Council	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal exceeds the number of houses allocated in the LPP1• 350 homes is not 'around 200'• The Vale has met its three-year housing land supply and has no need for this development• There is now a local surplus of housing in this area as evidenced by the low rate of sales on similar new sites in Faringdon and neighbouring villages. This will be further exacerbated with the development of 7,500 dwellings to the west of Swindon• Faringdon facilities are overloaded and Faringdon does not at present provide any additional employment opportunities• The development is not attached to Faringdon and further encroaches on the open space between the two existing parishes contrary to the NPPF. The site is not sustainable given its location outside the town• The original proposal included several amenities which have withered away. The proposed application has little amenity and inadequate play provision• There is no access into the estate for emergency vehicles should the single proposed access become blocked• The link to The Steeds (Phase 1) must be secured via the S106 agreement• This will be a cul-de-sac estate which is contrary to the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan• Cycling times in the transport assessment are unrealistic• Traffic surveys should have been undertaken earlier in the morning• Documentation needs to be updated to acknowledge its conformance with the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan. Currently none of the Neighbourhood Plan policies and recommendations appear to have been considered
------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The children's play area is allocated on the back of the development which might attract antisocial behaviour • There is no provision of allotments as required by Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan • Any further development proposed for this site should be eligible for CIL not S106 as the Local Plan allocation has been met • Supports medical practice comments and is concerned about the low level of funding from the S106 to the health centre. • There appears to be no funding for leisure within the S106 monies • It is regrettable that the quota of affordable housing has been reduced in order to make this development financially viable • Thames Water has raised concerns about both the capacity of the sewerage and the ability to provide water to this development. This raises serious concerns about the definition of sustainability of this application
Great Coxwell Parish Council	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No identified need for additional housing in this location • Additional housing in this location is not sustainable • Additional housing is contrary to the Vale's spatial strategy and not supported by infrastructure planning and sustainability assessments of development for the Western Vale • Additional houses in this part of the strategic site undermines the key objectives for the strategic site that it will be 'high quality sustainable' extension to Faringdon and that it will 'protect the landscape setting of Great Coxwell'. • The inspector of LPP1 stated: "Whilst some specific concerns are raised there is nothing to suggest that the housing allocations at/ adjoining Faringdon (sites 17, 18, 19 and 20) are not soundly-based and that the various constraints cannot be appropriately addressed as part of their development, bearing in mind that sites 18 and 19 have outline planning permission and the Council has resolved to grant planning permission for site 17, subject to a legal agreement. Moreover, in the light of my findings in Issue 8, there is not a need to increase the housing capacity of any of these sites." Granting such a large increase by planning additional housing on this site, beyond that proposed, examined and specifically noted to be acceptable when LPP1 was examined would seem to undermine the basis on which LPP1 was found sound.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LPP2 states that the Western Vale does not relate well to either Oxford or Science Vale and the identified housing need for this area is already planned for and the Western Vale contains less opportunity for strategic employment growth. The proposed housing is not supporting the local economy but is in excess of its needs. Rather than meeting local needs it will result in residents traveling further to more distant employment sites increasing car use. • Allowing further housing here undermines the reasoning for allocations in LPP2 and undermines the sustainability of other parts of the region by meeting overall housing needs in the wrong location, making later development in desired locations less attractive to developers • Over 700 new homes to be delivered at the edge of Faringdon with no space allocated to provision for anything more than a small play area. No single site has been developed over 200 houses at one time and therefore no onsite infrastructure provision is required. • If development of this strategic site has been brought forward for more than 200 homes in one go it would have required education facilities, outdoor sports and recreation, allotments, community halls, health facilities and community safety/ policing facilities. The two separate development adding up to 325 homes provide none of these things. • The site is removed from all of the provisions in Faringdon, it stretches the definition of easy walking distance and the idea of sustainable transport as expected in the NPPF. • Distances to facilities from the centre of the proposed development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education facilities (Infant School: 1.25 miles, Junior School: 1.2 miles) ○ Outdoor sports and recreation (football club: 1 mile, cricket, rugby and skate park: 1.9 miles) ○ Allotments (1.25 miles) ○ Community halls (Faringdon centre 1.24 miles) ○ Health facilities (1.35 miles) ○ Community safety/ policing (Faringdon centre 1.24 miles) • The proposed houses are distant than any previous development, have limited linkage to the existing development and does not provide the additional infrastructure that would be expected were it undertaken at a 325 home development. • The additional road entry decreases road safety and necessitates additional removal of vegetation to
--	--

	<p>provide visibility splays and further complicates siting of bus stops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reduction in height of building at the edge of the existing development becomes of limited value if further building takes place beyond its built footprint in protecting the landscape setting of Great Coxwell and retaining an open gap between the village and the proposed development in Faringdon • This site contributes to the rural setting of Great Coxwell and plays an important role in softening the impact of and separating the development on the rest of the strategic site from Great Coxwell • It will contribute to physical coalescence harmful to the character and appearance of the area and detracting from the rural setting of Great Coxwell contrary to Great Coxwell Neighbourhood Plan (GCNP) Policy EDQ1. • It decreases the distance between the built footprint and Great Coxwell including important heritage assets such as the Great Barn. • Concerns regarding the downstream effects of the additional loss of open countryside to hardscape in regard to drainage. • This would add an additional 125 homes bringing a total of runoff from more than 700 homes to impact downstream where flooding is already seen to occur after prolonged rainfall • Assessments of road safety based on data that does not consider the significant surrounding development cannot be considered relevant. • Road safety considerations should not rely on past accidents but should thoroughly assess the impact of two 200 house developments yet to be completed. • Additional footpath access for site occupants to the Coxwell Road is welcomed. • Concern regarding a footpath shown exiting the site onto a neighbouring field, implying plans potentially to build even closer to the Great Barn/ Courthouse/ access to Badbury Hill heritage area. • Given the considerable distance to the primary schools of this and the neighbouring development, the effect during the school run, particularly during inclement weather, along the Coxwell Road and around the schools needs to be considered • Welcome the significant increased green buffer on the south, west and north, especially the minimum 20m width for structural planting in accordance with GCNP, however object to the complete absence of a green interface to the east (road) side where the former thick hedging has been removed with no replacement shown on the masterplan
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept of maximum building height at two storeys is in accordance with limits in the GCNP and the idea of lower building heights for an 'outer' zone is sensible, however the suggested heights of 9.5m and 8.5m for the outer zone do not go far enough. • In response to the reserved matters application for the neighbouring development the Conservation Officer advises the need to avoid or reduce density and limit building height to 1 or 1.5 storeys within specified areas to protect important views. The whole of the site lies within view cones previously identified as being sensitive regions with regard to important sightlines from Faringdon and Great Coxwell where building should be avoided or of reduced density and limited one or one and half storeys. • The submitted heritage assessment omits consideration of Scheduled Monument Badbury Clump. There is a clear risk that the rooflines of the proposed development would be visible or conversely that important sightlines from the edge of Faringdon towards the clump are interrupted by the development. • The heritage assessment concludes that the Great Barn can be seen from the development and accepts development will be visible from the barn however considers the impact less important because this development neighbours an ongoing development. The picture submitted is from raised ground above the ground and does not consider the finished picture after landscaping, nor the view from the Great Coxwell conservation area or the Barn itself. • The amendments and heritage assessment fail to fully address the negative potential impact of the development on Great Coxwell's heritage environment as a whole and on the enjoyment and use of this heritage environment. • The proposed layout is regimented and presents unrelieved long straight lines of houses which are strictly aligned as streets of urban terraced housing. This is inappropriate for a development site bordering directly onto a rural parish with outstanding heritage aspects. • Onsite provision should complement not replicate that of surrounding developments; rather than providing another LEAP for younger children recreation facilities for older children such as a MUGA should be provided • Concerned that the Framework Plan illustrates and describes a 'potential access (road) to retained land'. Land to the west lies fully within the Green Buffer in the GCNP and has not been allocated in LPP2.
--	---

	<p>These gaps undermine the effort and degrade the intent of the green buffer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not sustainable financially unless it sacrifices social sustainability. For the local community the S106 requests are essential to make the development acceptable and it cannot be considered acceptable without them. • Overdevelopment of this strategic site is not sustainable, and the Vale's policy aims cannot be met
Countryside Officer	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main habitat is in intensive arable cultivation which as a very low ecological value. • The boundary hedgerows on the eastern and western boundaries are the most significant habitats on site and should be retained apart from the requirement for a new access road and the consequent visibility splay. • No significant populations of protected species have been recorded during the surveys, • Due to the intensive nature of the arable cultivation the site has been shown through a biodiversity impact calculator to be capable of delivering a small net gain in biodiversity value post development in accordance with CP46 of the LPP1. This should be secured via a condition to ensure that the detailed scheme design subsequently delivers a net gain in biodiversity.
Contaminated Land	No objection.
Environmental Protection	No objection, subject to conditions relating to noise mitigation, dust management plan and electric vehicle charging points with regards to air quality.
Housing	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The affordable housing provision for sites in the Vale is 35% however the applicant has submitted a viability statement. • After rigorous assessment, a 24.8% affordable housing contribution can be applied instead of the 35% requirement as per policy requirement. In addition to this the tenure split of rented and shared ownership is not policy compliant as a result of the viability assessment. • The majority if not all two-bed properties should be delivered as houses rather than flats as houses are considered more suitable for families needing rented accommodation and Registered Providers have advised that houses are more appropriate for shared ownership • Where 1 or 2-bed flats are provided it is preferable for housing management purposes if communal hallways

	<p>can be avoided so that each flat has a direct entrance to the street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The affordable housing should be distributed evening across the site to avoid concentration in any particular part of the site and to assist with ensuring that the affordable housing is indistinguishable from the market housing. • Parking courts should be avoided with parking spaces provided either on-plot or adjacent to the properties. All parking spaces should be allocated to the individual unit
Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £12,000 allocated for health is completely inadequate to cover the primary care infrastructure required to provide services for the additional 336 people who will require services as a direct result of this development. • According to the funding model agreed by OCCG Board for S106 to support primary care services, the sum of £120,852 is in line with the bed capacity of the dwellings
Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Transport – No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From examination of junction modelling, satisfied that the improvement works to the A420/ Coxwell Road Link Road junction will provide the necessary capacity to accommodate the increased traffic flows on the network. The applicant will have to provide these works prior to occupation of the development • OCC no longer requires the applicant to provide the pedestrian refuge on the A420 to allow pedestrians to access the PROW networks as it cannot be justified as a key desire line from the site • The applicant will provide improvements to the cycling and pedestrian routes that link into Fernham Road and the school and a formal crossing on the Coxwell Road, just to the south of Fernham Road. • All County Council requirements are listed as S106 financial contributions. The following must be delivered via a S278 agreement: bus stop infrastructure, off-site pedestrian/ cycle improvements, A420/ Coxwell Road signalisation and the crossing of Coxwell Road at Fernham Road • Travel Plan monitoring fee is £1,240 not £12,400. • The link from The Steeds (phase 1) site to the Land South of Steeds must be secured via the S106, although it is noted that this link cannot be made until after the 5 year expiry date of the planning consent given to the Steeds. <p>Education – no objection:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions towards the necessary expansion of school capacity would be sought through a S106 agreement <p>Archaeology – no objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An archaeological evaluation of the area did not reveal any significant archaeological features. The only features present were a post medieval drainage ditch and cultivation furrows No further archaeological investigation or mitigation is required and there are no archaeological constraints to the proposed scheme. <p>Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection</p>
Landscape Architect	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendments have addressed the majority of comments with regards to the width of the southern boundary woodland, connectivity of the site as additional footpaths are proposed and the necessary 20m offset from the play area The issues of the northern connecting footpaths are being resolved to ensure good connectivity between the northern and southern sites. The proposed gaps in the woodland planting for farm access have reduced but still stand at approx. 12 metres for the eastern boundary and 10 metres for the southern boundaries. If this width of gaps is required, then there are ways that the two woodland blocks can be linked both visually and in biodiversity terms A hedgerow should be planted on the site boundary to link the two woodland areas with a gap left for the field gates. The farm access routes could cut through the woodland on a diagonal which would allow the proposed woodland planting to overlap and therefore would be less of a visual gap in the woodland
Forestry Team	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amended width of the landscape buffer has every chance of maturing into a woodland landscape feature. The landscape scheme required for a detailed application will need to include the establishment of an appropriate replacement hedgerow along Coxwell Road.
Waste Management Officer	No objection, advice regarding bin provision for detailed application provided.
Drainage Engineer	No objection:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site lies within Flood Zone 1 at a low risk of flooding from rivers or sea. Other potential sources of flood risk are also considered to present a low risk to the site. • The surface water drainage scheme prepared is based on the principle of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and proposes to discharge into a drainage ditch at existing greenfield rates. Infiltration testing has confirmed that soakaways are not considered a viable solution for this site • Diversion of the drainage ditch is proposed; this is acceptable in principle and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on flood risk or the wider drainage provision for this area • Foul water drainage is to be pumped to the public sewer subject to agreement with Thames Water
Urban Design Officer	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A partial grid style layout causes an overemphasis on perimeter blocks with a lack of variation to building lines and forms; some street types have differing setbacks including deeper verges and paths but do not show variety in the building line. This will create a lack of character as the design will be based upon the street hierarchy. • A more dynamic response is required particularly in response to pedestrian permeability • The links to the development to the north are critical to the overall integration of the scheme within the greater development context • The sense of place needs further work • The central green space should have greater enclosure • Frontages should be broken up within the perimeter blocks as well as variety in the house types and architectural elements • There should be a more dispersed layout on the southern edge of the scheme
Thames Water	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water will not be discharged to the public network. • There is an inability of the existing water supply and foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal. A condition requiring necessary upgrades, or a housing and infrastructure phasing plan should be required
National Trust	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispute strongly the conclusion of the Heritage Statement that the Grade I listed Great Barn will

	<p>experience a negligible degree of harm to its significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The encroachment of development illustrate that Great Coxwell is now within 900m of becoming a suburb of Faringdon • The assessment of the barn within the Heritage Statement as being devoid of agricultural value due to its loss of 19th Century buildings in the 1950s is debatable not least with the Court House and its environs remaining. The photographic evidence in the statement is weak and illustrates little impact where a simple site inspection shows the impact and close nature of the development not least in the introduction of light pollution and urbanisation of this historically farmed landscape • The EIA Analysis and Screening does not reflect the further detrimental impact on the North Vale Corallian Ridge landscape • This development is harmful to the wider landscape and the setting of Faringdon and the village of Great Coxwell, specifically the Grade I Listed Great Barn. • This proposal would place the Great Barn and its environs into an urban fringe context causing irreversible damage. • Badbury Hill has far reaching views from the Schedule Ancient Monument not identified in the application. The development will be a highly visible site within the landscape • Concern of the encroachment of development on the south west boundary of Faringdon • The wider landscape to the south and south east of Faringdon and running to settlements such as Great Coxwell provides an important landscape setting and sense of place to these communities. To bring development this way is harmful and serves to materially diminish the sense of place here, to which the Great Coxwell Barn is so fundamentally a constituent part. • The nature of the proposed design would result in considerable increased light pollution and urbanisation resulting a negative impact on the landscape culminating in the loss of Great Coxwell's character as a village separated from neighbouring settlements
Conservation Officer	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site occupies a sensitive rural location which forms part of the open rural landscape surrounding Great Coxwell Tithe Barn and the wider setting of Faringdon Conservation Area which contains numerous listed buildings, as well as archaeology

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An illustrative heights plan should be produced to show ridge heights relative to surrounding topography and buildings and the development already approved to the south of Faringdon • The scheme is supportable in principle subject to reserved matters • The increase in development from the second application is not going to add significantly to the impacts of the first application as the housing would be viewed against the backdrop of Faringdon. • Keeping building heights down and boundary screening planting will be important
Historic England	No comment.
Leisure Team	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leisure contributions sought from this development for sports hall, swimming pool, health and fitness, bowls, outdoor tennis and playing pitches • Due to viability issues over the site it appears no leisure contributions will be sought within a S106 agreement as the development is required as part of housing needs within the Local Plan
County Councillor Judith Heathcoat	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division (inc. Faringdon, Great Coxwell, Little Coxwell, Buckland, Gainfield, Littleworth, Coleshill, Buscot and Eaton Hastings) has had to take a disproportion of development most concentration being on Faringdon • The Thames Water supply has problems with water pressure and the Thames Water sewerage plant on the Lechlade Road is at capacity • The GP surgery is over subscribed • The roads in the centre of Faringdon are gridlocked at school and commuter times and the queueing traffic causing vibration having an effect on the older properties in Gloucester Street and the condition of the roads • The schools are full to capacity • The A420 is hugely affected by the spread and enlargement of Swindon • The route 67 bus and the Faringdon community bus would benefit from allocation of S106 monies from developments • Further bus stops along the bus route 66 route impedes traffic flow • A420 should have more uniformity with pedestrian safe havens at junctions and solar operated lighting

<p>Faringdon Medical Practice</p>	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome funding but £12,00 will in no way meet the needs of the Practice to cope with the estimated extra 336 persons • The funding model indicates £120,852 • £90,000 was originally proposed and was more in line with need • The building was not extended, it was altered in configuration to cope with growing numbers of patients due to earlier developments • It will not be possible to maintain the level of service with increasing patient numbers
<p>Residents</p>	<p>A total of 21 letters have been received. Comments can be summarised as:</p> <p><i>Housing need/ strategy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development is not required; the Western Vale has sufficient housing to meeting its need • The Vale has met its three year housing land supply • There is a local housing surplus as shown by the low rate of sales on similar estates in Faringdon and neighbouring villages • The housing allocation in LPP1 has been met • LPP2 states that there are 0 dwellings remaining to be identified for the Western Vale housing supply and therefore these houses are not supported by LPP2 <p><i>Highways</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no plans to increase employment opportunities in the area which will mean more commuting and pressure on the A420 • The 66 bus service will be unable to cope at peak periods • Concerns regarding increased traffic at A420 junction • Traffic surveys have been shown to be erroneous and have understated the traffic densities • There seems very little concern for establishing a designated cycle way along Coxwell Road • The roundabout on the A420 should be built with monies from other developments without requiring more housing <p><i>Design and Layout</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5 storey proposed will be totally out of place either as a rural edge to Faringdon or as part of Great Coxwell • The proposed application has few amenities and inadequate provision for play areas • Building heights are too high • The street layout of straight lines is not suitable for an edge of town/ rural position

	<p><i>Environment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsustainable, too far from schools, shops, employment and hospitals. • The development is in the catchment of the River Cole not the River Ock • Boundaries between Faringdon and Great Coxwell are being eroded, losing precious green space • Loss of habitat for wildlife that cannot be compensated by planting a few trees • The site does not protect the landscape setting of Great Coxwell • It will erode the gap between Great Coxwell and Faringdon and undermine the settlement character of Great Coxwell • Concern regards drainage from new developments causing flooding • Noise and air pollution concerns • The development will be visible from the Tythe Barn and Badbury Hill • No hedge is shown along Coxwell Road which would help to soften the build of the site <p><i>General</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation should be updated to acknowledge conformity with the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan • It does not make any provision for the infrastructure necessary to support the increased population • House prices are out of range for first time buyers • The local schools and Doctors facilities are under considerable strain • The development should not be given permission if it is not financially viable. The financial report should not be used as a pretext to reduce their obligations to the detriment of the local community • Water pressure in the village is low • Electricity supply in the village is prone to being cut due to faults and poor weather
--	--

3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 [P17/V0118/RM](#) - Approved (13/06/2017)

Reserved Matters application following Outline planning permission P15/V1934/O for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 200 houses and flats, along with associated roads, parking, drainage, and landscaping, and provision of access to Coxwell Road. (As amended by drawings and information received on 21 April and 28 April accompanying agent's letter dated 25 April 2017).

[P13/V1102/O](#) - Withdrawn (29/07/2016)

Erection of up to 250 dwellings; a Class A1 retail shop (about 420sq m); a public house (Class A4); Green Infrastructure including sports pitches; children's play area ; sustainable drainage system and other related infrastructure ; internal roads, footways and cycleways; 2 vehicular accesses from Coxwell Road and alterations to the junction of Coxwell Road./A420 (as amended by plans received 20.12.13, 03.12.14, and 29.05.15 and the submission of an EIA on 03.12.14)

[P16/V1657/NM](#) - Approved (11/07/2016)

Non material amendment to condition 15 of outline planning permission P15/V1934/O to include long-stop date for sewage station upgrade works.

The condition was amended from 'None of the dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied until the completion of the upgrade works to the Faringdon Sewage Treatment Works (STW) or it is confirmed in writing by the sewerage undertaker that sufficient sewage capacity exists to accommodate the Development' to 'None of the dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied until 31 March 2018 or prior to this date if it is confirmed in writing by the sewerage undertaker that sufficient capacity exists to accommodate the development'.

[P15/V1934/O](#) - Approved (23/05/2016)

The erection of up to 200 dwellings together with Green Infrastructure, surface water attenuation and a new access from Coxwell Road

3.2 **Pre-application History**

P17/V2821/PEJ – pre-application advice sought for up to 150 dwellings. Application submitted prior to final advice being issued however officer provided advice during a meeting regarding an appropriate landscape buffer, connectivity, access and highways requirements, noise etc.

3.3 **Screening Opinion requests**

P18/V0462/SCR – Negative Screening Opinion issued for residential development up to 125 dwellings and associated public open space.

4.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 The site area exceeds 5ha in size and therefore is above the thresholds set in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. As set out above a negative screening opinion has been issued. The proposal is not EIA development.

5.0 **MAIN ISSUES**

5.1 The main issues are:

- Principle of development
- Amount of Housing
- Affordable housing and housing mix
- Design
- Residential amenity
- Landscape and visual impact
- Flood risk and drainage

- Traffic and highway safety
- Historic environment
- Biodiversity
- Financial contributions

5.2 **Principle of development**

The proposal is part of the South of Faringdon strategic housing site, allocated for housing by Core Policy 4 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (LPP1). The principle of development is therefore acceptable unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- 5.3 Core Policy 20 of LPP1 states that development at this strategic allocation will be supported where development meets the requirements set out within the Site Development Template and in accordance with the Development Plan taken as a whole. The Site Development Template states that the overall allocation will deliver around 200 homes, subject to masterplanning.

- 5.4 As the site is allocated for housing development in LPP1 the principle of housing on this site is acceptable. The proposed development is assessed against the requirements of the Site Development Template and the Development Plan taken as a whole below.

5.5 **Amount of Housing**

Objections have been raised that the amount of housing exceeds that envisaged by the adopted local plan. Policy CP4 of LPP1 allocates the site for around 200 dwellings. Housing allocation figures are only approximate as the final figure will always depend on the more detailed information and assessment that is provided with a planning application.

- 5.6 In meeting our housing needs, there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development under policy CP4 of LPP1. The government also expects allocated sites to make optimal use of their potential to achieve efficient use of land. As set out below, 125 units have been assessed against all relevant planning considerations and no technical objections have been raised. Therefore, officers consider an increase of up to 125 dwellings on the approximate number of 200 is, in principle, reasonable and does not result in a significantly different development to that outlined in the Local Plan.

5.7 **Affordable housing and housing mix**

Affordable housing

Core Policy 24 of LPP1 requires development to provide 35% affordable housing with a tenure split of 75% affordable rented and 25% shared ownership. Core Policy 24 also states that where it can be demonstrated that the level of affordable housing being sought would be unviable, alternative tenure mixes and levels of affordable housing provision may be considered if supported by a viability assessment.

- 5.8 The applicant has made a viability case to reduce affordable housing provision and has submitted a viability assessment report which has been rigorously assessed by officers and independently assessed by BNP Paribas on behalf of the Local Planning Authority. Following review, amendments to the viability

assessment have been made to ensure essential infrastructure to support the development is prioritised, as required by Core Policy 7 of LPP1. Officers consider on this basis, in consultation with your housing development officers, that the scheme can only viably provide 24.8% affordable housing provision with a tenure split of 52% affordable rented and 48% shared ownership. The S106 requirements to be secured are discussed later in this report.

- 5.9 Given the viability position, the development will provide the following affordable housing mix to be secured in a S106 agreement:

	1 bed (2p)	2 bed (4p)	3 bed (5p)
Affordable rented	2	8	6
Shared ownership	2	8	5

- 5.10 The detailed design of the development including layout, scale and appearance are reserved for future consideration. It is important however that the following points are considered at that stage:

- Affordable properties are required to accord with National Described Space Standards as set out in Policy DP2 of LPP2.
- It is preferable for the majority, if not all of the two-bedroom properties to be delivered as houses rather than flats
- One or two-bed flats should have direct access to the street rather than communal hallways
- The affordable housing must be distributed evenly across the site to avoid concentration in any one part of the site and must be indistinguishable from the market housing
- Parking spaces should be allocated to individual units and provided either on-plot or adjacent to properties rather than parking courts.

5.11 *Market housing*

Core Policy 22 of LPP1 expects a mix of house types that is in accordance with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) unless an alternative approach is proven to be necessary due to viability constraints. Due to the viability constraints of this development, the following market mix will be provided and secured via a S106 agreement:

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Market housing	0	22	41	31

- 5.12 The sizes of market dwellings used in the viability assessment submitted by the applicant are larger than Nationally Described Space Standards as required by Policy DP2 of LPP2, as they have been based on neighbouring development schemes. As a result, the sizes of market dwellings will also be secured in a S106 agreement to ensure the development once designed fully at the Reserved Matters stage, complies with the stated viability assessment. The viability assessment also accounts for all market 3 and 4-bed properties having a garage therefore this will also need to be secured in the agreement. The following sizes of market dwellings are proposed:

	2-bed house	3-bed house	4-bed house
Size of market dwelling	81.3sqm	102.2sqm	139.4sqm

5.13 **Design**

This is an outline application with only access to be considered. The details concerning layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the development are Reserved Matters and would be considered as part of any subsequent Reserved Matters or detailed application. However, in support of the outline application a Framework Plan and a Building Heights parameter plan (as part of the design and access statement) have been submitted, along with an Illustrative Masterplan.

- 5.14 The site development template in LPP1 sets out the following principles for the overall site relating to design and layout:
- Include linkages to the existing and planned facilities and services on site and to the adjacent site allocations (South West of Faringdon and East of Coxwell Road, Faringdon)
 - Housing will need to front the public realm, including roads and areas of public open space
 - Access should be provided from Coxwell Road
 - Provide adequate pedestrian and cycle links to Fernham Road and Coxwell Road
 - Create a landscape buffer on the southern and western part of the site to soften the interface with the higher ground to the west and to prevent coalescence with Great Coxwell
 - Create a new landscape structure, building on existing landscape features, to meet the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS) landscape strategy and contribute to the aims of the Great Western Community Forest
- 5.15 The Framework Plan indicates that vehicular access for the site will be located onto Coxwell Road to the east, along with a separate pedestrian access to Coxwell Road in the north-east and future access points to the development to the north. The pedestrian access in the north-east corner will help to facilitate connectivity with the existing settlement of Faringdon as well as with the Fernham Fields development to the east (application ref. P13/V0139/O).
- 5.16 Officers consider that pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the development to the north is of paramount importance for meeting the aims of the site development template and integrating the development successfully with

adjacent new development and the wider settlement. Officers understand that there is currently a legal agreement between the previous owner of the land to the north (The Steeds Phase 1) and Bellway Homes who are currently constructing homes on site which controls the provision of such links between the north site and this application site. The legal agreement restricts the ability to connect to The Steeds Phase 1 until 5 years from the time of consent being granted (9 March 2021) has lapsed or on the completion of the last house. Given that Reserved Matters consent will be required before works can commence on this application site, officers are content that in all likelihood the restrictive legal agreement will have lapsed by such time as reserved matters applications are determined to define such connections. The Framework Plan identifies four access points to the development to the north and the future links will be secured in the S106 agreement. Officers are satisfied that there is sufficient provision to ensure that linkages between the two sites will come forward.

- 5.17 The Framework Plan also shows there will be structural planting to the southern and eastern boundaries, with a minimum width of 20 metres as required by the site development template. This is acceptable.
- 5.18 *Density*
Core Policy 23 of LPP1 requires a minimum net density of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) unless local circumstances indicate that this would have an adverse effect on the character of the area, highway safety or the amenity of neighbours. The site area is 7ha which includes 0.2ha of highways land at the access from Coxwell Road. Subtracting the green infrastructure land shown on the Framework Plan which includes structural planting, public open space and the play areas leaves a site of 4.2ha for residential development which gives a density of 30dph.
- 5.19 *Open space*
Policy DP33 of LPP2 requires major development to provide 15% of the site as public open space. The Framework Plan indicates the provision of public open space will exceed this requirement and this provision can be secured in a S106 agreement.
- 5.20 *Design quality*
The illustrative masterplan indicates a very regimented perimeter block structure with a lack of variation in building line and form. This will likely result in a scheme that lacks character and a sense of place. There are some elements of the illustrative masterplan which are welcomed such as a central area of open space and development fronting the rural edges, however further work is required in terms of permeability and variation in building line and structure to achieve an acceptable layout at Reserved Matters stage.
- 5.21 Overall if the detailed design of the development were to come forward in the current form at Reserved Matters stage, officers do not support it. However, such details are reserved for future consideration, and overall officers are satisfied the quantum of development of up to 125 dwellings could be accommodated on the site in an alternative design of layout. Reserved Matters proposals will still need to demonstrate that the amount of development of up to 125 dwellings can be accommodated on the site whilst successfully responding to the points made above, achieving compliance with the requirements of

development management policies, adopted design guide principles and the suggested planning conditions to ensure compliance with core policies CP37 and CP38 of LPP1.

5.22 Residential Amenity

The Reserved Matters stage will be the opportunity to fully consider any impact on amenity for existing residents. Nearby residential properties however are located some considerable distance from the site boundary to the north, beyond the access road serving Steeds Farm. Residential properties to the east are located further away on the opposite side of Coxwell Road. Officers consider it should be possible to provide a housing development to accord with DP23 of LPP2 and design guide principles in respect of existing dwellings to avoid unreasonable overlooking.

- 5.23 A Noise assessment has been submitted in support of the application which assesses the impact of increased road noise on the operational stage of the development. It identifies that with the use of double glazed windows incorporating acoustically attenuated ventilation will reduce internal noise to within WHO guideline levels. Noise levels within gardens are predicted to experience noise levels of less than 55 dB(A); within WHO guidelines. The environmental health officer is satisfied with the submitted information and recommends a condition requiring full details of the acoustic insulation and ventilation to be agreed prior to construction and occupation of dwellings.

- 5.24 An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. The environmental health officer advises that dust from construction operations can be adequately controlled by adhering to the mitigation measures indicated in the assessment which can be secured via requiring a dust management plan by condition. The predicted impacts of the operational phase of development on air quality are very low. The environmental health officer recommends in line with the Council's draft Developer Guidance on air quality and in line with government proposals a condition should be attached requiring the provision of infrastructure for electric vehicle charging at each property with off street car parking to facilitate the uptake of electric vehicles by future occupants. The provision of electric charging points can be considered at the Reserved Matters stage.

5.25 Landscape and Visual Impact

The site is allocated for housing development in the local plan which suggests that the loss of this site to housing should have no unreasonable impact on the surrounding landscape. A Landscape and Visual Appraisal has been submitted in support of the application and the landscape architect considers this to be an appropriate assessment. The site has no specific planning designations and no public rights of way cross the site. The LVIA concludes that any adverse effects of the proposed development on the landscape and visual appearance would be localised and can be mitigated for by proposed Green Infrastructure.

- 5.26 The site development template in LPP1 sets out the following principles for the overall site relating to landscape:
- Key objective to protect the landscape setting of Great Coxwell and retain an open gap between the village and the proposed development in Faringdon

- Create a landscape buffer on the southern and western part of the site to soften the interface with the higher ground to the west and to prevent coalescence with Great Coxwell
- Create a new landscape structure, building on existing landscape features, to meet the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS) landscape strategy and contribute to the aims of the Great Western Community Forest
- Integrate existing trees and hedges into the development
- Landscape Strategy should contribute to the aims of the Great Western Community Forest, including provisions for the creation of a diverse woodland environment.
- Plant new trees and hedgerows along the southern edge of the site
- Contribute towards redressing the identified Green Infrastructure deficit in the area surrounding Faringdon.

5.27 Policy EDQ1 of the Great Coxwell Neighbourhood Plan designates a green buffer between Great Coxwell, Faringdon and the A420. The application site lies within however the policy acknowledges that in the event that some or all of the land being allocated for development in LPP1 and/ or planning consent is granted, the Green Buffer will be redrawn. The policy requires development that encroaches on the green buffer to provide a green interface with the surrounding countryside along the length of its boundary with the green buffer, of varying widths a minimum of 20 metres wide, providing vegetation planting including native hedgerow trees, small copses and community orchard areas.

5.28 The Framework Plan demonstrates that there will be a structural woodland buffer of a minimum of 20 metres with along the southern and eastern boundaries. This achieves the aims of the site development template in protecting the landscape setting of Great Coxwell and softening the interface with the higher ground to the west. The tree officer has advised that these buffers would have every chance of maturing into a woodland landscape feature.

5.29 The Framework Plan does however show retained access routes through this woodland planting and it is understood that these are required to retain access to farmland beyond the application site. The landscape architect has raised concerns regarding the width of these corridors. When landscape details are drawn up under Reserved Matters, these access routes must be carefully designed to be the minimal width required to limit any impacts from gaps in the woodland planting from both a visual and biodiversity perspective. The landscape architect provides the following advice for the detailed design and officers would expect such details to be fully taken forward:

- A hedgerow should be planted along the southern and western site boundaries to link the woodland areas with a gap left only for the necessary field gates.
- The farm access routes should cut through the woodland on a diagonal which would allow the proposed woodland planting to overlap, reducing the visual gap in the woodland.

5.30 A Building Heights parameter plan has been submitted that indicates that buildings with higher ridge heights of up to 9.5 metres (typically 2.5 storey properties) will be located in the north east corner of the site close to Coxwell

Road and adjacent residential development. Development around the periphery of the site to the west and south will be limited to up to 8.5 metres ridge height (typically 2 storey properties) where the site meets the rural edge and rises slightly in the west. Policy NDS9 of the Great Coxwell Neighbourhood Plan requires that new development should be no higher than two storeys with roof space behind dormers. Officers consider this to be 2.5 storey accommodation, and whilst it is likely that the rooflines of the development will be seen in some glimpsed long distance views from higher land to the south west, the development will be seen in the context of the existing urban edge of Faringdon, which is acceptable.

- 5.31 Officers are satisfied that through detailed design, the development can be integrated into the landscape without material harm, and through the development of appropriate landscape proposals at Reserved Matters stage (as set out in the Framework Plan) a development to comply with Core Policy 44 of LPP1 and Policy EDQ1 of the Great Coxwell Neighbourhood Plan can be achieved.

5.32 **Flood Risk and drainage**

The Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application confirms that the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and is at a low risk of flooding from rivers or sea as well as from other potential sources of flood risk.

- 5.33 The site is proposed to be drained via a SuDS system and an attenuation basin discharging into a drainage ditch at existing greenfield rates. The existing drainage ditch is proposed to be diverted to allow for the development. This approach is acceptable to the drainage engineer subject to further details being required by condition.

- 5.34 Foul water drainage will be drained via a gravity sewer to an on-site pumping station which will pump flows via a rising main to an existing Thames Water sewer. Thames Water advise that there is an inability of the existing foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the development. They recommend a Grampian condition requiring further details of any offsite works to ensure the necessary capacity is available prior to occupations of dwellings on site or an appropriate phasing plan is agreed.

- 5.35 Thames Water also advise that there is an inability of the existing water network infrastructure to supply the needs of the development. They recommend an additional Grampian condition requiring further details to upgrade the supply network to ensure the necessary capacity is available prior to occupations of dwellings on site.

Subject to the suggested conditions, the proposal would accord with CP42 of LPP1 and policies EDQ4 and NDS14 of the Great Coxwell Neighbourhood Plan.

5.36 **Traffic, parking and highway safety**

Access into the site is the only matter for consideration at this outline stage. The site development template in LPP1 sets out the following principles for the overall site relating to access and highways:

- Include linkages to the existing and planning facilities and services on site and to the adjacent site allocations (South West of Faringdon and East of Coxwell Road, Faringdon)
- Access should be provided from Coxwell Road. A major upgrade of A420/ Great Coxwell Road junction will be required
- Contribute to bus stops, frequency and infrastructure improvements along the strategic 66 bus route
- Contribute towards wider improvements along the A420 corridor and any necessary measures identified through the site Transport Assessment
- Provide adequate pedestrian and cycle links to Fernham Road and Coxwell Road

- 5.37 The development is proposed to be served via a new vehicular access onto Coxwell Road in the south east corner of the site with a right-hand turn lane into the site. A pedestrian access onto Coxwell Road will also be provided in the north east corner. Oxfordshire County Council are satisfied that the proposed access arrangements provide safe and suitable access to the site.
- 5.38 As detailed above there is currently a legal agreement restricting the ability to connect to pedestrian and cycle links to the development site to the north until March 20201. These connections are of paramount importance to the wider connectivity and permeability of the site and will be secured in the S106 agreement. Safe and suitable crossing points of the access road to Steeds Farm will need to be provided at the detailed design stage.
- 5.39 At OCC's request further information was provided on the likely traffic distributions from the development in combination with other committed development. The Coxwell Road Link/ A420 Junction is to be upgraded to a signal controlled junction with contributions towards these works having been secured from The Steeds Phase 1 and Fernham Fields developments. OCC require this development to direct deliver the junction upgrade works required, utilising the contributions already sought. Upon review of the additional information submitted, OCC officers have raised no objections to the application. OCC has confirmed that from examining the junction modelling they are satisfied that the improvement works to the A420/ Coxwell Road Link junction will provide the necessary capacity to accommodate the increased traffic flows on the network. The junction works will be required prior to occupations of dwellings on site.
- 5.40 The applicant will be required to widen the existing footpaths along Coxwell Road to facilitate shared use (pedestrian and cycling) and to provide a formal pedestrian crossing on Coxwell Road just to the south of Fernham Road to facilitate better connections to the school, leisure centre and facilities of the town beyond. The applicant is also required to provide a new pair of bus stops to the south of the site access and provide a financial contribution towards bus services.
- 5.41 As discussed above, officers have concerns regarding the layout shown in the illustrative masterplan. The street layout and hierarchy and parking provision will be further assessed at Reserved Matters stage.
- 5.42 **Historic Environment**

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.

- 5.43 Policy DP36 of LPP2 and Core Policy 39 of LPP1 state that proposals for new development that may affect heritage assets must demonstrate that they conserve and enhance the special interest or significance of the heritage asset and its setting. DP37 of LPP2 states development within or affecting the setting of a Conservation Area must demonstrate that it will conserve or enhance its special interest, character, setting and appearance. DP38 of LPP2 states that development within the setting of a Listed Building must demonstrate that it will preserve or enhance its special architectural or historic interest and significance. DP39 of LPP2 states that development will be permitted where it can be shown that it would not be detrimental to the site or setting of Scheduled Monuments.
- 5.44 The site is not located within a conservation area and is not directly adjacent to any listed buildings. Concerns have been raised over the impact on the setting of Great Coxwell conservation area, a number of listed buildings including the Grade I listed Tithe Barn as well as the Scheduled Ancient Monument at Badbury Clump.
- 5.45 The submitted heritage statement confirms that there are limited screened views from the site towards Great Coxwell and to the wooded lower reaches of Badbury Hill. The site can be glimpsed from the upper reaches of Badbury Hill through woodland planting and there are limited views of the site from Great Coxwell. Views to and from the Tithe Barn are limited by the slightly undulating intervening topography, hedgerows and trees however residential development north of the site and the edge of Faringdon are visible. Due to the distance between the site, the conservation area and the Tithe Barn, and the limited intervisibility it is not possible to appreciate or understand the special interest of the barn from the site. The assessment acknowledges that the proposed development may be visible once built in views from the Barn, however this will be in the context of the built development beyond and the existing urban edge of Faringdon. Such views will also be screened to a degree by intervening hedgerows and the proposed structural planting on the southern and western boundaries.
- 5.46 The structural planting proposed on the southern and western boundary will help to strengthen the screening of the site from the heritage assets to limit any effects from the limited available views. A building heights plan has been submitted which indicates that the ridge heights will be restricted to 8.5 metres (typically 2 storeys) in the west and south of the site, rising to a maximum of 9.5 metres in the northern east corner of the site closer to existing built development. The development under construction to the north is formed of a majority of 2 storey dwellings with a small number of 2.5 storey properties scattered within. Where it is possible to view the proposed development from heritage assets in the west and south west, this will be in the context of the existing built development of Faringdon.

- 5.47 The conservation officer has raised no objections to the proposed development and officers consider that it will not have a significantly harmful effect on the setting of listed buildings, including the Tithe Barn, upon conservation areas or the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument.

5.48 **Biodiversity**

The council's countryside officer has no objection. He advises that the main habitat is in intensive arable cultivation which has a very low ecological value. The habitats of most value were associated with the boundary hedges to the eastern and western boundary. No significant populations of protected species have been recorded during surveys carried out at the site.

- 5.49 Concerns have been raised that the hedgerow on the eastern boundary with Coxwell Road has been removed. From visiting the site, it appears that the boundary vegetation, which is fragmented sections of hedgerow with trees, remains. The details submitted with Reserved Matters can ensure it is retained and enhanced except for the access and associated visibility splays.

- 5.50 The countryside officer advises that due to the intensive nature of the arable cultivation of the site, it has been shown through a biodiversity impact calculator that the site is capable of delivering a small net gain in biodiversity value post development as required by CP46 of LPP1. A condition should be attached to ensure that the detailed scheme to be submitted through reserved matters delivers a net gain for biodiversity.

5.51 **Other considerations**

Archaeology

An archaeological evaluation of the area did not reveal any significant archaeological features, the only features present were a post medieval drainage ditch and cultivation furrows. Oxfordshire County Council's Archaeologist is content that no further investigation or mitigation is required and there are no archaeological constraints to the proposed scheme.

5.52 **Financial contribution requests**

The NPPF advises that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests in paragraph 56:

- 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.

- 5.53 Core Policy 7 of LPP1 provides that development will only be permitted where the necessary physical infrastructure and service requirements to support the development can be secured. It continues that if infrastructure requirements could render the development unviable, proposals for major development should be supported by a viability assessment. Where viability constraints are demonstrated by evidence the Council will:

- i) Prioritise developer contributions for essential and then other infrastructure
- ii) Use an appropriate mechanism to defer part of the developer contributions requirement to a later date

- iii) Or as a last resort, refuse planning permission if the development would be unsustainable without inclusion of the unfunded infrastructure requirements taking into account reasonable contributions from elsewhere including CIL.

5.54 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in September 2017 and implemented in November 2017. CIL is a levy charged on new development in the district; the money raised will be used to fund infrastructure and support growth. In general, off-site mitigation would be sought via CIL and on-site elements and direct mitigation would be sought via a S106 agreement. This site however is within Zone 3 and is exempt from CIL charges. Off-site mitigation will therefore be sought via a S106 agreement.

5.55 The following developer contributions have been requested:

District Contributions	Amount (£)
Waste bin provision	23,250
Street naming and numbering	2,977
Health - -towards Faringdon Medical practice	12,000
Faringdon Pumphouse Project	2,200
Great Coxwell Reading Room Project	3,400
Sports Hall provision	47,300
Swimming Pool provision	88,057
Athletics provision	1,232
Health and Fitness provision	20,249
Squash	6,162
Outdoor Tennis	14,884
Football Pitches	107,425
Cricket/ Rugby	215,371
Outdoor Bowls	6,066
Multi Use Games Area	19,493
Public Art	38,250
District monitoring fee	5,799 (tbc)
Total	£614,115
Oxfordshire County Council contributions and direct delivery requests	Amount (£)
Signalised junction works at A420/ Coxwell Road junction	Direct delivery (equivalent cost of £469,316.78)
Off-site cycle provisions along Coxwell Road	Direct delivery (equivalent cost of £166,760)
Formal crossing of Coxwell Road, south of Fernham Road	Direct delivery (equivalent cost of £46,840)
Changing speed limit	Direct delivery (equivalent cost of £3,190)
Public transport service	£130,694
Public transport infrastructure	£37,079
Travel Plan monitoring	£1,240 (<i>incorrect in viability report at £12,400</i>)
Primary and Early Years Education	£1,114,951

Secondary Education	£685,825
Special Education (SEND)	£64,300
Primary School Land	£66,350
OCC Admin and Monitoring fee	£9,971
Total	£2,796,517 (including direct delivery equivalent costs)
Overall Total	£3,410,632
Overall Total per dwelling	£27,285

- 5.56 As outlined earlier in this report, the developer has submitted a viability assessment which identifies that the proposed development would not be viable if all of the above infrastructure costs were sought with a scheme that is policy compliant in terms of affordable housing.
- 5.57 In reviewing the viability, officers have sought to ensure that developer contributions towards essential infrastructure are prioritised alongside affordable housing to make the development acceptable, in line with Core Policy 7 requirements of LLP1. The following amounts (to be index linked) are considered essential by your officers, are fair and proportionate and have been agreed with the applicant:

District Contributions	Amount (£)
Waste bin provision	23,250
Street naming and numbering	2,977
Health - towards Faringdon Medical practice	12,000
Faringdon Pumphouse Project	2,200
Great Coxwell Reading Room Project	3,400
District monitoring fee	5,799 (tbc)
Total	£49,626
Oxfordshire County Council contributions and direct delivery requests	Amount (£)
Signalised junction works at A420/ Coxwell Road junction	Direct delivery (equivalent cost of £469,316.78)
Off-site cycle provisions along Coxwell Road	Direct delivery (equivalent cost of £166,760)
Formal crossing of Coxwell Road, south of Fernham Road	Direct delivery (equivalent cost of £46,840)
Changing speed limit	Direct delivery (equivalent cost of £3,190)
Public transport service	£130,694
Public transport infrastructure	£37,079
Travel Plan monitoring	£1,240 (incorrect in viability report at £12,400)
Primary and Early Years Education	£1,114,951
Secondary Education	£685,825
Special Education (SEND)	£64,300
Primary School Land	£66,350
OCC Admin and Monitoring fee	£9,971

Total	£2,796,517 (including direct delivery equivalent costs)
Overall Total	£2,846,143
Overall Total per dwelling	£22,769

- 5.58 A contribution of £12,000 towards paying back borrowed costs for completed expansion works at Faringdon Medical Practice is being secured through the S106. The works carried out were in preparation for future growth. Concerns have been raised that this contribution is not adequate to cover the needs of the increased population. As referred to above, contributions sought must be necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan references the use of the NHS West Kent model for calculating healthcare contributions. This would equate to £108,000 for this development. Officers must ensure however that contributions sought are related to a specific project and a proportionate sum is calculated in relation to this development. Information provided by Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and the Faringdon Medical Practice identifies that following an NHS grant, the Practice borrowed £90,000 towards the project. The development at Park Road, Faringdon (application ref. P17/V1082/O) has secured a contribution of £79,350 towards this outstanding amount. Therefore, it is only appropriate to seek the outstanding amount, plus interest per annum, totalling to a contribution of £12,000.
- 5.59 Contribution requests towards community infrastructure have been received from both Faringdon Town Council (the Pumphouse Project) and Great Coxwell Parish Council (Reading Room project). Given the site's location and connectivity to both settlements, future residents are likely to use both community facilities, therefore 50% of each requested contribution is being secured.
- 5.60 Other contributions were requested from both parishes. These are listed below with a summary of why officers do not consider it appropriate to seek such contributions for this development when assessed against the statutory tests and the case of viability:

Faringdon Town Council additional requests:

- Towards the provision of a MUGA at Tucker Park – MUGA contribution listed above, but not taken forward due to viability
- £2000 Towards the museum – no specific project details were provided
- Towards the Place Children's Centre – no details of how the project is being improved/ increased

Great Coxwell Parish Council additional requests:

- Towards the renovation and improvement of MUGA at Great Coxwell Park – MUGA contribution listed above, but not taken forward due to viability
- £12,700 towards other park facilities – play facilities are to be provided on site and in adjacent developments

- 313,500 towards upgrading the footpath from Coxwell Road to Cherry Orchard – not requested by OCC
- £10,800 towards pavement and fence to protect the roadside ditch and allow safe access to nursery – not requested by OCC
- £10,800 towards replacement of pavement outside nursery – not requested by OCC.

5.61 Due to the viability position presented, the development is being asked to deliver affordable housing and S106 contributions below a policy compliant level. As a result, an overage clause will be included in the S106 agreement based upon house sales and the stated profit within the viability report, so that any excess can be secured to provide towards the shortfall in affordable housing via an off-site contribution and towards the reduced S106 contributions.

6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 This is an outline application with all details, save access, reserved for future consideration. The site is allocated for residential development in LPP1 as part of the wider South Faringdon strategic housing allocation and therefore the principle of development is acceptable. Officers consider that the proposed quantum of development of up to 125 dwellings can be achieved on site whilst complying with the requirements of the site development template in LPP1 and the requirements of the development plan as a whole, subject to the detailed design to be submitted at Reserved Matters stage.

6.2 The means of access to the site is acceptable and OCC, as Highway Authority, advise that subject to the necessary highway junction works, the impact on the local highway network is acceptable.

6.3 Further details of drainage are required by condition and full details of the layout, appearance, scale and landscaping shall be submitted with future Reserved Matters applications.

6.4 Overall, the development complies with the development plan and the provisions within the NPPF and is sustainable development.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031 PART 1:

CORE POLICIES 1, 3, 4, 7, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47 and Appendix A – Site Development Template – South Faringdon

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031 PART 2:

DEVELOPMENT POLICIES 2, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39

GREAT COXWELL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES:

EDQ1 – Establish a green buffer to protect the village from coalescence

EDQ3 – Reinforce the character and quality of the Village and Parish

EDQ4 – Achieve our objectives in as ‘environmentally friendly’ a way as possible

NDS1 – Vistas

NDS4 – Linear spaces: footpaths, carriageway edges and verges

NDS5 – Roads and Traffic
NDS6 – Positioning/ Plots
NDS7 – Driveway, Garages and Parking Plot size
NDS8 – Plot size
NDS9 – Bulk of Buildings
NDS10 – Roofs
NDS11 – Walls
NDS12 – Windows
NDS13 – Gardens and Landscaping
NDS14 – Drainage

UPDATED INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN (DEC 2016) and
DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT
(JUNE 2017)

VALE OF WHITE HORSE DESIGN GUIDE 2015


NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE


Case officer – Penny Silverwood

Email – penny.silverwood@southandvale.gov.uk

Tel – 01235 442600



 Site Boundary 7.0ha
Other Land Under Same Ownership



CAD file: J:\7900\7929\LANDS\Plans\7929-L-01 A Site Location Plan.dwg

Appendix 2



NOTE:

1. ALL DETAILS SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT WITH OCC (LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY) AND OPERATIONAL CAPACITY VERIFIED IN TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT.

INDICATIVE TOP OF DETENTION BASIN FOR PHASE 1

4.3m

FOOTWAY TO BE WIDENED TO 2m TO EXTEND TO THE FARM TRACK AND PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENT

ROAD MARKINGS TO TIE INTO EXISTING

6m ALLOWANCE FOR DITCH REALIGNMENT—MEASURED FROM BACK OF FOOTWAY

4.5m x 75m VISIBILITY SPLAY

2m FOOTWAY

CULVERT BENEATH ACCESS (DETAILS TBC)

POTENTIAL 6m WIDE SITE ACCESS TO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10mR

3.0m

3.0m

6m ALLOWANCE FOR DITCH REALIGNMENT—MEASURED FROM BACK OF FOOTWAY (SEE INSET 1)

2m FOOTWAY

10mR

EXTEND 1m FOOTWAY (AS EXISTING)

4.5m x 75m VISIBILITY SPLAY

TIE INTO EXISTING FOOTWAY

POTENTIAL RELOCATION OF 30mph SPEED LIMIT WITH GATEWAY FEATURE

CULVERT BENEATH ACCESS (DETAILS TBC)

TRAFFIC ISLAND WITH "KEEP LEFT" SIGNAGE & BOLLARDS (DIAGRAM 610, TSRGD)

6m ALLOWANCE FOR DITCH REALIGNMENT—MEASURED FROM BACK OF FOOTWAY

5m

1.5m VERGE (AS EXISTING)

TREE TO BE REMOVED (IMPACT ON VISIBILITY SPLAY AND FOOTWAY)

TREE TO BE REMOVED (IMPACT ON VISIBILITY SPLAY AND FOOTWAY)

EXTEND 1m FOOTWAY (AS EXISTING)

4.5m x 75m VISIBILITY SPLAY

INSET 1
SCALE 1:250

Rev	Description	Dm	Chk	Date
REVISIONS				
Preliminary Issue	Submitted for S104			
Planning Issue	Issued for Tender			
Submitted for S38	Issued for Construction			
Submitted for S278	As Built			

DRAWING STATUS



Stuart Michael Associates Ltd
Coombe House, Coombe Square, Thatcham, Berkshire RG19 4JF
T: 01635 867 711 es: mail@stuartmichael.co.uk
F: 01635 861 715 w: www.stuartmichael.co.uk

WELBECK STRATEGIC LAND II LLP

JOB TITLE

LAND SOUTH OF STEED FARM
COXWELL ROAD, FARINGDON

DRAWING TITLE


PROPOSED ACCESS ARRANGEMENT
GHOST ISLAND JUNCTION

DATE	DESIGN	COR	CHECKED	SCALE	ISSUE CHECKED
DEC '17			SMA		
DRAWING NO.	5761.001	REV		SCALE	1:500
					© A2

This drawing is the copyright of Stuart Michael Associates Limited. It may not be reproduced or amended without the written approval of Stuart Michael Associates



NOTES
This drawing is the property of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without written consent of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd.
Ordnance Survey Mastermap - Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence Number: 100019980 (Centremapslive.com).



- KEY
- Site Boundary 7.0ha
 - Residential [up to 125 dwellings] 4.2ha
 - Site Access [Includes 0.2ha of highway land]
 - Future access to The Steeds
 - Pedestrian access to Coxwell Road
 - Indicative Street Arrangement
 - Potential Access to Retained Land
 - Potential Pumping Station Location
 - Green Infrastructure including the following: 2.6ha
 - Open Space
 - Potential Structural Planting (minimum of 20m in width)
 - Zone for Bio-Retention Areas
 - Potential Footways
 - Potential meandering woodland walk
 - Zone for Equipped Play (dashed line shows 20m offset)
 - Realigned Drainage Ditch

G	25.10.2018	Updates to connection points	SGL	SGL
F	15.10.2018	Labels updated	SGL	SGL
E	30.04.2018	Footpath added to southern woodland buffer.	LH	SGL
D	25.04.2018	Revisions to landscaping	LH	SGL
C	12.1.2018	Updated to reflect masterplan Rev B	SGL	

rev	date	description	dm	chld
-----	------	-------------	----	------



client
Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP

project
Land south of Steeds Farm
Faringdon

drawing title
Framework Plan

masterplanning
environmental assessment
landscape design
urban design
ecology
architecture
arboriculture

FPCR Environment and Design Ltd
Lockington Hall
Lockington
Derby DE74 2RH

t: 01509 672772
f: 01509 674565
e: mail@fpcr.co.uk
w: www.fpcr.co.uk

scale 1:1000 @ A1	drawn / checked SGL / SGL	revision date 25 October 2018
drawing number 7929-L-02	rev G	

CAD file: J:\7900\7929\LANDS\Plans\7929-L-02G Framework Plan.dwg



This drawing is the property of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without written consent of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd.

Ordnance Survey Mastermap - Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence Number: 100019980 (Centremapslive.com)

- Site Boundary 7.0ha
- Residential [up to 125 dwellings] 4.2ha
- Access
- Potential Pumping Station Location

Green Infrastructure

- Existing and Approved Vegetation
- Potential Structural Planting (minimum of 20m in width)
- Green Interface with the Great Coxwell Green Buffer (NP Policy EDQ1)
- Bio-retention Area (with planting)
- Diverted Drainage Channel
- Water Attenuation delivered by others
- Focal Greenspace
- Future access to The Steeds
- Play Area with solid line showing 20m offset (to LEAP standard with focus on young children to complement approved play to the north)
- Play Area delivered by others
- Frontage with Coxwell Road featuring new native hedgerow and formal specimen tree planting
- Potential Access to Retained Land
- Pedestrian Access to Coxwell Road
- Potential Meandering Woodland Walk

Category of Open Space	Requirement	Masterplan shows
Children's Play and Youth Provision	0.25ha per 1000 [0.07ha required]	0.08ha
Public Open Space	15% residential area [0.63ha required]	2.52ha
Sub-areas within the Public Open Space		
Bio-retention Areas	-	0.30ha
Woodland / Structural Planting	-	0.84ha

Standards taken from Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (Publication Version: October 2017) Appendix K: Leisure and Open Space Standards. Calculations based on 125 dwellings and 300 population (@ 2.39 persons per dwelling)