

Agenda



Contact Officer: Michael Flowers, Democratic Services Officer

Tel: 07895 213755

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

Date: 31 August 2021

Website: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

WILL BE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 8 SEPTEMBER 2021 AT 6.00 PM

FIRST FLOOR MEETING SPACE, 135 EASTERN AVENUE, MILTON PARK,
OX14 4SB

You can watch this meeting via this weblink:

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

Members of the Committee:

Max Thompson (Chair)

Val Shaw (Vice-Chair)

Ron Batstone

Cheryl Briggs

Jenny Hannaby

Diana Lugova

Ben Mabbett

Mike Pighills

Janet Shelley

Substitutes Councillors

Jerry Avery

Paul Barrow, Dr

Eric Batts

Nathan Boyd

Andy Cooke

Amos Duveen

Hayleigh Gascoigne

Simon Howell

Alison Jenner

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.

Patrick Arran

Head of Legal and Democratic

1. Chair's announcements

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

2. Apologies for absence

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

3. Minutes (Pages 4 - 9)

To adopt and sign as a correct record the Planning Committee minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 23 June 2021.

4. Declarations of interest

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

5. 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.

6. 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.

Summary index of applications

Site Address	Proposal	Application No	Page.
7. Land South of A415, Marcham	Outline planning permission for residential development of up to 90 dwellings (Use Class C3) including means of access into the site (not internal roads) and associated highway works, with all other matters (relating to appearance, landscaping, scale and layout) reserved. (As per the updated air quality assessment received on 11 November 2020, drainage technical note 29 March 2021, Frilford Lights technical note 31 March 2021 and Frilford lights mitigation 23 July 2021).		10 - 52

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 23 June 2021 at 6.00

pm

in the First Floor, 135 Eastern Avenue,
Milton Park, Milton, OX14 4SB

Open to the public, including the press

Present in the meeting room:

Members: Councillors Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Ron Batstone, Cheryl Briggs, Jenny Hannaby, Diana Lugova, Ben Mabbett, Mike Pighills and Janet Shelley

Officers: Paul Bateman and Emily Hamerton

Remote attendance:

Councillor Paul Barrow and Councillor Richard Webber
Officers: Martin Deans, Susie Royse and Stuart Walker

Number of members of the public: 3

PI.44 Chair's announcements

The chair welcomed the two new members to the committee, Councillor Cheryl Briggs and Councillor Ben Mabbett.

PI.45 Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

PI.46 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

PI.47 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

PI.48 Public participation

Vale of White Horse District Council - Planning Committee Minutes

A list showing members of the public who had registered to speak had been sent to the committee prior to the meeting. Statements received from the public were circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.

PI.49 P21/V0293/FUL - Land at Park Farm, East Challow

The committee considered application P21/V0293/FUL for a variation of conditions 1 (approved plans), 5 (car parking) & 6 (boundary details in accordance with specific plan) on application P18/V0744/RM. Reserved Matters application following Outline Approval P16/V0652/O (as varied by application no. P17/V2884/FUL) for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Development of up to 88 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, landscaping and other associated works with all matters reserved with the exception of access) on land at Park Farm, East Challow.

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 the application site formed part of a wider area on which the council had permitted 88 dwellings and that development had commenced, with some dwellings completed and others under construction. This application would not increase the number of dwellings on the site and, if approved, would result in a cumulative decrease in floor space by some 109.4 sqm. The applicant had proposed changes in relation to eight approved house types within the scheme; there were no changes in the overall number of dwellings and all proposed house types were compliant with the 'nationally described space standards'. The change in housing mix, if approved, would result in the loss of one 2-bedroom unit and a gain of one 5-bedroom unit. There were also proposed adjustments to the boundaries of certain plots, resulting in one garage and parking space being re-located and a double garage being replaced with a single garage (its associated plot being reduced from 4-beds to 3). Also, some hardstanding between two plots would be replaced by green space. There were some minor adjustments to garden sizes, but it was emphasised that these revised areas continued to comply with policy guidance. The proposed changes were considered necessary to align more closely with present housing market demand. The planning officer advised the committee that these proposed changes would require alterations to the relevant proposed planning conditions (conditions 1, 5 and 6) and that the recommended revised wording was set out in appendix 1.

Mr. Nicholas Daruwalla, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He stated that the developer was most supportive of proposed condition 7, for 'electric charging point for each dwelling with on plot parking', which was beyond the council's climate change requirements and would result in an improved application. In response to a question relating to reasons for the changes in housing mix, the applicant responded that at the present time the market required mid-sized housing, compared with executive style properties, as the latter category were taking longer to sell. Therefore, the changes should help to increase occupancy rates.

The democratic services officer had sent to the committee prior to the meeting a statement by Mr. Steve Gillott.

In response to a question regarding the relationship of this planning application and a possible future application, the planning officer displayed a plan depicting the extent of an alternative layout which might be completed, which could result in a different layout, but it

was emphasised that the plot changes being considered in the application at this meeting would remain unchanged.

In response to a question regarding paragraph 1.9 of the report, which stated that ‘there would be an uplift of 11 dwellings on the Park Farm overall’, the planning officer stated that the committee were being requested to consider this application’s area only, and that a future undetermined application for an uplift of 10 dwellings, had the possibility of resulting in an uplift of 1 dwelling.

In response to a question regarding possible changes to the S.106 agreement to reflect the proposed changes to the housing mix, the planning officer reported that variations were permitted without the need for a new agreement, The alterations, which did not increase house numbers, would not have implications for increased traffic generation and therefore there would be no further mitigation required in respect of highways safety, and consequently no additional financial contribution would be required. With respect to a question regarding the number of 4-bedroom houses, the planning officer confirmed that this proposal was in line with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for market housing. In response to a further question regarding paragraph 5.21 and Thames Water’s involvement, the planning officer reported that as that agency had signed off on the original application and that there was no proposed change to house numbers, there was no expectation of a response to the variation.

The committee considered that the retention of the 40 percent affordable standard on this site was to be supported and that the minor changes to house types and plots would not affect residential amenity and would help with the quicker occupancy of the 20 affordable units. Additionally, the proposals for electric vehicle charging points and revised landscaping, incorporating additional street trees, were welcomed.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P21/V0293/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans

Pre-Commencement Conditions

2. Surface and foul water drainage scheme to be agreed

Pre-Occupancy or Other Stage Conditions

3. Landscaping implementation
4. Road and footway construction to each dwelling to be provided before each occupation
5. Parking and turning spaces for each dwelling to be provided prior to occupation of each plot
6. Boundary treatments as approved plans
7. Electric charging point for each dwelling with on plot parking

Post Occupancy Monitoring and Management Conditions

8. Construction hours – 7.30 to 18.00 Monday to Friday 8.00 to 13.00 Saturday no works on Sunday or bank holidays

Informative

1. Broadband provision

PI.50 P21/V0167/FUL and P21/S0274/FUL - Land at Former Didcot 'A' Power Station, Milton Road, Didcot

The committee considered applications P21/V0167/FUL and P21/S0274/FUL for a hybrid planning application consisting of the following, on land at the former Didcot 'A' Power Station, Milton Road, Didcot;

a) Full Planning Application for the erection of a single storey 8,692 m² Data Centre building (containing data halls, associated electrical and AHU Plant Rooms, loading bay, maintenance and storage space, office administration areas and screened plant at roof level), emergency generators and emission stacks, diesel tanks and filling area, electrical switch room, a water sprinkler pump room and storage tanks, a gate house / security building, MV substation, site access, internal access roads, drainage infrastructure, hard and soft landscaping and

b) Outline Planning Application for the erection of a two storey 20,800 m² Data Centre building (containing data halls, associated electrical and AHU Plant Rooms, loading bay, maintenance and storage space, office administration areas and screened plant at roof level), emergency generators and emission stacks, diesel tanks and filling area, electrical switch room, a water sprinkler pump room and storage tanks; details of appearance will be reserved, along with hard landscaping immediately around the building (as amended by plans and documents received 5th May 2021).

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 hybrid applications, permission was being sought for a single - storey data centre building and related buildings and works, and an outline application for a larger, two – storey building, with landscaping and related buildings. Landscaping and appearance were reserved matters. With reference to paragraph 1.4 of the report, the planning officer confirmed that the land lay within the Didcot Garden Town zone, and not within the zone of influence, as had been stated. Also, as this was a cross-boundary application, the South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) Planning Committee would be considering the application on 30 June 2021.

The planning officer reported that the development plan for this proposal comprised the adopted Vale Local Plan 2031, Part 1 (LPP1), the adopted Vale Local Plan 2031, Part 2 (LPP2) and the adopted SODC Local Plan 2035 (SOLP). There was currently no made or draft neighbourhood plan for Sutton Courtenay or Didcot. The site was allocated for redevelopment in LPP1 and through the grant of outline planning permissions, which remained extant, the principle of commercial development at this location had been established. Development of the site for the data centre use (Use Class B8) complied with policies CP6 and CP16 of LPP1 and policies STRAT1 and STRAT3 of the SOLP, and was therefore acceptable in principle, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

The planning officer reported that height of the development was acceptable to officers, and the proposed design would represent a positive contribution to the surrounding area. The proposed landscaping was also acceptable, and it was considered that the development would have no detrimental impact upon the amenity of existing or future residents in developments adjacent to the south west corner of the site. Transport and highway safety issues would not present any problems, and the impact on the existing roads network was considered to be negligible. Officers considered that these applications would considerably benefit the future mixed-use development of the wider Didcot power station site. The parking arrangements for vehicles and cycles on the site were acceptable and the size and width dimensions for the proposed frontage landscape bund were satisfactory. There were adequate measures for species protection and, in terms of biodiversity, there would be a net gain at this site. There were no outstanding matters in respect of drainage and land contamination. The committee was recommended to approve the applications, subject to conditions, as set out in the report and to the conclusion of a legal agreement.

Camilla Fisher, on behalf of the developer, spoke in support of the applications.

Councillor Richard Webber, the local ward councillor, spoke to the applications.

The planning officer responded to points made by Councillor Webber. It was confirmed that the committee was being asked to permit both units; the only matters reserved for Unit 2 were in respect of its appearance and landscaping. The concerns of the Sutton Courtenay Parish Council regarding possible standard B8 use with associated heavy goods vehicle movements were acknowledged; any alternative use would require planning permission; this proposal related to a data centre only. Landscaping proposals had been worked up with the countryside officer and the landscape officer, and biodiversity, landscaping and visual impacts were acceptable, with alterations having been made. The Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) was leading on the production of a construction traffic management plan, which specifically included wheel washing facilities. There had been discussions with the developer regarding heat generation in the interests of 'greener' solutions, but at present there was no possibility of an outlet for piping-off heat to residential properties in the area, primarily because of existing infrastructure. However, an amendment to the application confirmed that there were now plans for excess heat to be used for offices on the site. A Community Employment Plan was being prepared prior to the occupation of Unit 1, which allowed construction of Unit 1 to proceed so as not to impede progress of the development. The council's economic development team and the developer had been discussing wording for the condition relating to Unit 2, and the signing off on the appropriate condition, 13, was therefore proceeding well. In terms of the legal agreement, lower contributions, compared with other types of development would be a feature of this scheme. The reason for this was that as the proposals were not residential, where mitigation would be required to facilitate a population increase, for example play areas and education, the only district council contribution would be in respect of public art. The parish council's concerns about Housing Infrastructure Funds being fairly allocated to the local area were noted and the committee was advised that OCC had been carefully monitoring the situation.

Also in response to a question, the planning officer reported that it was intended that a publicly accessible route would be provided around the data centre site, incorporating a route by the watercourse, down the western boundary, coming out on to Milton Road (not under the carriageway) and merge with the cycleway on the main road. The delivery of this route would be fully compliant with OCC standards. Responding to a further question regarding landscaping and possible pre-planting, the planning officer reported that

proposed condition 12 dealt with minor landscaping. Pre- planting had not been specifically discussed with the developer, but would feature in the landscaping scheme ahead of the publicly accessible route being delivered.

The committee concluded that the application represented a good use of the land, with commendable biodiversity measures and good revised landscaping proposals, and that it should be supported.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: that authority to grant planning permission for applications P21/V0167/ P21/S0274/FUL is delegated to the head of planning subject to;

- (a) The completion of a S.106 legal agreement and
- (b) The following conditions:
 - 1. Approved Plans
 - 2. Submission of Reserved Matters for unit 2
 - 3. Commencement of full permission
 - 4. Commencement of outline permission
 - 5. Materials in accordance with approved plans
 - 6. Energy statement verification – unit 1
 - 7. Energy statement submission – unit 2
 - 8. Energy statement verification – unit 2
 - 9. Foul and surface water drainage scheme for unit 2 to be agreed
 - 10. Drainage construction compliance report before occupation
 - 11. Contaminated land remediation strategy prior to occupation
 - 12. Revised landscape scheme to be agreed prior to occupation
 - 13. Community Employment Plan to be agreed prior to occupation
 - 14. Vehicle and cycle parking provision in accordance with approved plans prior to occupation
 - 15. Construction Traffic Management Plan
 - 16. Tree Protection
 - 17. Lighting in accordance with approved plans
 - 18. Diesel generator testing
 - 19. Emergency use of generators
 - 20. Travel plan implementation
 - 21. Restricted use – Data centre only
 - 22. No extra office floor space without permission
 - 23. Informative – land drainage consent
 - 24. Informative – contaminated land
 - 25. Informative – planning obligation

The meeting closed at 7.05 pm

APPLICATION NO.	P20/V1388/O
SITE	Land South of A415 Marcham Oxon
PARISH	MARCHAM
PROPOSAL	Outline planning permission for residential development of up to 90 dwellings (Use Class C3) including means of access into the site (not internal roads) and associated highway works, with all other matters (relating to appearance, landscaping, scale and layout) reserved. (As per the updated air quality assessment received on 11 November 2020, drainage technical note 29 March 2021, Frilford Lights technical note 31 March 2021 and Frilford lights mitigation 23 July 2021).
WARD MEMBER(S)	Catherine Webber
APPLICANT	Catesby Land Promotions Ltd
OFFICER	Adrian Butler

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. A S106 agreement being entered into to secure contributions towards local infrastructure, management of public open spaces and to secure affordable housing; and
2. Conditions as follows:
 - 1 Reserved matters (internal access arrangements, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) to be submitted
 - 2 Application for approval of reserved matters within 3 years and development to commence within 2-years of approval of final reserved matter
 - 3 Approved plans

Pre Commencement Conditions

- 4 Tree and hedge protection to be approved
- 5 Levels to be agreed
- 6 Construction Management Plan including wheel washing, HGV delivery route, dust suppression and deliveries outside the hours of 7.30 to 9.30 and 16.00 to 18.00
- 7 Surface water drainage to be approved
- 8 Archaeological written scheme of investigation

- 9 Staged programme of archaeological investigation
- 10 A construction environmental management plan for biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity) to be approved

Pre-Occupancy or Other Stage Conditions

- 11 Foul water drainage to be approved
- 12 Drainage compliance report to be submitted and approved.
- 13 Noise mitigation to be set out as part of the reserved matters application
- 14 Concurrent with the submission of any reserved matters application a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP) to be submitted to and approved
- 15 Access to A415, pedestrian crossing point, foot/cycle way provision beside the A415, relocation of speed limit and gateway in accordance with approved plan and prior to occupation of any dwelling.
- 16 Concurrent with the submission of any reserved matters application details of pedestrian and cycle access to the A415 to be submitted
- 17 Travel plan and travel information pack
- 18 Active electric vehicle charging points for each dwelling with on plot parking
- 19 Details of hedge planting behind vision splays as part of reserved matters submission
- 20 Market housing mix to be agreed
- 21 Space standards - policy DP2 compliant

Post Occupancy Monitoring and Management Conditions

- 22 Maximum two storeys dwellings only
- 23 No more than 90 dwellings permitted

Informatives

- 1 Broadband provision
- 2 Bird nesting
- 3 Protection of Thames Water underground assets
- 4 S106 Obligation

1.0 **INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 The application is presented to planning committee as Marcham Parish Council objects to the proposal and at the request of Councillor Catherine Webber.
- 1.2 This 3.46ha site, allocated in the Local Plan for housing development, is located on the southern side of the A415 at the south eastern edge of Marcham. A site location plan is **attached** as appendix 1. The site is open and relatively flat agricultural land. Boundary hedges separate the site from housing to the west, agricultural land to the east and south and the A415 to the north beyond which are houses and open land.

The Proposal

- 1.3 This is an outline planning application for up to 90 dwellings with access to the A415 to be considered. All other matters, being internal access arrangements, appearance, layout, landscaping and scale are reserved for future consideration should outline permission be granted.
- 1.4 Vehicular access is proposed directly to the A415 with a separate cycle/footway access to the footway beside the A415 as shown on the plan **attached** as appendix 2.
- 1.5 The application has been subject to amendments and the submission of further highway, air quality and drainage reports in seeking to address comments from consultees. Amendments to the scheme include revised vehicular access details providing measurements for the access and footways beside it, new footways on the north and south side of the A415 with a connecting pedestrian refuge and the repositioning of 30mph/50mph speed limit signs on the A415 to the east of the site (details are shown on the plan **attached** as appendix 2). Another amendment is the proposed widening of the cycle/footways to 3m on the A415 on the approach to and at the Marcham interchange. In addition, widening the west bound A415 carriageway at the Frilford traffic lights junction is proposed. This work extends the left hand turn lane opposite the petrol station.

2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

- 2.1 A 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

Parish Council	<p>Current comments: Objection: <u>Connectivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connectivity to the Willows development is essential and should be secured by condition. Without the connection sole pedestrian access would be along the A415 and would present considerable safety issues. <p><u>Air Quality, Access and Highways</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no current time line or funding details for the Marcham bypass and it cannot be considered as a solution to the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) problem. A previous application (P18/V2473/O) was refused on air quality grounds and that site was further away from the AQMA with alternative access routes. The applicant’s air quality assessment claims impacts are insignificant and this conflicts with County Council’s and Highways England view
----------------	--

	<p>that development in Marcham should be restricted until at least a bypass is complete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The application does not consider alleviating traffic flows through the centre of Marcham which is required on page 20 of the LPP2 appendix.• Ask that development is restricted in Marcham until the County Council and Highways England agree with any revised assessments of air quality and publish the figures that justify such a change in view.• Concerned at the safety of access to the A415 and recommend the access is moved to be opposite Howard Cornish Road and a mini roundabout provided. <p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal is contrary to core policy 1 of the LPP1 and at odds with the climate emergency.• It does not make a direct contribution to services and facilities within the parish, nor would it encourage a strong and sustainable economy within the Vale's towns. The site is too far from destinations for meaningful levels of walking or cycling.• Access to services and facilities is via congested roads.• There would be additional air, noise and light pollution, and extra people and traffic would have an adverse impact.• No capacity at the village school and no space for expansion. Children would need to be transported to other schools. OCC objected to application no. P18/V2473/O. <p><u>Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Thames Water restricted the number of houses on the Taylor Wimpey site in the village that could be accommodated on the existing network. There are known problems and the Parish Council require assurance from Thames Water that existing capacity in the sewer system is adequate and how many dwellings can be accommodated. <p><u>Flood Risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Whilst the development is not in the flood plain as things stand, a full review should be conducted prior to the consideration of this application of the effect that the Marcham bypass would have on the site.
--	--

	<p><i>Previous Objections:</i></p> <p><u>Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The drainage amendment does not address the bypass, whose plans were noted in the original application. Nor does it deal with the observed winter flooding and existing flood-zone to the south of the site which raises concerns that, at times of heavy water load, surface water would be unable to drain away reasonably quickly. In addition there is possible leakage from the attenuation system into the adjacent site of the Willows, or impacting on the Willows drainage system, that would exacerbate their known flooding problem.• Foul Water is not addressed in the drainage note. It is known that the Marcham foul water system cannot cope with its existing load. The recent winter flooding demonstrates this lack of capacity. Thames Water had to use tankers to take away excess from the pumping station. This proposed development will add load to the Marcham foul water system. Without additional capacity in the Marcham system, foul water flooding is an increased risk. The Parish Council's objection on the grounds of inadequate drainage, therefore, continues. <p><u>Frilford Lights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Congestion at the lights will be increased. Any scheme aimed at reducing congestion will have its impact reduced by the proposed development. Whatever is done, traffic congestion will be worse if this development goes ahead unless there is a major rebuild (or the bypass is built and connected).• The Parish Council continues to support the County Council with its continued objection on traffic grounds <p><u>Connectivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintain that a pedestrian / cycle route connection is provided between the site and the adjacent development of The Willows, particularly as there has been planning consent granted already for a pedestrian connection between the existing adjacent development of The Willows and Monks Walk. The Parish Council supports an integrated village, and does not wish to see separated developments. There is no alternative path at the south end of the site, so pushing leisure cyclists, pedestrians and children with tricycles etc, to the A415 which is not safe, nor
--	---

	<p>attractive or convenient, with its several thousand traffic movements per day, is putting them at greater risk. The Parish Council strongly objects to the removal of this safe linking path, well away from the traffic, and requires it to be reinstated. The proposal to remove it goes against Local Plan principles of local connectivity and access.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No changes have been made to the original application to mitigate the Air Quality problems in Marcham. Whatever the calculation method, there will be some adverse impact on Air Quality in Marcham. An application just west of Marcham for housing development, was recently refused. One of the reasons being that an air quality management area exists on the A415 in Marcham, and that the increased traffic flows in the AQMA would be detrimental to the living conditions and potentially the health of the occupants of those Marcham residents. Surely, the same reasons for refusal apply to this application? The Parish Council therefore supports the County Council in its view that a full assessment of the A415/A338 staggered junction is required to fully assess the impact on the village.• The air quality assessment is unable to confirm zero impact on Marcham, therefore as the area in question forms part of the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), where action is required to improve the level of air particulates, the Parish Council cannot see how adding more traffic is acceptable.• In regard to the highway proposals, the Parish Council is of the opinion that the poor design of the access will maximise interference with traffic flows.• The applicant's updated Air Quality Assessment dated 21st September 2020, concludes that there will be an adverse impact on air quality in Marcham with the impact being described as negligible to moderate adverse. The Parish Council believes this downplays the impact by stating that the impact is not significant overall. The Parish Council considers any adverse impact, however limited, in a residential area that is already subject to Air Quality Management, should lead to an application being rejected.• Pollution wreaks havoc on human health, and it is not acceptable to admit that there will be an
--	--

	<p>adverse impact on air quality and then state that that is permissible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A bypass is not a solution for air quality impacts as there is no current time line for providing a bypass.• The applicant's assessment that air quality effects are not significant is at odds with the County Council's and Highways England view that development in Marcham should be restricted until a bypass is complete.• The district council refused application P18/V2473/O on air quality impact grounds• The LPP2 Appendix (p20) states that potential options to alleviate traffic flows through the centre of Marcham (which is a designated AQMA) should be considered. The application does not consider alleviation at all and instead relies on a theoretical calculation. <p><u>Flooding and Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Since the application was submitted there has been foul water flooding in the adjacent Willows. housing development. The drainage/sewerage system for Marcham is at capacity and during periods of heavier rainfall cannot cope. The designed SUDS on the adjacent Willows development site does not work, with high ground water levels infiltrating the SUDS. Overspill rainwater cannot even effectively be taken away in the foul sewer. A full assessment of ground water conditions and impact of the proposed development needs to be undertaken.• Whilst the development is not in the flood plain, a full review should be conducted prior to the consideration of this application of the effect that the Marcham bypass would have on the site in question. (see Local Plan part 2 Appendix P21).• There are known problems with the existing foul water system, and the Parish Council requires an assurance from Thames Water, with calculations put into the public domain that the existing capacity of the sewer system is adequate <p><u>Access and Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The only vehicle access will be onto the A415. The Parish Council has grave concerns over the safety of this.• Should the proposal be permitted access should be moved to opposite Howard Cornish Road and by means of a mini roundabout.• Extra traffic generated would have an adverse impact.
--	--

	<p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development does not make a direct contribution to services and facilities within the parish, nor would it encourage a strong and sustainable economy within the Vale’s towns. The site is too far from destinations for meaningful levels of walking or cycling. Access to work, shopping and leisure e.g. Abingdon, Oxford, and Oxfordshire Science areas would be along already congested roads. • Insufficient capacity at the village school with no possibility for expansion. This would result in the need for children to be transported to other schools resulting in additional traffic and pollution. • Some children would be living in parts of Marcham further away from the school than this development and these children would be unable to attend the school at which they had expected a place to be available (P18/V2473/O was subject to an objection from OCC on education grounds). <p><u>Other Matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional noise and light pollution impacts
<p>Councillor Webber</p>	<p>Asks that the application be decided by planning committee as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This development would exacerbate the poor air quality of the AQMA. It flanks the AQMA, which was the major reason for refusing a development north east of the village which would have been even further away from the AQMA than this proposed development. • The access onto the A415 is dangerous. There is a real concern about the suitability of the position of this access...speed of traffic, turning into the development from the west...it would be better opposite Howard Cornish road , if this development goes ahead. Obviously a highways issue. If a bypass is built, it would access the A415 close to this access....another reason to move the access. • If a bypass is built it would risk flooding on this development....it is close to a flood area. • The development is far from village amenities. • The primary school is already full, which means that children of this estate would have to be bussed outside....or, even worse, they would usurp the places of children already in the village, who would find themselves living further away from the school than those in this development. As a result these children would then have to be

	<p>bussed to another school which would cause much resentment. This is a village and residents want children to attend the local school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a real concern about drainage and the shaky sewer system in this village....this development would add to its problems.
Residents	<p>One letter of support has been received as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the additional opportunities for home ownership. • Support proposals to widen the foot/cycleway to Abingdon which will help reduce travel by car. <p>Seven letters of objection have been received as follows:</p> <p><u>Principle of Development and Visual Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside the village. • Loss of a greenfield site • Urbanisation of the rural environment • The development will appear isolated • Unstructured expansion with little or no infrastructure investment. • Pushing the village closer to Abingdon, loses the traditional village feel. <p><u>Inadequate Local Infrastructure/Services</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased strain on local services such as the school and doctors surgeries. • Inadequate foul water capacity. <p><u>Flooding/Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localised flooding due to greenfield land take up reducing surface water permeability. • Potential for increased flood risks for local roads and properties. • The adjacent development’s designed drainage solution failed in 2021 after heavy rainfall with foul water discharged on to the road and adjacent ditches resulting in pollution. This shows the foul drainage system is beyond capacity. <p><u>Impacts for Wildlife</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on birds and wildlife through tree and hedgerow loss. • All hedges and boundaries should be respected to provide a rural street scene. <p><u>Loss of Privacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overlooking <p><u>Highways and Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic on to the A415 which is already busy

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased traffic queues due to the pinch points in Marcham• A cycle/footpath route beside the A415 is unsafe and does not meet Department of Transport Local Transport Note 1/12 – Shared Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists. This route will be subject to increased use from occupants, there is insufficient space for pedestrians, wheelchair users and cyclists to pass, no buffer to the road and the revisions to the plans do not address this at the most dangerous part of the 50mph route and does not address the risk of serious injury. <p><u>Detriment to Air Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased pollution from the increased traffic worsening air quality in the village.• Air quality has been allowed to persist since the introduction of the AQMA without any actions to reduce levels of air pollution.• Air quality has worsened as a result of planning permissions granted with no mitigation provided.• The submitted air quality assessments and response from the council’s air quality officer do not account for cumulative impacts from other development sites which is contrary to paragraph 186 of the NPPF. In the absence of proper consideration of the cumulative impacts, it could not be concluded that the application would not contribute towards either a "moderate adverse" or "substantial adverse" impact, which is likely to have a significant effect on human health according to the 2015 IAQM publication Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality. In any event an approval would result in a further worsening of air quality in the Marcham AQMA to 2024/25, and beyond, when the 90 dwellings are forecast to be occupied from, even if the impact from the application in isolation is accepted by the Council as 'negligible' and the resulting effect is 'not significant' unless mitigation that contributes towards compliance is secured.• The 'future baseline' for the consideration of cumulative effects ought to reflect the 'real world' increase experienced by receptors when committed and allocated sites in the local area are occupied. Otherwise, approval of the application without such consideration would contribute to a "creeping baseline" contrary to para. 5.6 and 6.22k of IAQM's Land-Use Planning and Development Control.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event that mitigation is required, attention is drawn to the Court of Appeal judgment in Gladman Developments Ltd v SSCLG & CPRE (Kent) 2019. This ruling is key for developers when promoting schemes with an effect on Air Quality Management Areas as they will need to clearly show how any financial contribution will translate into tangible measures which will avoid a worsening in air quality. Object to the application in the absence of mitigation being secured and, in the event of a financial contribution being sought, the absence of this being shown to translate into tangible measures which will avoid a worsening in air quality. • Concerned the report to the Planning Committee may fail to deal lawfully with the likely effects of the proposed housing development on air quality in the Marcham AQMA. This is due to the absence of proper consideration of cumulative effects contrary to the policy in para. 186 of the NPPF and the absence of proper consideration of any necessary mitigation. • Concern that the application is inconsistent with the Council's Air Quality Action Plan 2015 in the absence of any mitigation being secured towards specific actions. • No details of any funding that has been secured towards a Marcham bypass which during the Local Plan examination was claimed to be at an advanced stage. Information on providing the Marcham bypass is essential for understanding how impacts on air quality in Marcham can be mitigated. • Even if the impact on air quality is accepted by the Council as being negligible, without sufficient mitigation the proposal would not <i>"contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas"</i> as required by the NPPF. • The forthcoming Environment Bill is a material consideration as confirmed in a recent appeal decision and should be taken into account in considering air quality matters.
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>Current comments: <u>Highways</u> No objection.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An assessment of the A415/A338 staggered signalised junction (Frilford Lights) has been undertaken by the applicant and a suitable mitigation scheme put forward.• It appears that the mitigation scheme would be deliverable within adopted public highway and no safety issues have been identified with the preliminary design.• The site access arrangement from the A415 is appropriate and acceptable and the required visibility splays along the A415 are achievable without obstruction.• A separate pedestrian/cycle access for the development would be provided in the north-western corner of the site from the A415.• Sections of the existing shared footway/cycleway along A415 to the east of the site and at the Marcham Interchange junction would be widened to 3m.• New bus stop infrastructure would be provided on Howard Cornish Road to the north of the site to ensure an improved environment for waiting passengers and better identification of the bus stop locations.• As stated above, the applicant is willing to widen sections of the existing shared footway/cycleway alongside the westbound carriageway of A415 and at the Marcham Interchange junction to 3m were planning permission to be granted.• It would not be feasible to widen the entire length of the existing shared footway/cycleway as part of the development proposal due to the presence of an existing watercourse and ditch.• As stated in previous consultation responses, an assessment of the below junctions was required to understand the impact of the development on the highway network.<ul style="list-style-type: none">– A415/A338 staggered signalised junction (Frilford Lights);– A415/Unnamed Road to Gozzard’s Ford; and– A415/A34 Marcham Interchange• Following a review of subsequent information submitted as part of amendments to the application and as confirmed in previous consultation responses, it is considered that the development proposal would have a negligible impact on the A415/A34 Marcham Interchange junction, while a capacity assessment of A415/Unnamed Road to Gozzard’s Ford would
--	---

	<p>not demonstrate a requirement for enhancement of the junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The mitigation scheme for Frilford Lights put forward by the applicant would increase the flare length of the A415 Frilford Road arm and therefore the queueing space for left-turning traffic. This work is all deliverable within the public highway and a stage 1 safety audit has not identified any safety issues.• The assessment of Frilford Lights has been undertaken with LinSig modelling, using data files prepared by independent consultants as part of the planning applications for other development proposals in the local area. The LinSig model used by the applicant is an alternative model which runs with each set of traffic data from the independent consultants LinSig model with 2023 and 2027 future years and a LinSig model with 2023 and 2028 future years, where both models include appropriate traffic growth and committed development sites.• A total of 16 scenarios have been run in the LinSig model as part of the assessment of Frilford Lights• The proposed increase in the physical length of the A415 Frilford Road left-turn lane would not only mitigate the development impact of an additional 15 two-way vehicle movements through Frilford Lights for all future year assessment scenarios, but it would also improve the overall operation of the junction in comparison to the 'BASE' level of traffic without the mitigation scheme in place.• In all 'BASE' scenarios, the existing length of the A415 Frilford Road left-turn lane is not adequate to accommodate all left-turn demand of approximately 10 vehicles per cycle of green signal time, with some of these vehicles being mixed with vehicles using the offside right-turn lane. An increase in the physical length of the A415 Frilford Road left-turn lane would accommodate this left-turn demand and therefore enable more vehicles to travel through the junction during the green time phase. The proposed mitigation scheme would result in an overall increase in the Practical Reserve Capacity of the junction and a decrease in Mean Max Queue, particularly along the A415 Frilford Road arm.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of delivering the mitigation scheme Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) request that, the developer be required to either provide the mitigation scheme or make a financial contribution. This financial contribution will be made exclusively towards the delivery of a future strategic infrastructure improvement scheme for the A415/A338 staggered signalised junction and will be based on the monetary equivalent of the proposed mitigation scheme put forward by the applicant. OCC will notify the developer within an agreed time period prior to the occupation of the new development to confirm whether the mitigation scheme is to be provided at the A415/A338 staggered signalised junction directly or the financial contribution is to be taken instead. To enable this element of the S106 Agreement to be approved, the applicant has provided a comprehensive cost estimate of the mitigation scheme which OCC will review. The financial contribution request is considered to be in accordance with Policy 8a of the LPP2 which states that the development proposal is required to “<i>contribute towards infrastructure improvements along the A415 (Marcham Bypass, Frilford Lights) and elsewhere if required</i>”. In this context and while the proposed mitigation scheme would improve the overall operation of Frilford Lights, OCC may require a financial contribution towards strategic highway improvements of the junction from the development proposal instead. <p><u>Suggested conditions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and vision splays in accordance with approved plan • Pedestrian crossing points footway realignments, relocation of speed limit signs and gateway feature prior to first occupation. • A415 foot/cycle way improvements by first occupation. • Public transport infrastructure works by first occupation. • Internal access arrangements and foot/cycle way connection from the site to the A415 foot/cycleway as part of reserved matters application. • Car parking in accordance with standards to be provided in the reserved matters application. • Travel plan and travel information pack required.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Construction Traffic Management Plan which shall state that no deliveries of plant or materials will take place between the hours of 07:30-09:30 and 16:00-18:00. <p><i>Previous Highways Comments</i></p> <p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• While an assessment of the A415/A338 staggered signalised junction (Frilford Lights) has been undertaken and a mitigation scheme put forward, the applicant is required to demonstrate that the mitigation scheme would be deliverable were planning permission to be approved.• The mitigation scheme would increase the flare length of the A415 Frilford Road arm to improve the overall operation of the staggered signalised junction at Frilford Lights) following the addition of development traffic on the local highway network. From the various tables in the supporting modelling reports, it appears that this proposed improvement scheme could mitigate the development impact at the Frilford Lights of an additional 15 two-way vehicle movements in both the AM and PM peak periods for all future year assessment scenarios. Further discussions are however required with the Traffic Signals team to ensure the proposed improvement scheme has the required effect. The LinSig outputs indicate that the overall Practical Reserve Capacity of the junction would increase, while the overall length of the Mean Max Queue would decrease, particularly along the A415 Frilford Road arm.• The mitigation scheme would increase the physical length of the A415 Frilford Road left-turn lane from 6 Passenger Car Units (PCU) to 12 PCU; however, it also indicates that there would also be an increase in the physical length of the A338 Wantage Road (N) arm of 4.9 PCU, from 14.8 PCU to 19.7 PCU, which would enable an extra 5 cars to stack within the junction. It is therefore unclear if the overall increase in Practical Reserve Capacity and overall decrease in Mean Max Queue is entirely a result of the proposed increase in flare length of the of the A415 Frilford Road arm. The applicant is required to account for the difference in the physical length of the A338 Wantage Road (N) arm between the two junction modelling runs.• Subject to the above point being resolved, the applicant is required to demonstrate that the
--	--

	<p>proposed mitigation scheme would be deliverable were planning permission to be approved for the development proposal.</p> <p><u>Safeguarding for Marcham Bypass and forthcoming optioneering work</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As the applicant is aware, there is land safeguarded for a bypass of Marcham in the Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2031 Part Two. This safeguarded land immediately abuts part of the southern boundary of this development proposal. At present, no funding for the delivery of this bypass exists.• However, the County Council has been allocated, through the Housing and Growth Deal fund, some monies towards an exercise to consider options for addressing both the congestion issues at Frilford junction and air quality issues within the Marcham AQMA.• Given the interrelationship of these two issues, the appropriate mitigation to address each issue needs to be considered as a comprehensive scheme. This development proposal will be required to contribute to the resultant preferred option. Until this piece of work has been completed it is not possible to identify a suitable contribution rate as it will be derived from the total estimated scheme cost, as will be the case with contributions to be requested from other developments in the area. This optioneering exercise is currently due to be completed in winter 2021/22. <p>Current Comments</p> <p><u>Strategic Comments</u></p> <p>No objection:</p> <p>The site is allocated for up to 90 dwellings in the Local Plan Part 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The County Council provided comment on the proposed allocation throughout the process of preparing the Local Plan Part 2. Key matters of concern were transport, air quality and school capacity. In respect of the South-East Marcham site we made it clear that Marcham is not a favoured location but did not raise a particular objection given the location and limited number of 90 houses. At the Modifications stage in 2019, post hearings, our response stated that the County Council will insist that planning applications are supported by appropriate air
--	--

	<p>quality impact modelling assessments based upon increased and cumulative traffic volumes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is land safeguarded for a potential bypass outside of the allocated area. The safeguarding is necessary to ensure that alternative ways of addressing traffic in this location are not compromised given increasing levels of traffic, and the need to improve air quality. <p><u>Air Quality</u> No objection: Content with the combination of TEMPro and committed development traffic included in the assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additionally, the OCC notes that the distribution of traffic eastward (73%) and westward (27%) generated by the development proposal has been amended in accordance with our request. Accordingly, the OCC is content that the air quality assessment has been based on the appropriate traffic data assumptions.• OCC will work with the District's Environmental Health Officer on the matter of whether the resultant impacts on the Marcham AQMA are deemed acceptable. <p><u>Drainage</u> No objection subject to the conditions recommended by the district council drainage engineer.</p> <p><u>Education</u> No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed development is served by Marcham CE Primary School, which is in the process of being expanded by a capacity of 140 places to a capacity of 210 places in order to meet local housing growth. Numbers at the school are already rising, and as of September 2020 the school had 171 pupils on roll, i.e. significantly above its pre-expansion capacity, and a temporary classroom has been needed to accommodate pupils in advance of the permanent accommodation. At its expanded size it will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the pupils expected to be generated by the proposed development. This expansion is therefore necessary to meet the needs generated by the proposed development, and a proportionate share of the cost is sought as a s106 contribution.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development area is served by secondary schools in the Abingdon area, which includes four secondary schools. Between them these schools will provide 630 places per year group, once a recent increase in admission number at the Europa (all-through) School feeds through. This is forecast to be sufficient until 2025 after which there is expected to be a growing shortage of secondary school places, emerging first at the Year 6-7 point of transfer and then feeding up through the year groups. • To provide sufficient secondary school places in the area surrounding Abingdon there will be a requirement for one or more new secondary schools. The size, location and timing of these schools will be dependent on the progress of the strategic developments surrounding Abingdon which would be in a position to provide sites for a new school. At this stage, the s106 contribution has been based on a new 600-place secondary school, as the smallest viable scale of new secondary school. <p><u>Archaeology</u> No objection subject to conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application is located immediately south east of a late prehistoric and Romano British settlement and a Bronze Age barrow cemetery. The full extent of these features is unclear. Artefacts, including flint implements have been recovered from the field. Archaeological investigations immediately west of the proposed site have recorded medieval and Saxon-Norman field systems. • An archaeological desk based assessment has been submitted which highlights the archaeological potential of the site and recommends that conditions are attached to any planning permission to secure a programme of archaeological investigation. <p><u>Suggested Conditions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeological written scheme of investigation required • A staged programme of archaeological evaluation and if necessary, mitigation to be undertaken.
Thames Water	Current Comments: No objection:

	<p><u>Waste Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify an inability of the existing foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development. Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission: <i>"The development shall not be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either: 1. All wastewater network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed; or, 2. A development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with the Local Authority in consultation with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan. Reason - Network reinforcement works are likely to be required to accommodate the proposed development. Any reinforcement works identified will be necessary in order to avoid sewage flooding and/or potential pollution incidents".</i>• The application indicates that surface water will not be discharged to the public network and as such Thames Water has no objection, however approval should be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority. Should the applicant subsequently seek a connection to discharge surface water into the public network in the future then we would consider this to be a material change to the proposal at which point their position would be reviewed. <p><u>Water Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify an inability of the existing water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development. Recommend a condition requiring no development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ All water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or,○ A housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed. <p><i>Previous Comments:</i> No objection:</p>
--	--

	<p><u>Waste Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to foul water sewerage network infrastructure capacity, no objection to the based on the information provided. • The application indicates that surface water will not be discharged to the public network and as such there is no objection, however approval should be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority. Should the applicant subsequently seek a connection to discharge surface water into the public network in the future then we would consider this to be a material change to the proposal, which would require an amendment to the application at which point we would need to review our position. <p><u>Water Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify an inability of the existing water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development. Recommend a condition requiring no development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either: • All water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or, • A housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed. <p><u>Other Matters:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development is located within 15m of our underground water assets. Ask for an informative to be attached to any approval advising that <i>“the proposed development is located within 15m of Thames Waters underground assets, as such the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide ‘working near our assets’ to ensure your workings are in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you’re considering working above or near our pipes or other structures <a 178="" 335="" 795="" 909"="" href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-ordiverting-our-pipes”.</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="> <p>Drainage Engineer</p> </i>	<p>Current comments: No objection: <u>Flood Risk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in a suitable flood zone for the type of development proposed.
--	--	--

	<p><u>Surface Water Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Flood Risk Assessment proposes an attenuation-based strategy with discharge to an adjacent ordinary watercourse. Attenuation is proposed in the form of an attenuation basin and linear swale with overall discharge limited to QBar. Whilst we would expect further detail on the SUDS features, particularly regarding how these are designed to blend in with the landscape strategy and provide for low flow scenarios, biodiversity and amenity, the general strategy is considered reasonable.• The supplementary drawing provided confirms that proposed ground levels will be raised to reduce the risk of groundwater flooding affecting the site. Whilst further monitoring should be undertaken, we are satisfied that a strategy is in place to mitigate this risk. <p><u>Suggested conditions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A detailed surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved prior to development commencing.• Prior to first occupation of any phase a drainage compliance report is to be submitted and approved.• A detailed foul water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved prior to development commencing. <p><i>Previous Comments:</i></p> <p>Originally no objections were raised. However, following flooding on the adjacent housing site in January 2021 a holding objection was raised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Further details of proposed minimum levels should be provided to ensure ground levels are sufficiently high given that the Council has evidence that groundwater can come to the surface on this site during times of prolonged rainfall.• Given the strategy for the adjacent site included foul storage and a valve to prevent flow to Thames Water's network at times when the off-site foul network has capacity issues, the information provided on foul drainage capacity is not considered adequate. We understand that this valve remained closed for many days earlier this year, which caused issues in the local area.• The site strategy plan for this new site involves a connection to a TW manhole (CL – 55.875, IL
--	--

	<p>53.145), which has a lower cover and invert level when compared to the connection point of the neighbouring-built scheme (CL – 56.50, IL 53.50). The strategy effectively shows a part pumped part gravity system where the cover levels could drop within the site as the proposed site falls away from the main road. Given the sites topography and that other evidence does not correlate with the capacity assessment letter provided, capacity needs to be reassessed taking into consideration information from recent events with details of any mitigation measures required provided and the site strategy updated as necessary.</p>															
<p>Housing Development Team</p>	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy compliant scheme would be 31.5 affordable dwellings with 75% for rent and 25% shared ownership. • 31 dwellings should be delivered on site with a commuted sum of £68,110 payable for the part (0.5) unit. • In general, it is anticipated that the mix of affordable housing should reflect the significant demand for two-bedroom units for both rented and shared ownership tenures with a reduction in one-bedroom accommodation and an adjustment to the number of larger homes • The following affordable housing mix is proposed: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1 bed/2person</th> <th>2 bed/4 person</th> <th>3 bed/5 person</th> <th>3 bed/6 person</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rent</td> <td>6</td> <td>11</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S/O</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is preferable for the majority, if not all of the two-bedroom properties to be delivered as houses rather than flats. 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 bedroom flats are provided it is preferable for housing management purposes if communal hallways can be avoided and each flat has a direct entrance to the street. • The affordable housing should be distributed evenly across the site to avoid any concentration in any particular part of the site and to assist with ensuring that the affordable housing is indistinguishable from the market housing. 		1 bed/2person	2 bed/4 person	3 bed/5 person	3 bed/6 person	Rent	6	11	4	2	S/O	0	5	3	0
	1 bed/2person	2 bed/4 person	3 bed/5 person	3 bed/6 person												
Rent	6	11	4	2												
S/O	0	5	3	0												

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where possible, parking courts should be avoided with parking spaces provided either on-plot or adjacent to the properties.
Forestry Officer	<p>No objection subject to conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arboricultural impact assessments have been submitted and no trees are to be removed. <p><u>Suggested Conditions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree protection Landscaping scheme and management required
Countryside Officer	<p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been subject to ecological surveys between 2016 and 2020, including bat and reptile surveys. The site does not support significant populations of protected species and the habitats on site are not considered to be a constraint to development. Features of greatest ecological value are boundary hedgerows, trees and ditches which are currently shown to be mostly retained except for a small section of hedgerow to be removed for access A biodiversity metric assessment concludes that the development will likely result in a small net loss of biodiversity, in the order of -1.6 units which can be addressed through biodiversity offsetting. The detailed figure will need to be assessed once layout and landscaping are sought for approval. However, at this time the likely small net loss can be addressed through biodiversity offsetting at the appropriate stage. <i>(Planning officer comment: this could be secured if necessary by planning condition and an informative at reserved matters stage).</i> <p><u>Suggested conditions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A construction environmental management plan to be agreed and implemented A biodiversity enhancement plan to be agreed and implemented
Urban Design Officer	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome the approach of the Design and Access Statement that has been submitted. It is useful and informative with a strong section on context analysis (including a comprehensive character assessment and a constraints and opportunities

	<p>plan) which helps inform the design rationale behind the scheme and they key principles within the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide as many clear connections as possible with existing built up area.• Make sure to provide substantial landscaping throughout. Street trees throughout the development (not only in clusters) would help to soften the impact of built form. Wherever trees are proposed, it is also important to consider that these may not have enough room to establish themselves. Open planting can be used instead in the form of a privacy strip as part of the street scene if it is deemed necessary. This can demark an interface zone between public and private.• From an urban design point of view, it is positive to see a back to back relationship with existing built up area.• A balanced approach should be taken to achieve convenient parking in close proximity to households whilst also reducing the dominance of car parking on the street scene. Soft landscaping helps to soften the impact of parking on the street.• Non-allocated, shared parking, is more efficient than designating parking to individual dwellings. This can be considered to reduce parking numbers within the development scheme. On-street parking can also be used as a traffic calming measure (for a 20mph residential street). Some parking on street can help slow down speeds.• At street corners, specially designed buildings should be used to turn corners so that the buildings present a front to the public realm along both streets.• In order to aid legibility and identity, focal points throughout the site should be provided, especially at corner plots. Think about how to terminate vistas. Focal points should be visually prominent and buildings should specifically be designed for these areas (i.e. slight increase in building height/ difference in materials palette, etc). Exposed, blank gable ends with no windows fronting the public realm should be avoided.• It is positive to see that development provide a positive edge which has a clear and well defined external image (outward facing towards the countryside).
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private drives should be joined to close off the perimeter block. It is welcomed to see that these streets/ drives have been designed with a different character in mind (shared surface). • Providing surface water features/ SuDS can make a significant contribution to the landscape character, biodiversity and sustainable performance of a development. In order to meet the standards set out in the council's supplementary planning document, the 15% site area set aside for public open space should not include the SuDS within the land provision. It would be advantageous to link the different elements of the green framework, for instance by drainage swales (as seems to be proposed), to maximise biodiversity and to help create a distinctive sense of place. • Can the substation be located in a more discreet location within the masterplan? At present, it is too obvious in what could otherwise result in an attractive shared surface space.
<p>Air Quality Officer</p>	<p>Current Comments:</p> <p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revised air quality assessment has been submitted with amended assumptions on east /west traffic movements from the site and correcting the road speeds which were incorrect when included in the original modelling. The revised model predicts that the revised air quality impacts will be negligible. The modelling methodology has followed sound principles. • A key part of the model is the traffic generation associated with the site, and in particular the quantum of traffic which is likely to pass through Marcham as opposed to heading towards the A34. I am happy with the air quality assessment subject to OCC highways being content with the traffic forecasts used in the model. <p>•</p> <p><u>Suggested conditions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric vehicle charging points for all dwellings with off road parking • Dust management plan <p><u>Previous Comments:</u></p> <p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modelling of air quality has been reported in the latest air quality assessment and indicates a 'slight adverse' impact on air quality, generally; at

	<p>10 Packhorse Lane the prediction is for a 'moderate adverse' impact, and this is at the most sensitive location in the AQMA. In view of this, I remain unable to support this level of adverse impact on air quality at this location which already exceeds the Air Quality Objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The updated air quality assessment uses more relevant weather data in the modelling. The outputs of the modelling indicate that the air quality impacts in the most sensitive part of the Marcham AQMA are similar to the original modelling and as such I am unable to support his application and I maintain my objection. • The operational phase takes account of the AQMA and local air quality monitoring and uses it in modelling of future years air quality both with and without the development in place. The modelling approach and inputs appear to be generally well considered and sound. • The outputs of the current modelling indicate that overall the impact on air quality during the operational phase is negligible and this is accepted in general terms. However, at 10 Packhorse Lane the predicted impact is described as moderate with a 1% increase of the national air quality objective (AQO) levels for nitrogen dioxide predicted at this location. This predicted increase is significant at this location where the nitrogen dioxide annual average regularly exceeds the AQO and represents the worst air quality in the Marcham AQMA. • Such an adverse impact would also work against the objectives of the Air Quality Action Plan . • Object pending an updated modelling exercise using the most appropriate meteorological data and a demonstration that the development can proceed without further reducing the local air quality within the Marcham AQMA and specifically near 10 Packhorse Lane. • The construction phase impacts will be time limited and can be mitigated through implementation of a dust management plan.
<p>Environmental Protection Officer</p>	<p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is subject to implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Acoustic Design Statement submitted in support of the application .

Contaminated Land Officer	<p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted reports satisfactorily address the requirements for submission of a Phase 1 contaminated land preliminary risk assessment and Phase 2 comprehensive intrusive investigation. No significant contamination has been identified. In respect of the land contamination assessments undertaken the application site would appear to be suitable for the proposed development. Do not consider any further contaminated land assessments are necessary.
Waste Management Team	No comments
Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is already under considerable pressure from surrounding planning applications, and this application directly impacts on the ability of practices to provide primary care services to the increasing population. Primary Care infrastructure is therefore requested to support the nearest practice, which is Marcham Road Health Centre.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 Pre-application History

P20/V0287/PEJ - Advice provided (27/02/2020)

Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except access) for residential development of up to 90 dwellings, attenuation and ecological enhancement area, public open space (comprising 15% of the total site area) and associated infrastructure.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 The proposal is for fewer than 150 dwellings and the site is not in a 'sensitive area'. The site area does not exceed 5ha and therefore, the proposal does not fall within the thresholds set at Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. Consequently the proposal is not EIA development.

5.0 MAIN ISSUES

The main issues are:

1. The principle of development
2. Affordable housing
3. Market housing
4. Design
5. Residential amenity

6. Landscape and visual impact
7. Highway safety, traffic and parking
8. Air quality
9. Flood risk and drainage
10. Other considerations
11. Financial contributions

The Principle of Development

- 5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. The development plan for this proposal currently comprises the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (the LPP1) and the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (the LPP2).
- 5.2 This site is allocated by core policy 8a in the LPP2 for housing development (90 dwellings). The principle of this proposal for up to 90 dwellings is therefore, acceptable.
- 5.3 Land south and east of the application site which is safeguarded by core policy 12a of the LPP2 for a potential Marcham bypass is not directly affected by this development.

Affordable Housing

Affordable Housing

- 5.4 Core policy 24 of the LPP1 requires 35% of the proposed dwellings to be affordable dwellings. 35% of the proposed 90 dwellings is 31.5. The applicant is offering 35 dwellings on site and a financial contribution for the 0.5 part of a dwelling. This is satisfactory accords with core policy 24 and can be secured through a s.106 legal agreement.
- 5.5 It is expected that the tenure split will be 75% social or affordable rented and 25% shared ownership. To accord with core policy 24 of the LPP1 affordable housing should be evenly distributed across the site and in clusters of fewer than 15 affordable dwellings. The proposal achieves this and can be secured through a s.106 legal agreement.
- 5.6 Core policy 22 of the LPP1 states:
“A mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of current and future households will be required on all new residential developments. This should be in accordance with the Council’s current Strategic Housing Market Assessment unless an alternative approach can be demonstrated to be more appropriate through the Housing Register or where proven to be necessary due to viability constraints”.
- 5.7 The applicant’s proposed affordable housing mix is shown in the table below. The mix is acceptable according with the housing team recommendation and

complies with core policy 22 of the LPP1. This mix can be secured through a s.106 agreement:

No of bedrooms	1 bed	2 beds	3 beds (5 persons)	3 beds (6 persons)
Rent	6	11	4	2
Shared ownership	0	5	3	0

Market Housing

- 5.8 The applicant's suggested market housing mix is compliant with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) estimate and is shown in the table below:

No of beds	1	2	3	4+
Proposed	5.9%	21.7%	42.6%	29.8%
SHMA	5.9%	21.7%	42.6%	29.8%

- 5.9 The market housing mix will be dealt with by any subsequent reserved matters. A planning condition is proposed to ensure the market housing mix is compliant with core policy 22 of the LPP1.

Space standards

- 5.10 Policy DP2 of the LPP2 sets out space standards for new residential development. This is an outline application and therefore, no details of dwellings are provided. A condition is necessary at this stage to ensure the council's adopted space standards are met ensuring the dwellings designs meet policy DP2 requirements.

Design

- 5.11 Core policy 37 of the LPP1 states that new development must demonstrate high quality design that responds positively to the site and its surroundings, creating a distinctive sense of place through high quality townscape and landscaping that physically and visually integrates with its surroundings. It sets out further design criterion for streets and movement, green infrastructure, social inclusion and safe communities, climate change resilience and that development must be visually attractive, with scale, height, massing and materials appropriate to the site and surrounding area. Core policy 38 of LPP1 sets out more detailed design criterion required for strategic and major development sites.

- 5.12 Details of the design are reserved and will be part of the considerations at reserved matters stage. The LPP2 sets out design principles for the site which are:

1. Seek to enhance the connectivity of the site with Marcham village.
2. Buildings should be no higher than two storeys.
3. Masterplanning should take into account the strategy for introducing an edge to the development in relation to the existing settlement and the safeguarded route adjacent.

- 5.13 Local concern has been raised on connectivity of the site. A submitted connectivity report demonstrates the site is well connected to the village and its

services via existing footways, public footpaths and controlled road crossings. These routes do not require enhancement. A pedestrian connection to the Willows (the neighbouring housing site) is not included as third-party land which the applicant has no control over is required to achieve this. The highway authority does not object as dedicated cycle and pedestrian access will remain along the site frontage (the submitted illustrative concept masterplan shows a pedestrian route along the site frontage but within the site and connecting to the footway beside the A415 towards the north western edge of the site).

- 5.14 Officers consider it would therefore be unreasonable to refuse the application on this basis.
- 5.15 Housing on the adjacent site is primarily two-storeys with maximum heights of 9m although there are four bungalows three of which adjoin the application site. Houses on the north side of the A415 are either two or 1½ storeys. In this context two storey development is appropriate on the application site and a condition can restrict the dwellings to two storeys to accord with the LPP2.
- 5.16 An illustrative concept masterplan accompanies the application and seeks to demonstrate how 90 dwellings could be accommodated whilst providing soft edges to the south and eastern boundaries, public open space (compliant with policy DP33) and drainage attenuation without encroachment onto land safeguarded for a bypass. Core policy 23 of the LPP1 seeks minimum densities of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) unless specific local circumstances indicate that this would have an adverse effect on the character of the area, highway safety or the amenity of neighbours. The density is a little over 26 dph and reflects lower than 30dph densities in this part of Marcham and is acceptable on this edge of settlement site which in turn is allocated for 90 dwellings by policy 8a of the LPP2. In this case the proposal accords with core policy 23 of the LPP1.
- 5.17 The proposal is also considered to comply with the site development template in the LPP2.

Residential Amenity

- 5.18 Layout, appearance, and scale are reserved matters and residential amenity will be considered as part of future reserved matters applications. Notwithstanding, the submitted concept master plan demonstrates distances of 21m and above can be achieved to neighbouring dwellings and between proposed dwellings to accord with the adopted design guide. The existing hedge between the Willows and the site should also be retained to protect amenity.

Noise

- 5.19 Noise generated from road traffic on the A415 is apparent on site. The applicant has provided a noise impact assessment and in response to its findings, dwellings within 20m of the A415 and facing it should be fitted acoustically treated trickle vents to prevent unreasonable impact on future residents of dwellings. Likewise it is considered is the Marcham bypass does proceed along the route safeguarded in the LPP2, it would be 20m of more

from the proposed housing and the magnitude of effect could be similar to the A415 situation. However, it will be for any proposal for a bypass to ensure no unreasonable impact on residents. As the layout of the scheme is reserved and therefore, not currently fixed, a condition should require an updated noise assessment to be provided as part of a reserved matters application. The environmental protection team raises no objection, subject to implementation of proposed mitigation which can be secured at Reserved Matters stage. The proposal therefore accords with policy DP25.

Landscape and Visual Impact

- 5.20 Core policy 44 of LPP1 confirms that key features that contribute to the nature and quality of the district's landscape will be protected from harmful development, and where possible enhanced. Where development is acceptable in principle, proposals will need to demonstrate how they have responded to landscape character and incorporate appropriate landscape proposals.
- 5.21 Loss of this site to housing and the limited impact for local landscape character is expected as the site is allocated for housing. Boundaries to the east and south can be boosted by hedge and tree planting to screen development in public views and act as a screen between the proposal and any future Marcham bypass.
- 5.22 Public views from the north are limited mainly to persons using the A415 and Howard Cornish Road. Likewise views from the north east and east are restricted to those using the A415 due to the lack of public footpaths in this area and Peat Moor Lane is well screened by trees and hedges. Views of the site are in the context of the housing on this edge of Marcham.
- 5.23 A bridleway crosses the landscape some 1.3km south of the site. Public views of the site are limited due to hedges and the site is seen in the context of the open fields to the south and the village itself. Views from the west are constrained by existing development.
- 5.24 The site is allocated for housing and impacts in public views are to be expected. The impacts are limited and the housing will be seen in the context of the developed village. The eastern and southern boundaries can be planted with hedges and trees and housing restricted to two storeys as recommended by the site template in appendix A of the LPP2. Landscaping is a reserved matter and therefore, landscaping and landscaping management and maintenance conditions are not proposed at this stage but could be added to a future reserved matters approval.
- 5.25 In providing the access and required visibility splays, some 65m of the hedge fronting the A415 will be removed or altered. Some of this is mainly brambles. A replacement field species hedge and tree planting should be provided behind the vision splays to screen the development and to enhance biodiversity. This can be secured by condition.

- 5.26 It is concluded that the landscape and visual impacts of housing on this site can be made compliant with core policies 37 and 44 of the LPP1.

Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking

- 5.27 Core policy 33 of LPP1 actively seeks to ensure that the impacts of new development on the strategic and local road network are minimised, to ensure that developments are designed in a way to promote sustainable transport access and to promote and support improvements to the network that increase safety and improve air quality. Core policy 35 of LPP1 promotes public transport, cycling and walking and together with policy DP17 of LPP2 requires proposals for major developments to be supported by a Transport Assessment in accordance with OCC guidance. Policy DP16 of LPP2 requires evidence to demonstrate that acceptable off-site improvements to highway infrastructure can be secured where these are not adequate to service the development.
- 5.28 Local concern has been raised on traffic generation and impact on the local highway network. Access to the A415 is proposed via a 'T' junction and this has been subject to a safety audit. The Highway Authority is satisfied that this arrangement and its location would not result in any issues of capacity or delay to traffic flows along A415. Appropriate vision splays of 2.4m x 155m to the east and 2.4m x 102m to the west can be provided and the 30mph speed limit is to be extended eastwards beyond the application site and beyond the 155m vision splay. In the absence of any technical evidence to the contrary, the access arrangements are reasonably safe and appropriate.
- 5.29 As required by OCC the applicant's revised transport assessment is based on a split of 73% of vehicles from the site heading east and 27% heading west.. Based on 27% of traffic heading west to the Frilford junction results in an increase of 15 two-way traffic flows in each peak. Without mitigation this additional traffic would add to the queues at the Frilford junction which is considered by the Highway Authority as severe. In response, mitigation has been identified by increasing the length of the left hand turn lane on the west bound carriageway of the A415 opposite the existing petrol station. This will allow greater flow of traffic to join the south bound A338 thereby mitigating the increase in queue lengths that this scheme might otherwise produce. This mitigation can be secured through either direct delivery by the developer or a financial contribution in a s.106 agreement that OCC can use to implement the left hand turning widening or pool towards wider improvements at the Frilford junction. On this basis, the proposal can mitigate for its impacts and is therefore, acceptable.
- 5.30 Provision of car parking will be dealt with at reserved matters stage with parking expected to comply with Oxfordshire County Council's car parking standards.
- 5.31 The proposal is considered to accord with core policies 33 and 35 of the LPP1 and policies DP16 and DP17 of the LPP2.

Air Quality

5.32 Policy DP26 of the LPP2 confirms that development proposals that are likely to have an impact on local air quality, including those within relative proximity to existing air quality management areas (AQMAs) will need to demonstrate measures / mitigation to minimise any impacts associated with air quality. Paragraph 186 of the NPPF states decisions should ensure that any new development in AQMAs is consistent with the local air quality action plan.

5.33 An air quality management area (AQMA) has been designated for Marcham and local concern is raised that the development will have an adverse impact on air quality. All but the north western corner of the application site is outside the AQMA as is the proposed vehicular access and the Transport Assessment indicates the majority of traffic will head east, away from the village AQMA.

5.34 The submitted air quality assessment takes account of cumulative effects from committed and allocated development sites and predicts insignificant increases in Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) and particulate emissions in the Marcham AQMA, with impacts considered negligible. The council's air quality officer considers the modelling methodology in the air quality assessment has followed sound principles. Representations from residents including comments about cumulative impacts, national guidance and the draft Environment Bill have also been considered and shared with the air quality officers. Having considered these, the air quality officer advice remains no objections to the proposal.

5.35 Air quality impacts were also considered at the time the site was allocated for development in the LPP2. Paragraph 2.49 of the LPP2 states:

“There are concerns associated with highway impact from development at Marcham and the village is identified as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). It is considered that the majority of additional traffic associated with the proposed allocation at Marcham would travel towards Oxford, Abingdon-on-Thames and Science Vale (i.e. away from Marcham) and that new opportunities exist for improved public transport, cycling and walking connections in this area. The Council is satisfied that the relatively small development (90 dwellings) proposed to the south-east of Marcham will not adversely impact the AQMA located in Marcham village”.

5.36 In examining the LPP2 the Planning Inspector's report states:

Most traffic from the development would route to and from the east; modelling demonstrates the remainder would only have a negligible impact on air quality in the narrow and twisting Packhorse Lane to the west which is the focus of the designated Marcham AQMA.

With no overriding objections to its development, the site provides a suitable opportunity for further expansion of the village in the short to medium term whilst reserving the route for the by-pass and providing affordable housing, open space and a landscaped edge to the settlement”. (Paragraphs 77 and 78 of the Inspector's report).

- 5.37 The applicants air quality assessment and your officers have considered cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas on the Marcham AQMA as required by paragraph 186 of the NPPF. The impact would still be negligible and therefore, is acceptable. As such the Marcham bypass to mitigate impacts of this application. If permitted, this scheme can provide active electric vehicle charging points for each dwelling with on plot parking, a travel plan and travel information pack and a financial contribution towards bus services through Marcham. Furthermore, as part of the construction environmental management plan, HGV's delivering to the site during the construction phase can be directed eastwards and away from the AQMA. These can all help mitigate air quality impacts by encouraging more sustainable modes of travel.
- 5.38 The Parish Council refer to a previous planning application in Marcham that was refused on air quality grounds. Each case needs to be considered on its merits. Nonetheless, that application for 114 dwellings was on an unallocated site, with some 445 daily traffic movements likely through the AQMA and it failed to account for cumulative impacts. These are significant differences compared to the current application.
- 5.39 The proposal is considered compliant with core policy 43 of the LPP1 and policies DP23 and 26 of the LPP2.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 5.40 Core policy 42 of the LPP1 seeks to ensure that development provides appropriate measures for the management of surface water as an essential element of reducing future flood risk to both the site and its surroundings. The most recent Environment Agency flood map indicates the site is wholly within flood zone 1. Flood zone 1 is least susceptible to fluvial flooding and preferred in flood risk terms for housing development.
- 5.41 Following flooding on the adjacent housing development during early 2021 the drainage strategy has been re-examined and revised. The surface water drainage strategy is based on attenuation via a basin and swales with water discharged to a ditch along the southern boundary. Site levels will need to be raised to provide sufficient cover to the surface water sewers with some finished floor levels for dwellings being raised by 1m on the western side of the site. This strategy has been reviewed by the council's drainage engineer and is considered acceptable, subject to full details being agreed and this can be secured by condition. Raising site levels and floor levels by 1m above existing ground levels will not result in any harmful landscape or visual impact or overlooking of existing neighbours, subject to the design of dwellings and the layout. This can be considered at reserved matters stage.

Foul water

- 5.42 Thames Water initially identified a capacity issue where upgrades to the foul water network are required. The foul water drainage strategy consists of the northern parts of the development draining to existing sewers by gravity. The southern parts of the development will discharge to a proposed pumping station with a rising main conveying flows to the sewer network in the northern

part of the site. Thames Water has since confirmed no objection in regard to foul water drainage and has confirmed by email to the applicant in April 2021 that sufficient foul water drainage capacity for this development does exist. Again, full details of a foul drainage scheme can be secured by condition.

- 5.43 It is concluded the proposal complies with core policy 42 of the LPP1.

Other Considerations

Historic Environment

- 5.44 Core policy 39 of the LPP1 and DP36 of LPP2 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.
- 5.45 There are no designated assets within the application site or settings of listed buildings or conservation areas affected.

Archaeology

- 5.46 Policy 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 or nationally important designated or non-designated archaeological remains. No Scheduled Monuments or their settings are affected.
- 5.47 An archaeological desk based assessment has been submitted which highlights the archaeological potential of the site and recommends that conditions are attached to any planning permission to secure a programme of archaeological investigation. The county archaeologist considers archaeology is not of such significance as to preclude the principle of development, but further investigation of those areas will be required in advance of development. Further investigation can be achieved through appropriate conditions should consent be granted to accord with policy DP39 of the LPP2.

Biodiversity

- 5.48 Core policy 46 of LPP1 requires development to avoid losses in biodiversity and actively seeks net gains. The site is not covered by statutory or non-statutory designations. There is no impact for designated sites including the Cothill Fen SAC which is over 2.6km north of the site or any SSSI; the nearest being Barrow Farm Fen about 900m north east of the site.
- 5.49 The application is supported by an ecological appraisal and informed by ecological surveys including those for bats and reptiles. As explained by the council's countryside officer, the features of greatest ecological value on site are the boundary hedgerows, trees and ditches which can be retained except for forming access but new hedgerow planting can be provided behind vision splays. Open spaces, the attenuation basin and new planting can provide new green infrastructure. Planning conditions for hedge replacement and a construction environmental management plan for biodiversity can assist in enhancing biodiversity. Landscaping is a reserved matter for future

consideration. The application is considered compliant with core policy 46 of the LPP1.

Health and wellbeing

- 5.50 The application is supported by a Health Impact Assessment which confirms the scheme is arranged to encourage walking and cycling and will provide facilities to meet day to day needs for all ages. The layout will be determined at reserved matters stage to ensure an appropriate mitigation from sources of noise along with a mix of accessible housing responding to local needs. Offsite facilities and public transport improvements can be supported by financial contributions via CIL or s.106 agreement, and electric vehicle infrastructure and superfast broadband can be achieved on site. Officers are satisfied the proposal could create a healthy and sustainable community.

Contaminated land

- 5.51 Policy DP27 of the LPP2 requires proposals for the development, redevelopment or re-use of land known, or suspected, to be contaminated, to submit a Contaminated Land Preliminary Risk Consultant Report. A relevant report accompanies the application and this has been reviewed by the council's contamination officer who considers the site appears suitable for the proposed development no further contaminated land assessments are necessary.

Community Employment Plan

- 5.52 Policy DP11 of LPP2 states all new development should demonstrate how opportunities for local employment, apprenticeships and training can be created. A Community Employment Plan should only be required for residential schemes of 500 dwellings or more. As such a plan is not required for this application.

Financial Contributions

- 5.53 The NPPF advises that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:
- 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.
- 5.54 Core policy 7 of the LPP1 will only permit development where the necessary physical infrastructure and service requirements to support the development can be secured.
- 5.55 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will require contributions from the development based on floor space of the dwellings with this calculated at reserved matters stage.
- 5.56 In accordance with the Developers Contributions SPD 2017 (the SPD), a s.106 would be needed to secure affordable housing, provision of, management and maintenance of public open spaces and a Locally Equipped Area of Play

(LEAP) by a management company, public art, street naming and bin provision for the dwellings, public transport service improvements, direct works or a financial contribution towards Frilford junction improvements and Marcham primary school improvements. Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (OCCG) requests improvements to primary healthcare. In this case and in accordance with the SPD, CIL contributions could be used by OCCG towards healthcare provision.

- 5.57 As explained by OCC Marcham CE Primary School, is being expanded by a capacity of 140 places to a capacity of 210 places and the expansion will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the pupils expected to be generated by this proposal. The Parish Council makes reference to planning application no. P18/V2473/O which related to a speculative housing proposal beyond the village edge and which was refused for seven reasons including its education impact. In responding to that application OCC was clear that expansion of the school is only “*sufficient for already permitted housing growth and the additional growth proposed to be allocated in Local Plan Part 2 (90 dwellings at SE Marcham)*”. The application subject to this report is not speculative but planned housing growth being allocated in the LPP2 and this is a significant and material difference from application no. P18/V2473/O. The primary school expansion is designed to accommodate pupils from this allocated site.
- 5.58 If permission is granted this authority would expect the following financial contributions to be secured through a s.106 agreement:

District Council			
Infrastructure / Service	Amount	Index	Trigger for payment
Bin provision	£186 per dwelling	RPIX October 2019	On commencement of development
Public art on site or in Marcham Parish	£306 per dwelling; plus a commuted sum for maintenance where the ownership of on-site art features is to pass to anyone other than the site owner / developer. This will represent 7% of the value of the works to cover the costs associated with	RPIX October 2019	On commencement of development

	monitoring, repairs and maintenance over a 15-year period.		
Street naming of this development	£229 per 10 dwellings	RPIX October 2019	On commencement of development
Affordable housing – 0.5 of a dwelling	£68,110	BCIS All In - July 2020	On commencement of development
S106 monitoring fee	£3,381	N/A	On commencement of development
Oxfordshire County Council			
Retention/improvements of existing bus services that will serve the development.	£93,330 based on 90 dwellings	RPIX December 2019	TBC by OCC
Expansion of Marcham CE primary school and early years education serving the site	£596,075 (subject to the approved number of dwellings and housing mix)	BCIS All In TPI - 3Q 2019	TBC by OCC
Expansion of secondary education in the Abingdon area including sixth form, serving the site	£611,856 (subject to the approved number of dwellings and housing mix)	BCIS All In TPI - 3Q 2019	TBC by OCC
Frilford junction improvements	TBC	TBC by OCC	TBC by OCC
S106 monitoring	TBC	N/A	TBC

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 This application has been determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The site is allocated for 90 dwellings in the LPP2 and in considering the site the planning inspector examining the LPP2 advised there are *“no overriding objections to its development, the site provides a suitable opportunity for further expansion of the village”*.
- 6.2 The development has benefits including the provision of housing on an allocated site that will assist the council in meeting its identified housing need, as well as much needed affordable housing. Substantial weight is given to these benefits.

Economic benefits would arise both during construction and through support for local services by way of the spend of the future occupiers. The development is in an accessible location. These benefits are given weight in favour of the scheme. Some limited landscape and visual harm will occur particularly in the short term before landscaping becomes established. There is negligible harm for air quality in the Marcham AQMA and the LPP2 states *“The Council is satisfied that the relatively small development (90 dwellings) proposed to the south-east of Marcham will not adversely impact the AQMA located in Marcham village”*. Consideration has been given to all relevant matters that have been raised. The benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh any perceived harm.

- 6.3 In conclusion, the proposal is considered to accord with the development plan subject to the imposition of conditions and securing a s.106 agreement for infrastructure improvements.

Plan delivery

- 6.4 Officers are mindful of the impact this site may have on housing supply and delivery of the local plan and requirements of core policies 47 of LPP1 and 47a of LPP2. The trajectory for this site has been forecast to deliver dwellings from 2024.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 1 – core policies:

- CP1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- CP2 - Cooperation on unmet housing need for Oxfordshire
- CP3 - Settlement hierarchy
- CP4 - Meeting our housing needs
- CP7 – Providing supporting infrastructure and services
- CP8 - Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area
- CP22 – Housing mix
- CP23 – Housing density
- CP24 – Affordable housing
- CP33 – Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility
- CP35 – Promoting public transport, cycling and walking
- CP36 – Electronic communications
- CP37 – Design and local distinctiveness
- CP38 – Design strategies for strategic and major development sites
- CP39 – The historic environment
- CP40 – Sustainable design and construction
- CP42 – Flood risk
- CP43 – Natural resources
- CP44 - Landscape
- CP45 – Green infrastructure
- CP46 – Conservation and improvement
- CP47 – Delivery and contingency

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 2

- CP4a – Meeting our housing needs

CP8a – Additional Site Allocations for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub- Area
CP12a - Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area
DP2 – Space standards
DP11 – Community Employment Plan
DP16 – Access
DP17 - Transport assessments and travel plans
DP20 – Public art
DP21 – External lighting
DP23 – Impact of development on amenity
DP25 – Noise pollution
DP26 – Air quality
DP27 – Land affected by contamination
DP28 – Waste collection and recycling
DP30 - Watercourses
DP33 – Open space
DP36 – Heritage assets
DP39 – Archaeology and scheduled monuments
CP47a – Delivery and contingency

Neighbourhood Plan

Marcham is not currently preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.

Adopted Guidance

Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015
Developer Contributions – Delivering Infrastructure to Support Development
Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – June 2017

Other Relevant Legislation and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
Community & Infrastructure Levy Legislation
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990
Human Rights Act 1998
Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010
Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act (including New Homes Bonus)
- Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
- Environment Act 1995
- Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000
- Air Quality (England) Amendment Regulations 2002
- Air Quality Standards (England) Regulations 2010
- Air Quality Standards (England) Amendment Regulations 2016

Case Officer – Adrian Butler

Email – adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk

Tel – (01235) 422600




- Site boundary
- Other land within the applicant's control



client:
Catesby Land Promotions Limited
 project:
Land south of the A415, Marcham
 drawing title:
Site Boundary Plan


job number:
CAT102
 drawing number:
1002 rev B
 scale:
1:1250 @ A3
 drawn:
AJ
 date:
March 2020
 status:
Planning

urbandesignbox.co.uk
 Copyright of Urban Design Box. This drawing is for illustrative purposes only and should not be used for any construction estimation purposes. No liability or responsibility is accepted arising from reliance upon the information contained in this drawing. DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS.



Appendix 2

-  EXISTING FOOTWAY
-  NEW FOOTWAY



Page 52

Based upon the ORDNANCE SURVEY MAPS with the permission of THE CONTROLLER OF HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE © Crown Copyright AL 100030412 © David Tucker Associates

REV	DESCRIPTION	DRAWN	INITIALS	DATE	DRAWING STATUS	CHECKED BY	DATE



david tucker associates
 transport planning consultants
 Forester House, Doctors Lane,
 Henley In Arden,
 Warwickshire B95 5AW
 Tel: +44(0)1564 793598
 Fax: +44(0)1564 793983
 www.dtatransportation.co.uk

JOB TITLE		South East Marcham		CLIENT		Catesby	
DRAWING TITLE							
Proposed Site Access Details							
SCALE	DRAWN BY	DATE	DRAWING No	REVISION			
1/1000@A3	BP	Feb21	18241-09-2	c			

