

# **WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **LOWLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

**19 JANUARY 2015**

### **Report of Additional Representations**



---

WEST OXFORDSHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

## Agenda Index

Please note that if you are viewing this document electronically, the agenda items below have been set up as links to the relevant application for your convenience.

I4/I009/P/OP	<a href="#">Land to the West of Fruitlands, Eynsham</a>	Page 3
I4/01510/S73	<a href="#">2 The Crescent, Witney</a>	Page 10
I4/01669/S73	<a href="#">Hulse Ground Farm, Little Faringdon</a>	Page 11
I4/01863/OUT	<a href="#">Land West of Station Road, Eynsham</a>	Page 12
I4/01971/FUL	<a href="#">79 Milestone Road, Carterton</a>	Page 16
I4/02205/FUL	<a href="#">Land North of Northold Road, Carterton</a>	Page 17
I4/02062/FUL	<a href="#">North Street Farm House, North Street, Aston</a>	Page 18

Application Number	I4/I009/P/OP
Site Address	Land To The West Of Fruitlands Eynsham
Date	15th January 2015
Officer	Kim Smith
Officer Recommendations	Approved subject to Legal Agreement
Parish	Eynsham
Grid Reference	442427 E 209807 N
Committee Date	19th January 2015

**Application Details:**

Erection of 19 dwellings with associated access and open green space. (Amended plans and description)

**Applicant Details:**

J A Pye (Oxford) Ltd  
Langford Locks  
Kidlington  
Oxon  
OX5 1HZ

Consultation Responses

**Parish Council**

This is the decision of the Eynsham Parish Council Planning Committee supplemental to the original response to you of 8 August 2014, which should be read in conjunction with this response.

Objection. The Parish Council objects for the following reasons:

1. No positive support has been received from any residents of Eynsham for this application. The Applicant's own Statement of Community Engagement shows overwhelming objection to this application, as do the comments posted in accordance with the WODC online consultation for this amended application. A large majority of local residents state that Eynsham's infrastructure, including roads, schools, health care and sewers are incapable of coping with the proposed development on this site.
2. As set out in the Parish Council's response of 8 August 2014, development on this site (SHLAA Site 180) has been opposed since it was first proposed by the Applicant in 2010. Granting consent would allow the Applicant to profit from his historic breaches and lack of enforcement of WODC's planning conditions (Planning Statement, December 2014).
3. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, June 2014 assesses the site (180) as 'not suitable' citing 'Loss of important amenity space; intrusion into the soft rural edge of the village; possible harm to biodiversity'. The SHLAA June 2014 further states that no houses are required for Eynsham to April 2019. It also identifies two sites (179 and 187a) which are 'developable' to satisfy the housing requirement from 2019 to 2029. Develop of site 180 is therefore not only unsuitable but unnecessary. The West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment also says further urban intrusions into the attractive rural fringes to the west of the village should be discouraged.
4. The Applicant admits the proposal does not conform to H7 (Planning Statement). Adequate transport, service and community infrastructure are not available (BE1). Building on the only existing woodland in Eynsham would result in a loss of a facility of benefit to local residents and of an area of natural conservation value (BE2 and NE6). The surface water drainage proposals could cause unacceptable levels of pollution (BE18, NE7 and NE11). It would set an undesirable precedent for other sites on the western edge of the village (H2). These are material considerations which would create adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and a presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF, para 14).

5. While the Applicant's Transport Statement alleges 'the traffic impact on the local network will be minimal', the proposed development would be a cul-de-sac at the end of a dead-end road (Fruitlands) at the end of a dead-end road (Old Witney Road) which accesses Witney Road near one of the busiest junctions in Eynsham, with the A40. The Parish Council is informed by residents of both Fruitlands and Old Witney there are now regular traffic jams at peak periods. The WODC Suitability Appraisal July 2014 (Appendix I, 43 and 44) states the A40 Witney to Oxford is Oxford's worst congestion problem and identifies Witney Road as one of the six worst local congestion problems in West Oxfordshire. The reduction from 21 to 19 houses in this application is unlikely to lessen to a significant degree the additional burden this proposed development would place on local residents and the already overstretched road network.

6. The whole of Eynsham's foul water drainage flows through a single pipe beneath the Bitterell footpath to the Thames Water pumping station on the east side of the eastern bypass. The proposed site's connection to this would be one of the furthest away of any development in the village. Existing Fruitlands residents have reported blockages in the current system. The Applicant admits the foul drainage from the site will require a pumping station to drain foul sewage from the site via the existing Fruitlands foul drainage connection. The design and access statement, revised December 2014, states that a revised (December 2014) flood risk assessment and drainage statement has been submitted in support of this application but this has not been provided to the Parish Council and is not available on the District Council's website. Subject to a satisfactory drainage strategy and impact assessment, the Parish Council would question whether the relocated pumping station is best placed to deal with the additional foul water drainage required by the proposed development without adversely affecting the existing sewage system of Fruitlands and Eynsham as a whole.

7. While the Applicant's drainage statement says surface water will be dealt with by 'a full infiltration system' the proposed drainage strategy plan (14-1477-03 Rev P04) clearly shows intended run off of surface water toward the drainage ditch to the west of the proposed site, which already receives surface water sewer drainage from Fruitlands itself. It is noticed that the drainage easement for the Fruitlands surface water sewer has been omitted from the revised site layout plan. The combination of the two drainage schemes into this ditch risks increased pollution passing from the ditch to the Chil Brook and on to the Wharf Stream and into the Thames.

8. While the revised design and access statement says (at 4.9) that the layout has been influenced by the desire to retain as many existing trees as possible, the revised site layout, bunching the majority of the dwellings in the northern end of the site, appears from the landscape master plan, to actually reduce the number of existing tree groups.

9. The revised site layout places Plot 18 at the north side of the entrance to the site, in unacceptably close proximity to existing houses. In the Applicant's pre-application layout for 22 houses this siting was dropped in favour 21 houses with this area left unbuilt.

10. The Applicant admits overcrowding at the local primary school. The school is already turning away children from families moving to the village. It also admits oversubscription at Bartholomew School. Bartholomew has recently made an application to expand its impacted campus by four classrooms and two science labs to accommodate an anticipated 95 new students in Autumn 2015. This is without the impact of the proposed development. Any s106 contribution will not solve the existing school problems if the existing schools are incapable of further expansion. The Applicant also fails to address the impact on local health care with the one health centre in the village (and its branch in Long Hanborough) already restricting appointments. The centre is under-strength with 10 doctors, half of which are part-time and with a registration of over 13,600 patients and increasing.

11. It is noted that the reduction in this application from 21 to 19 dwellings is achieved by dropping one 3 bed affordable and one 3 bed market dwellings while retain all seven 4 bed ones. As the SHMA and WODC Housing Consultation showed, the demand both for affordable and market homes is for one to three bed homes. A reduction in proposed dwellings should be reflected in the 4 bed models as well.

If the local planning authority does grant consent for this proposed development it should be conditional on:

- a) Strict restrictions on construction traffic and times of travel, as well as vehicle and road cleansing as the only access to the site is along Fruitlands itself which is unsuitable for heavy construction traffic.
- b) The amended layout creates greater public open space which was previously allocated as building plots. In order to preserve this open space the Parish Council proposes a prohibition on further development on the site.

If consent is granted, following advice from the District Council on s106 contributions the Parish Council requests for the benefit of residents a developer contribution of £36,630 towards sport and recreation, play areas, or street furniture or other appropriate village amenities to reflect the additional strain on existing community infrastructure this development will represent.

## **Environment Agency**

### Environment Agency Position

We have no objection to the application as submitted, subject to the inclusion of a condition, detailed under the heading below, to any subsequent planning permission granted.

Without the inclusion of this condition we consider the development to pose an unacceptable risk to the Environment

### Condition 1

The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to dispose foul sewage has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

### Reason

This development site is located over the Summertown-Radley Sand and Gravel Member (Secondary A Aquifer) and whilst there are no springs that emanate from this drift geology to feed streams, there is a surface water drainage system in place to the south of this site that drains to the Chil Brook.

Therefore we require confirmation of the foul drainage system to ensure there is no risk to pollution of controlled waters, in accordance with paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

### Explanation

The application form states that the development will connect to the foul sewer and that there will be a new pumping station compound.

However, we would require re-assurance that this approach is possible, with confirmation from the sewerage provider that there is capacity for this connection to be made to the foul sewer.

As there is no confirmation that the applicant can connect to the foul sewer, the above condition, for a scheme to be submitted, is necessary to ensure that the finalised foul drainage system does not cause pollution to controlled waters.

## Flood Risk

The proposed development is located in Flood Zone I (low probability) based on our Flood Zone map. Whilst development may be appropriate in Flood Zone I, paragraph 103 (footnote 20) of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out a Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted for all developments over one hectare in size.

We note that a FRA has been submitted in support of the proposed development.

The West Thames Area (Environment Agency South East) is operating a risk based approach to planning consultations. As the site lies in Flood Zone I and is between 1 and 5 hectares we do not intend to make a bespoke response to the proposed development. The following standing advice is provided as a substantive response to you. If this advice is used to refuse a planning application, we would be prepared to support you at any subsequent appeal.

In order for the development to be acceptable in flood risk terms we would advise the following:

### Surface Water Flooding

Our flood risk standing advice (<https://www.gov.uk/flood-risk-standing-advice-frsa-for-local-planning-authorities>) contains guidance on what FRAs need to include. Key points for developments in Flood Zone I (cell F5) are:

- Surface water runoff should not increase flood risk to the development or third parties. This should be done by using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to attenuate to at least pre-development runoff rates and volumes or where possible achieving betterment in the surface water runoff regime. (The applicant should contact Local Authority Drainage Departments where relevant for information on surface water flooding.)
- An allowance for climate change needs to be incorporated, which means adding an extra amount to peak rainfall (20% for commercial development, 30% for residential). See Table 5 of Technical Guidance for NPPF.
- The residual risk of flooding needs to be addressed should any drainage features fail or if they are subjected to an extreme flood event. Overland flow routes should not put people and property at unacceptable risk. This could include measures to manage residual risk such as raising ground or floor levels where appropriate.

### Final Comments

We trust the standing advice in this letter will assist you in reviewing surface water of the proposed development and in determining the planning application. We recommend that you liaise with your Land Drainage Engineer in consideration of the above.

### **WODC- Communities and Leisure**

We have considered the scale and housing mix in this application and should it be approved we will not be seeking S106 contributions towards public art at this site.

## **Natural England**

Thank you for your consultation received by Natural England on 9th December 2014.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England has previously commented on this proposal and made comments to the authority in our letter dated 18th July 2014.

The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this amendment although we made no objection to the original proposal.

Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before sending us the amended consultation, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.

## **Representations**

Since writing the report 67 representations have been received in respect of the amended scheme. Many of the concerns raised were raised in respect of the original submission for 21 dwellings which are reported under the 'REPRESENTATIONS' section of the Committee report (pages 9-13). The representations in respect of the amended scheme can be viewed in full on the Council's website.

The following additional matters/concerns have been raised in respect of the amended scheme for nineteen houses:

- The revised plans are not an improvement. Pye claims that the density is reduced but this is only on the south eastern edge and has increased on the northern side of the new access road;
- The LVIA (November 14) states that the development will have a minimal impact from the viewpoint of living rooms. This is not true. We think that it is not possible in any way for the remaining trees plus extra planting to improve the biodiversity of the site compared to the present situation. In the amended scheme the number of trees on the plan are the same and the majority of the houses have not been pulled back from the boundary. The reduction of 2 houses will have a minimal effect on traffic;
- Very few of the houses can be afforded by young people or bungalows which would be of interest to older residents and in turn free up houses of variable sizes within the village;
- The scheme has been amended to safeguard vistas along and across the site but it does nothing to protect vistas at the south east corner;
- In the south west corner little appears to have been done to protect the view, or trees. Our privacy will be compromised with 4 houses overlooking our garden.
- If the Fruitlands copse is preserved and if local residents wish, there is the potential to clear and plant more trees and make an even more significant amenity. The loss of this area to housing would constitute a significant loss of amenity and heritage to the village with limited benefit in terms of housing. There are other areas which provide better opportunities to build- with much less impact;
- Pye's claims that the development would 'improve the biological capital of the site' and 'provide further arboricultural benefits' are rather odd. Surely leaving the area as natural woodland would be the best thing to do from an ecological point of view;
- The Local Plan schedules no new homes in Eynsham for the next 5 years as enough are in the pipeline (68) or have been provided (120) since 2011;

- Some statements in the revised design statement are weird and would only apply if the site was left as a public open space and not a housing estate;
- 'Plonking' the affordable housing in the middle of a green space look totally out of place and could cause a lot of social problems in the future;
- If the application is successful my main concern is that my property will become the meat in a sandwich as Planning will have very great difficulty in refusing them planning permission when they also present new applications;
- The alterations are purely cosmetic;
- There is clear evidence on the site of long term local use by children (tree swings, dens, BMX bike trail) and well used trails and paths throughout the site used by dog walkers and fruit pickers;
- It takes an extremely creative mind to argue that building on and concreting over at least 80% of natural vegetation is 'enhancing a natural amenity'. The majority of the 'improved' open space will not be accessible to the public as 70% of the new green areas will be private back gardens;
- Pye is claiming to be benefiting the local environment when in fact they are taking away the majority of a well-used, much loved public amenity;
- Object to Pye's intention to use improved access to the school playing fields as a reason to gain planning permission. The playing fields belong to Bartholomew School and are not for public use;
- Concerned that promises to retain several of the mature trees will not be enforceable as there are no TPO's in place. Nothing in the amended plan enhances the landscape quality or the nature conservation area;
- It would be a major error if this application was to be approved, but if it is the green space will need protecting, so that there is a maintenance system, and the green spaces will need protecting from further building;
- The arboreal report is incorrect;
- A European Protected Species Licence will be required before work commences;
- The proposal would result in the loss of a facility of benefit to local residents. Loss would include walking, wood, fruit etc.
- The fact that there appears to be no significant response from WODC in the interim ( between initial submission and amendment) and a revision has come over the Christmas and New Year holiday period requiring a response by January 8th can only leave one feeling more cynical regarding the whole process.
- What has changed following the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2014 when it was not deemed suitable for development? Has the developer/ builder come up with an offer you can't refuse!
- I note the reduction of dwellings from 21 to 19. Although this provides welcome additional open space in the development, it still builds on what is currently green space on the western edge of the village, and puts additional pressure on the existing infrastructure.
- The reduction of houses by 2 does not substantially affect the issue of increased traffic.
- The proposal talks of 50% affordable dwellings, but the site plan identifies only 6 out of 19 dwellings as affordable.
- The planning document also states that the development has preserved pedestrian access to the playing fields to the south of the site; these playing fields are an important amenity, which the proposal recognises, and if this application is granted it will be even more important to preserve them in future - for the increased population and also to provide run off for drainage.
- While the revised application is now only 19 homes and in relation to Fruitlands could be considered 'infilling' , in terms of development on the west side of the village it could be the thin edge of a very large wedge.



- The application should be deferred pending the publication of the Village Neighbourhood Plan, now in the process of being drawn up.
- If WODC are minded to approve the application I would prefer to see the ten affordable houses dotted about the development, giving greater social cohesion.
- If the Fruitlands application is granted, it is important that it is indeed regarded as a special case, for historical reasons, and is not used in support of any future
- development plans for this side of the village.
- This application is at total variance with all policies in both the NPPF and the local plan aimed at protecting, conserving and enhancing the natural environment. A point endorsed very recently by the West Oxfordshire District Councils own professional advisors through the SHLAA and supported over decades by various objective planning inspectors, including the Secretary of State's.
- This site provides a home for or is used by a large range of species including deer, foxes, badgers, hedgehogs, bats, wood mice, and dragonflies. Bird species include owls, kestrels, sparrow hawks, green and spotted woodpeckers, tree creepers, bullfinches, jays, and winter visiting fieldfares
- and redwings. Some of the fruit trees were specific to Eynsham. The heart of this area will be ripped out dispersing the wildlife and destroying an area left to nature for more than 30 years.
- If future housing is built on the west of the village as was in the local plan the retention of this diverse habitat is even more important. The previous local plan stated this land is not suitable for development because of its biodiversity. I would like to see this land given to BBONT or the Wychwood Project. It is after all part of the Wychwood Forest.
- When Fruitlands was built surface water drains were put in on the application site. This suggests the developer always intended to build here and not hand the land over for public use. I think it is wrong that a developer can ignore a condition of planning consent and at a future date benefit from not complying with that condition. Pyes accepted the planning consent, built the houses, and accepted the money for the project. The houses are still here and we, along with many others, have been using the application land as intended in the 1984 planning consent.
- Furthermore there are a number of sites, some readily available, including brownfield sites, in the locality that if developed would not result in the destruction of such a heavily wooded rare natural amenity. It is completely pointless and unnecessary to allow the destruction of this site whilst so many alternatives exist.
- The applicant's record of non-compliance must bring into question their intentions with regard to preservation of any of the natural woodland. By anyone's interpretation of planning guidelines or standards this cannot and must not be allowed to happen.
- In short the village is in grave danger of losing a unique area of woodland used as public open space for decades; It is a Heavily wooded, ex-orchard, now unmanaged and very natural. Relatively flat with dense undergrowth criss-crossed with well-trodden routes. Feels remote and isolated despite being adjacent to a housing development and close to the village centre. Although there are no TPOs here, the woodland here is quite dense and mature and contributes to a soft urban edge. WOLA stresses the need to avoid further intrusions into this edge. At least half of this site is a UKBAP site. Considering the length of time that this environment has had to develop, it is likely that it forms a valuable habitat to a variety of flora and fauna.
- Our main objections are the impact on the character of the area, impact on traffic generation and the scale of the development
- Little has changed from the original application and supporting documents from the applicants retained advisors which contain subjective and misleading information.
- It is clear that the small reduction in the number of dwellings is merely a means to provide more pockets of unusable 'open space' as a trade-off for sacrificing a large area of natural woodland used and enjoyed by many local village residents. It is difficult to comprehend how building 19 houses on a small area of dense natural woodland can do anything other than destroy it.

Application Number	14/01510/S73
Site Address	2 The Crescent Witney Oxfordshire OX28 2EL
Date	15th January 2015
Officer	Sarah De La Coze
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Witney Parish Council
Grid Reference	436334 E 210561 N
Committee Date	19th January 2015

**Application Details:**

Non-compliance with condition 2 of planning permission 09/1571/P/FP to allow annexe to be used as a separate dwelling.

**Applicant Details:**

Mr & Mrs Denis ODriscoll  
2 The Crescent  
Witney  
Oxfordshire  
OX28 2EL

**Amended Description**

Please note that the description has been amended as the original description referred to the incorrect application number.

**Highway Comments**

Description: Non-compliance with condition 2 of planning permission 09/1571/P/FP to allow annexe to be used as a separate dwelling.

Please find my comments on the above planning application consultation as follows:

Recommendations

This application should be granted but the suitable conditions applied (as below).

Conditions

I suggest the following conditions:

- Prior to occupation of the dwelling vision splays measuring 2m by 2m shall be provided to each side of the access. This vision splays shall not be obstructed by any object, structure, planting or other material with a height exceeding or growing above 0.6 metres as measured from carriageway level.  
Reason In the interest of highway safety

General Observations

The proposal seeks the allowance for the existing annex to become a one bedroom separate unit. One car parking space has been allocated to this unit which meets parking standards.

The Highway Authority has recommended a condition be placed upon any permission if granted for the provision of pedestrian vision splays and these to be protected from being altered or obstructions place upon the field of view.

Given the nature of the existing carriageway vehicular traffic and speeds are likely to below.

It is my opinion that the vehicle movements associated with the proposal does not present “severe harm” as required in the recent Government guidelines in the Nation Planning Policy Framework to warrant a recommendation for refusal on highways grounds.

Application Number	14/01669/S73
Site Address	Hulse Grounds Farm Little Faringdon Lechlade Oxfordshire GL7 3QR
Date	15th January 2015
Officer	Sarah De La Coze
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Little Faringdon
Grid Reference	423208 E 202004 N
Committee Date	19th January 2015

**Application Details:**

Non-compliance with condition 3 of planning permission 10/1054/P/FP to allow unrestricted occupancy of converted barns.

**Applicant Details:**

Mr & Mrs J Holden  
Hulse Ground Farm,  
Little Faringdon  
Lechlade  
Gloucestershire  
GL7 3QR

**Highway Comments**

Description: Non-compliance with condition 3 of planning permission 10/1054/P/FP to allow unrestricted occupancy of converted barns.

Please find my comments on the above planning application consultation as follows:

Recommendations

This application should be granted but the suitable conditions applied (as below).

Conditions

I suggest the following conditions:

- The access point will need to be widened and a scheme to show this will need to be submitted. Drives onto existing county roads must be 4.1m wide for the first 6m from the highway edge tapering to 3.0m over the next 6m.
- Given the length of the access lane it is recommended that passing places be provided so as to allow for two vehicles to pass each other.

General Observations

Given the nature of the existing carriageway vehicular traffic and speeds are likely to be low.

It is my opinion that the vehicle movements associated with the proposal does not present “severe harm” as required in the recent Government guidelines in the Nation Planning Policy Framework to warrant a recommendation for refusal on highways grounds.

The Highway Authority notes that the site is not in a sustainable location and would have been recommended for refusal on this ground, however given the potential number of vehicle movements associated with the proposal, it is considered not of a level to recommend refusal.

After reviewing the supplied plans and documentation, the Highway Authority has No Objection subject to the above condition(s) to the proposal on the basis of Highway Safety.

Application Number	14/01863/OUT
Site Address	Land West Of Station Road Station Road Eynsham Oxfordshire
Date	15th January 2015
Officer	Phil Shaw
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Eynsham
Grid Reference	442933 E 209101 N
Committee Date	19th January 2015

**Application Details:**

Proposed Residential Development of up to 49 dwellings, Public Open Space, Vehicular Access, Landscaping and Associated Works.

**Applicant Details:**

Mr Gladman Developments  
Gladman House  
Alexandria Way  
Congleton  
Cheshire  
CW12 1LB

Additional comments have been received from the following consultees:

**Eynsham Parish Council**

Objection. The Parish Council objects for the following reasons:

1. No positive support has been received from any residents of Eynsham for this application. The Applicant's own pre-application consultation website responses (as set out in the Statement of Community Engagement) shows a majority of objections to the proposal. So do the comments posted in response to the WODC online consultation on this application. A large majority of local residents state that Eynsham's infrastructure, including roads, schools, health care and sewers are incapable of coping with a development on this scale. Thames Water responded (letter 17/12/14) stating 'the receiving sewer may not have sufficient spare capacity to accommodate the calculated net foul flow increase from the proposed development'. Many residents, some with catastrophic personal experience of local flooding, also expressed serious concern about the effect the development would have downstream on the Chil Brook and the residents who live there. This makes the WODC pre-application decision not to require an Environmental Impact Assessment (letter, Chris Hargraves 3/11/14) incomprehensible.

2. The Strategic Land Availability Assessment June 2014 assesses the site (209) as 'Not suitable' stating that 'Development here would have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Conservation Area and setting of Eynsham. Falls in an area of high quality floodplain pasture. The expansion of the village here would have a significant impact on the site's pastoral character'. The SHLAA June 2014 further states that no houses are required for Eynsham to April 2019. It also identifies two sites (179 and 187a) which are 'developable' to satisfy the housing requirement from 2019 to 2029. Development of site 209 is therefore not only unsuitable but unnecessary.

3. As for the primary considerations contained in Local Plan 2011, the proposed development does not comply with the following policies:

BE1 - Appropriate supporting transport, service and community infrastructure is not available and no plans are available for their adequate provision either by the applicant or the local authorities. BE2 - The development will not improve the character and quality of its surroundings. Existing features of importance in the local environment are not protected or enhanced (H2). The landscape surrounding the village is adversely affected. BE4 - The development will result in a loss or erosion of an open area which makes an

important contribution to the visual amenity or character of an area of nature conservation value (H2). The Applicant says the proposed 49 houses will be 2 to 2.5 stories with ridge heights of 7.5m to 8.5m. The proposed boundary landscaping will not adequately screen this large intrusion into the visual aspect of the village, either from the entry to the village from the south or the aspect of the countryside when viewed from the immediately adjacent Conservation Area to the east and north. BE5 - the Eynsham Conservation Area, which is adjacent to the site boundary on the east and partially on the north, will not be preserved or enhanced and its character will be eroded. BE18 - The proposed surface water drainage from the development would increase the risk of unacceptable levels of pollution (NEI 1). H2 - It would erode the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including important open public open space and adversely affect features of historical or ecological importance and their setting. The Eynsham fishponds, created as part of Eynsham Abbey in 1217 and a proven ecological and biodiversity site is immediately to the east of the site on Station Road (BE2 and BE5). Development on the rural edge of the village would create an undesirable precedent for other sites which would cumulatively erode the character and environment of the area. H7 - Eynsham is a service centre and the development is neither infilling nor rounding off.

4. Further, the development does not comply with the following core policies of the West Oxfordshire Draft Local Plan:

CP5 - It does not propose infrastructure adequate to support the development. CP17 - It does not conserve or enhance the character or distinctiveness of the local natural environment, or respect the intrinsic character of the local landscape. CP23 - It does not respect, protect or enhance the local historic environment, its heritage assets or setting. CP34 - It exacerbates the potential flood risk from the Chil Brook to local residents downstream from the site.

5. These are material considerations which would create adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and a presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF, para 14).

6. In terms of the infrastructure to support the proposed development, the general assertions of adequacy by the Applicant are disingenuous. The primary school, having expanded recently, is already turning away the children of residents recently moving to the village. Bartholomew School is oversubscribed. It has recently made an application (14/1357/P/FP) to expand by four classrooms and two science labs to accommodate an anticipated 95 new students in autumn 2015. This is without the impact of the proposed development. Any s106 contribution will not solve the existing school problems if the existing schools are physically incapable of further expansion. The one health care centre in the village (and its branch in Long Hanborough) is already restricting appointments. The centre is under-strength with 10 doctors, half of which are part-time and with a registration of over 13,600 patients and increasing.

7. The Applicant's Transport Assessment is equally disingenuous, particularly with regard to the traffic impact. The traffic figures summary for peak travel concentrates on the periods 800-900 and 1700-1800. Whereas the detailed traffic survey results show significant traffic movement outside these narrow bands, particularly before 800 and before and after 1700. This is an indication that commuting work patterns have already been altered by traffic congestion. The traffic survey also confines its study to Station Road between the junction with Acre End Street and the roundabout with the B4449. No account has been taken of the travel of these vehicles, either going north or south either through the village or along the bypass. The only connection directly to the centre of the village and local services is along Acre End Street. The only entrances to and exits from the village from the north are Acre End Street and Witney Road to the A40, through the village itself via Oxford Road, or along the B4449 bypass to either the Swinford Toll Bridge or the A40 at Eynsham Roundabout. WODC's Sustainability Appraisal July 2014 (Appendix 1, at 43 and 44) identifies the A40 from Witney to Oxford and the worst congestion problem in West Oxfordshire. It further states of the six worst local congestion problems in West Oxfordshire, two are in Eynsham - Oxford Road-Witney Road-Acre End Street and Swinford Toll Bridge. The traffic impact is at present unsustainable and would be further exacerbated by a substantial development on the southern fringe of the village.

8. Flood Risk is a very real fear for Eynsham Residents, as is made clear from the graphic letters referred to above. The Station Road area suffered extensively from flooding of the Chil Brook in 2007 and 2008 and has remained at risk ever since. Flooding of the village playing fields by the Chil Brook happens almost annually. Any development upstream on the Chil Brook must be very carefully assessed to avoid increasing the likelihood of further flooding. Long term residents of the Station Road area report the development of Merton Close has added an increased risk of flooding. The Applicant admits in its Flood Risk Assessment that the surface water run-off from the site flows in a southerly direction and discharges to the Chil Brook. It further states that the soil composition of the site is calcareous gravel with limited moisture storage. The Applicant's reliance on a surface water SuDS drainage system is therefore unviable where there is no natural water retention on the site and any run off collected from roofs, hard landscaping and even permeable paving from the development will only find its natural course to drain into the Chil Brook, the excess causing the watercourse to rise higher and faster than it traditionally does. The remedial measures proposed such as water butts would be totally ineffective. The proposed attenuation pond would itself be full in periods of sustained wet weather and no use in retaining the increased run off.

If consent is granted, following advice from the District Council on S106 contributions the Parish Council requests, for the benefit of the residents, a developer contribution of £94,465 towards sport and recreation, play areas, or street furniture or other appropriate village amenities to reflect the additional strain on existing community infrastructure this development will represent.

### **Oxfordshire County Council**

No objection from Highways, Archaeology, Education and Property Services subject to S106 contributions and conditions.

### **WODC Public Art**

A S106 contribution towards public art to provide interpretation materials and community arts events in the immediate area. A S106 contribution of up to £9800 would be required based on £200 per house which is benchmarked with other authorities in Oxfordshire. This figure would be reduced if the number of affordable properties rises.

### **Additional Representations**

Five additional letters have been received since the report was written, and are summarised as follows:

- Following the establishment of new housing off Chilbridge Road and the large estate adjacent to Bitterell, we now have developers seeking planning consents for new builds in Fruitlands and Station Road.
- Has adequate consideration been given to the ability of the local facilities to cope, I ask? Our schools are already full, our health centre has every appearance of operating at full capacity and the Eynsham branch of Lloyds chemist is at full stretch.
- Need a complementary expansion of our service infrastructure. Almost at any time during any working day the A40 is congested and will become ever more so with the planned expansions of Witney and Carterton.
- Surely the A40 must have priority before any further planning consents are simply nodded through.
- Development here would have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Conservation Area and setting of Eynsham.
- It falls in an area of high quality floodplain pasture.
- The expansion of the village here would have a significant impact on the site's pastoral character. The field (as site 209) has been proposed for development by its owners repeatedly in West Oxfordshire District Council's (WODC) Local Plans (LP). Each time it has been rejected, most recently in 2005 when the Government Inspector was looking at objections to WODC LP. He pronounced that, together with the field to the east of Station Road which is in the Conservation Area (CA), this site provided: - "an attractive approach to the village. These open fields, enclosed as they are by stone walls, set the scene for the traditional Cotswolds Buildings which line Station Road and which lead you

to the historic core of the village.” “Whilst the field on the western side of Station Road lies outside the Conservation Area it makes a positive contribution to its setting...the development of which is likely to have an adverse impact on the setting of the village and the Conservation Area. (WODC SHLAA January 2011) Nothing has changed.

- There should be a design and access statement for this site. In view of the conservation issues the development may well be contrary to the provisions Listed Building and Conservation Areas act.
- The Traffic Plan as an input is meaningless; a plan is something made before the event, not after it. The Gladman application pays scant regard, if any, to the important heritage aspects of this site and its proximity to ancient abbey precincts.
- There is a strong likelihood of it being a significant burial site given both its name and location. There would also be a detrimental impact on the adjacent conservation area and particularly on the southern approach to the village.
- Of considerable concern is the potential for serious flood risks - notwithstanding the substantial amount of documentation supplied by Hydrock (Ref. C14051/002) in support of the project. The site itself may well only be held in Flood Zone 1, but the effects are likely to be felt further down on properties closer to the Chill Brook, specifically those immediately south of the Chill Brook bridge
- Pointing out that Stanton House and the Dutch Cottages would not be at significant risk completely misses the point; these are slightly lower than the specified site, but still well above the Chill Brook area noted above, which has flooded on several occasions.
- In fact these and much of the surrounding area was badly affected after the 2007 floods - which on one of the maps even indicated that the allotment fields were not affected at this time.
- Eynsham is on several gravel layers and water percolates through these layers at varying rates. The maps supplied have a number of other inaccuracies and the supplied letter from the EA indicated that "further investigation (could be) required."
- 40+ houses means at least 40+ cars, 80 new patients for the doctors, 80-100 more children.
- Where are the doctors and school places are coming from?
- Station Road has been known to flood on several occasions.
- Village amenities are already under pressure as is the local road network during rush hours
- We agree with the SHLAA which describes the site as not suitable for building.

### **Applicants Case**

The applicant has also submitted a revised flood risk assessment which is available to view online.

Application Number	14/01971/FUL
Site Address	79 Milestone Road Carterton Oxfordshire OX18 3RL
Date	15th January 2015
Officer	Phil Shaw
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Carterton
Grid Reference	427815 E 206111 N
Committee Date	19th January 2015

**Application Details:**

Proposed residential development of the site to provide 14 apartments and associated access, parking and landscaping.

**Applicant Details:**

Mr Brad Andrews  
N/A  
United Kingdom

**\*\*\*\*\*THIS APPLICATION HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN\*\*\*\*\***



Application Number	I4/02205/FUL
Site Address	Land North Of Northolt Road Carterton Oxfordshire
Date	15th January 2015
Officer	Sarah De La Coze
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Carterton
Grid Reference	427988 E 207332 N
Committee Date	19th January 2015

**Application Details:**

Erection of two dwellings

**Applicant Details:**

Mr Paul Mansbridge  
Darley Grange  
Barron Farm  
Shippon  
Abingdon  
Oxon  
OX13 6UX

**Highway Comments**

The proposal, if permitted, will not have a significant detrimental effect on the safety and convenience on the local highway network.

No objection subject to

- G11 access specification
- G36 parking as plan

Application Number	14/02062/FUL
Site Address	North Street Farm House North Street Aston Bampton Oxfordshire OX18 2DJ
Date	15th January 2015
Officer	Kim Smith
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Aston, Cote, Shifford And Chimney
Grid Reference	434133 E 203390 N
Committee Date	19th January 2015

**Application Details:**

Proposed residential development including the erection of four dwellings, the conversion of two redundant agricultural buildings to form two dwellings, extensions to the existing farmhouse and associated access, parking, landscaping and demolition.

**Applicant Details:**

Mr H Chopping  
N/A  
United Kingdom

The members of Aston, Cote, Shifford & Chimney Parish Council considered the above application at a meeting on 8 January 2015. The Parish Council is pleased to see the amendments to the site layout, and the road accesses in particular, since the previous application (14/1229/P/FP). The amendments have overcome the objections the Parish Council made to the previous application, and we do not wish to object to this new application.

However, the Parish Council remains concerned over the lack of clarity of the ownership of some of the open space on the site; most particularly the land outside the garden wall of the existing farm house which abuts North Street. On other sites in our parish, where the ownership and maintenance responsibility of open spaces is not clear, we have experienced issues achieving acceptable land management, and would not wish to see that repeated here. We would be grateful if you would raise this concern with the developer and gain assurance on the title and maintenance responsibility of that area of the site once it has been developed.