

# **WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

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

**Date: 9<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

### **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.

I6/00602/FUL	<a href="#">Land North Of Springfield Oval</a>	3
I6/01054/OUT	<a href="#">Land At Former Stanton Harcourt Airfield Main Road</a>	4
I6/03427/FUL	<a href="#">46 Acre End Street, Eynsham</a>	6
I6/03492/OUT	<a href="#">Land At Station Road, Bampton</a>	9
I6/03626/FUL	<a href="#">Land At Station Road, Bampton</a>	10

## Report of Additional Representations

Application Number	I 6/00602/FUL
Site Address	Land North Of Springfield Oval Witney Oxfordshire
Date	30th November 2016
Officer	Phil Shaw
Officer Recommendations	Approve subject to Legal Agreement
Parish	Witney Parish Council
Grid Reference	434994 E 210588 N
Committee Date	12th December 2016

### Application Details:

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 75 no.dwellings (1, 2 & 3 bed houses and flats) with associated access, parking, landscaping, and public open space (Amended plans)

### Applicant Details:

C/O Agent

### Additional Representations

Leading into and over the Christmas period the applicants have tabled a further series of amendments. These have addressed some but by no means all of the concerns/deficiencies expressed by your officers and have not been the subject of any further publicity or consultation with neighbours. No technical responses have been received in respect of the amendments.

Your officers do not consider that it is appropriate to bring the application forward for determination when the plans involve amendments that have not been the subject of the proper publicity and consultation, and as such will be recommending deferral.

It is hoped that the applicants will address the outstanding matters, finally fix the plans that they wish to be determined and then table them such that proper re-consultation can be undertaken with a view to determination at the earliest opportunity.

NB In seeking amendments it should not be inferred that approval will necessarily be positively recommended but rather that the scheme is the best that is possible when it is determined given the constraints of the site and limitations of funding to mitigate impact.

Application Number	16/01054/OUT
Site Address	Land At Former Stanton Harcourt Airfield Main Road Stanton Harcourt Oxfordshire
Date	30th November 2016
Officer	Catherine Tetlow
Officer Recommendations	Approve subject to Legal Agreement
Parish	Stanton Harcourt Parish Council
Grid Reference	441452 E 205396 N
Committee Date	12th December 2016

### Application Details:

Re-development of former airfield for housing-led development comprising up to 50 dwellings and up to 450 sqm of office space, green infrastructure, public open space, access from Main Road and the demolition/retention of existing buildings in accordance with the submitted Airfield Building Retention Strategy (amended description and details)

### Applicant Details:

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

### Additional Representations

Substitute Condition 14 with the following:

A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before commencement of the development (including site clearance and demolition). The content of the LEMP shall be based upon the mitigation and enhancements recommendations contained within Section 5 of the Ecological Assessment by Ecology Solutions Ltd dated January 2016 and the Bat Mitigation and Enhancement Principles document by Ecology Solutions Ltd dated October 2016, and shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following information:

- i. A Reptile Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy, including full details of the translocation programme and receptor sites;
- ii. A Sensitive Lighting Strategy for biodiversity, including dark corridors for foraging/commuting bats;
- iii. Stanton Harcourt Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) protection measures to ensure no detrimental impact within the site and within 10 metres of its boundary;
- iv. Full specification of habitats to be created, including locally native species of local provenance and locally characteristic species;
- v. Description and evaluation of features to be managed; including location(s) shown on a site map;
- vi. Landscape and ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
- vii. Aims and objectives of management;
- viii. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
- ix. Prescriptions for management actions;
- x. Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a 5-10 year period);

- xi. Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan;
- xii. On-going monitoring and remedial measures;
- xiii. Timeframe for reviewing the plan; and
- xiv. Details of how the aims and objectives of the LEMP will be communicated to the occupiers of the development.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body/bodies responsible for its delivery. The LEMP shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that the conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented. The LEMP shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details.

**REASON:** To maintain and enhance biodiversity, and to ensure long-term management in perpetuity, in accordance with the NPPF (in particular section 11), policies NE13, NE14 and NE15 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and in order for the council to comply with Part 3 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

Application Number	16/03427/FUL
Site Address	46 Acre End Street Eynsham Witney Oxfordshire OX29 4PA
Date	6th January 2017
Officer	Miranda Clark
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Eynsham Parish Council
Grid Reference	443168 E 209302 N
Committee Date	9th January 2017

### Application Details:

Conversion of existing building to provide six 2 bed self-contained flats. Erection of two 4 bed semi-detached houses. Associated parking, communal gardens, bin storage and cycle storage.

### Applicant Details:

Mr Gary McHale  
The Old Chapel  
Union Way  
Witney  
OX28 6HD

### Additional Representations

The applicants agent has submitted further comments which have been summarised as;

The proposals now before you for consideration are the culmination of a number of consultations with your officers, including conservation, to produce a suitably high quality scheme for the development of this site. By engaging in pre-application correspondence the applicant has undertaken every change the LPA has requested and we therefore trust that officers will be able to support this application.

- Analysis of the Local Planning Authority's housing supply shows that there is a clear under-supply of housing across the District, but regardless of this position the current Local Plan is out-of-date by virtue of the fact that the housing supply policies are now time-expired.
- In light of the absence of a 5 year supply, paragraph 49 of the NPPF aims to ensure that in situations where, as here, the existing development plan policies have failed to secure a sufficient supply of deliverable housing sites, the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' is duly applied. The mechanism for applying that presumption is set out in paragraph 14 of the Framework. This explains that where relevant policies are out-of-date then (unless material considerations indicate otherwise) permission should be granted, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.
- Clearly the pronounced need for housing in a sustainable location also plays heavily in favour of approving this application. The presumption in favour of sustainable development applies.
- The development would have a significant positive impact on the Council's housing land supply figures, in a settlement which is constrained in terms of outwards expansion and therefore opportunities such as this to make optimum use of in settlement sites need to be explored. The development of the land would fully comply with Policy H7 of the WOLP, albeit this is now time-expired.
- The site is within the core of the village of Eynsham, designated as an 'other centre' in the WOLP and upgraded to a 'rural service centre' in the submission version of the emerging local plan. This being the case, Eynsham is considered to be one of the District's more sustainable settlements in relation to the offer of local services and facilities and its general accessibility credentials.
- The Council also accept that Eynsham is an appropriate location for development, in that the

village has already been the focus of some growth with the Council recently granting consent for dwellings on land to the west of the settlement and proposals for a large scale new village on land to the North of the A40.

- There can therefore be no question that the principle of developing this site is acceptable.
- It is also relevant to assess the proposal in the context of a valid 'fallback' option for the applicants and, therefore, represent an appropriate frame of reference against which to assess this planning application. The weight to be attached to a 'fallback' option has been relatively well-defined by court cases including, inter alia, Spackman v SOS & Thamesdown BC, Snowden v SOS & City of Bradford MC, Gwinnell v SOS & LB Islington and Simpson v SOS and Medway Council. In short, these cases identify that the weight to be attached to a 'fallback' option increases commensurately with the likelihood of that scheme being implemented if an alternative option, requiring planning permission, is refused. In addition, the case law also identifies that any alternative application option should result in no greater harm, from a planning perspective, than would result from the implementation of the 'fallback' alternative.
- In this case, it is relevant as part of the decision-making process to consider that the existing property has been used for a number of years as three separate properties. All of these units could at any time be re-used for residential purposes and have a significantly greater impact than the proposal to convert to flats. This is because, without recourse to planning, each of the units could be converted to C4 Houses of Multiple Occupation for which each unit could accommodate up to 6 unrelated individuals. This would result in up to 18 persons residing in the building, with the associated parking and highways impacts, as well as the noise and activity generally associated with transient HMO occupants in comparison to private family units.
- It is therefore self-evident that the 'fallback' option could have significantly different and undesirable impact compared to the application that is before the LPA for consideration. Additionally, the applicant has an evident desire to provide the accommodation and, more relevantly perhaps, they have the financial means to undertake the development. Consequently, it is considered that the existence of the 'fallback' PD option, and the distinct likelihood of it being undertaken if the current application is refused, provide the necessary justification for this development to be approved.
- The frame of reference for the new houses design has been based on the scale and form of the existing property, which is the context within which the design should be seen.
- It is entirely unreasonable for anyone to consider the development to be 'overdevelopment'. The footprint of the buildings are equal to if not smaller than those of neighbouring properties and ample space around the properties has been provided: both to ensure the new dwellings are not overbearing and to provide a good amount of garden space and privacy for future occupants. Acre End Close is a dense development, to suggest otherwise is plainly incorrect, and the proposed townhouse carefully follows this character without providing too much built form.
- The proposed development does not fall within a site identified in the CA appraisal as being important or having views that require safeguarding. The land is also not a significant parcel of open land – it is in fact previously developed land where there are remnants of former industrial structures.
- The rear gables project no further to the rear of the building than those of neighbours on Acre End Close. The frontage building line will also not be interrupted.
- A sight line has also been maintained from the front to the rear of the site, therefore ensuring a spacious and open feel to the development. The degree of separation with No. 46 is also more than ample.
- The conversion of No.46 works with the features of the existing building and very few external changes are proposed. This will help to revitalise an important building in the Conservation Area and is therefore an enhancement to the Eynsham CA.
- The new townhouses continue the design of Acre End Close, adopting a two storey form and incorporating attics and dormers as the other properties do. The height and form reflects the varied built character of the CA. The architectural details that would be included, and the materials that would be used, would reflect the palette of features and materials that characterise the area.
- There are no listed buildings that will be affected by the development, nor will the development be seen within the setting of any.
- As required by officers, a bin collection area will be provided to the front to ensure ease of collection for refuse teams. This is in addition to the storage to the rear. The details of how the bins are stored can be secured by condition to ensure the area does not become unsightly.

- Parking will be provided in accordance with WODC parking standards. The arrangement of parking to the front for the 2 new properties is identical to the arrangement of other properties on the Close. 2 spaces per dwelling is also appropriate for each 4 bedroom property.
- Secure cycle storage will also be provided to the rear, therefore ensuring that future residents have other means of sustainable transport available to them with ease.
- Members will note that there are no objections from OCC Highways and we trust that their technical advice and expertise will be endorsed.
- With the control that could be exerted by condition requiring further details on landscaping, there is no reason why the development proposed, including the parking to the rear, would appear as unduly urban.
- Any trees that are proposed to be removed are either of poor quality, or are in decline. The landscaping scheme could rectify this.

There are no technical objections from any consultee – statutory or otherwise- and therefore it is fair to conclude that the presumption in favour of the development applies.

We trust that officers will be able to support this application and it is duly approved by Members without further delay.

- The comments from the management company are duly noted. Officers will be aware that these are not relevant to planning and can be addressed, if deemed at all necessary, separately by the applicant post the granting of planning permission.

The window arrangements that neighbours have raised as harmful at No.46 are pre-existing and cannot be considered as harmful if they can be used for residential purposes at any time. Also, the arrangement across the street with front elevations facing each other is the same as other properties on the Close and is a typical relationship on residential streets – the distance of separation is appropriate.



Application Number	16/03492/OUT
Site Address	Land At Station Road Bampton Oxfordshire
Date	30th November 2016
Officer	Phil Shaw
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Bampton Parish Council
Grid Reference	431447 E 203636 N
Committee Date	12th December 2016

**Application Details:**

Residential retirement development to provide nine dwellings with all matters reserved except access and layout.

**Applicant Details:**

220 Park Avenue  
Aztect West  
Almondsbury  
Bristol  
BS32 4SY

**Additional Representations**

It is likely that this application will not be determined as it has been superseded by application 16/03626 on page 60 of this agenda. Representations received in respect of both are reported in the context of the latter application

Application Number	16/03626/OUT
Site Address	Land At Station Road Bampton Oxfordshire
Date	30th November 2016
Officer	Phil Shaw
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Bampton Parish Council
Grid Reference	431447 E 203636 N
Committee Date	12th December 2016

### **Application Details:**

Residential retirement development to provide nine dwellings with all matters reserved except access and layout.

### **Applicant Details:**

220 Park Avenue  
Aztec West  
Almondsbury  
Bristol  
BS32 4SY

### **Additional Representations**

#### WODC Ecologist

I am satisfied with the ecological appraisal report that has been submitted with the application. The recommendations contained within Section 6 of this report should be implemented as a condition of planning consent, including the protection of trees and hedgerows, bat roost tree, hedgehogs and enhancements for birds and bats.

I note from the DAS and Planning Statement that there will be a communal area of open space to the north of the application site (which forms approx. one third of the whole field), which provides an opportunity for significant biodiversity enhancements such as wildflower meadow and pond creation, as well as hedgerow and tree planting. A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) should be submitted for approval as a condition of planning consent to comprise habitat creation within the northern area of public open space, as well as the recommendations made in the ecological appraisal report.

Section 2.10 of the DAS states “the intention is for the remaining area of the field to the north to be sensitively landscaped” and section 4.9 states “a further landscaped area if located to the north includes a formal garden. Details of the landscaping would be provided at reserved matters stage

The loss of the outgrown scrub from the boundary hedgerows and some section of hedgerow would be adequately compensated through the planting of new garden hedgerows around each of the proposed new dwellings and by the landscaping of the area of public open space to the north. The planning statement recognises this in section 8.15, stating “the development can provide alternative and enhanced habitats for target species, particularly bats and birds, which include more diverse planting and providing bat bricks and bird nesting boxes...”.

Section 8.14 of the planning statement confirms that the tree with low potential for bats in the western boundary hedgerow near the site access will be retained. I note, however, that the tree survey report recommends that the ivy be severed from the tree as a management recommendation. It is the “light ivy cladding” that has the potential for roosting bats. I therefore recommend that if the ivy is removed, bat boxes are erected on the tree to compensate.

Section 9.8 of the planning statement states “there would be scope for ecological enhancement of the site by way of new ecological features together with provision of additional public open space”.

I recommend that a new native, species-rich hedgerow should be planted along the southern boundary of the application site and that all hedgerows are restored and managed appropriately. This should be included within the LEMP required as a planning condition.

A sensitive lighting strategy to minimise light spillage into boundary hedgerows and the public open space to the north should also be submitted for approval as a condition of planning consent.

The applicants have tabled an updated Flood Risk Assessment that concludes:

The proposal is for the construction of 9 new dwellings, and the entire associated infrastructure on a greenfield site in Bampton, Oxfordshire. The underlying geology of the site and testing carried out by Southwest Geotechnical Ltd indicated a high seasonal water table and poor infiltration rates that would prevent the use of soakaways as a site wide solution for surface water disposal. Surface water will be pumped and discharge at 3 l/s as agreed with the West Oxfordshire Council and discharge via gravity into the dry ditch from the development due to the constrained nature of the site. The headwall and culvert exiting the ditch is assumed to fall under the duties of the riparian owners of the adjacent site although this will need to be confirmed in the detailed design. Foul drainage will discharge at 0.46l/s into the existing adopted foul sewer in Station Road which has been confirmed as suitable by the Thames Water. Based on the above, it is considered that there is no reason why the site should not be developed from a flood risk and drainage point of view.

OCC Highways have advised further that :

#### Parking

The OCC guidelines recommend two spaces per house, plus three additional spaces for visitors (based on 0.3 per dwelling). Therefore, 21 spaces in total. The three visitor spaces should all be single, not tandem. With regard to Plots 3 and 6, the paths leading to the front doors lead directly from the side of the parking bays. Therefore, when a car is placed there in the bay, the path will be partially obstructed. It's not a show-stopper, but may inconvenience a resident, particularly if elderly.

#### Shared Surface Concept

As you say below, vehicles coming into the site will be moving relatively slowly as they round the bend. Pedestrians will tend to stay to the east side of the road, away from the oncoming vehicles, and have the option to walk off-road on the service strip. Therefore, on reflection, and having looked at the other similar developments, I am happy to withdraw my request that the footway continues to the turning head.

#### Parish Council

With apologies for its late submission the Parish Council advise as follows:

#### Location

The proposed development is outside but adjacent to the Conservation Area. A previous application for 15 dwellings was refused in 1998 because it would cause harm to the Conservation Area. We believe this still to be case.

The houses are being slotted in between a road and a play park that already delineate the edge of the settlement. The reports suggest that building here will define the Eastern edge of the settlement but it will also open up the land to the North of the settlement for further development. Bampton is already accommodating 167 houses on New Road and the prevailing view in the village is that no more large scale developments - which this one may herald - are either wanted or needed.

The Conservation Area is mentioned several times in the reports. This entrance to Bampton is important because it takes you almost immediately into the Conservation Area and its historical buildings. The Heritage statement (paragraph 6.5.2) actually says it 'brings a strong sense of expectation' and that this development would 'reduce the contribution this local part of the setting makes'.

Although the reports suggest the development will not be seen so the impact will be minimal, it admits the gable ends of houses will be clearly visible. This 'affect' on the historical streetscene at the entrance to Bampton was one of the reasons for denial of the appeal in 1998. We therefore feel the development is not in keeping with the surrounding landscape pattern and character of the village.

## Access

Access to the site is from a main A road and therefore accurate information is vital to make an informed decision. The developers have made numerous factual errors in their submitted plans, detailed below.

The developers plan to use the historic access to the site which, in their Planning Supporting Statement they erroneously refer to as new. In addition, the trips statistics used in the report were gathered during the Spring Bank holiday. Both businesses and schools were closed on this day and therefore none of these statistics can be relied on as typical or accurate.

The developers state they have discussed access to the site with OCC who have approved their plans. However, drawings 301 and 002 showing the access fail to show the traffic calming measures. This gives an entirely false impression of the actual layout and of the dangers associated with any new development.

The developers describe the road as 'safe' citing that here have only been minor accidents. However, if they took statistics from less than a mile up the road they would show at least 2 deaths.

The developers' measurements of various aspects of the road are particularly worrying in their inaccuracies.

1. They claim that the distance from the access point to New Road is 200m – our measurements suggest it is more like 60 metres
2. They claim the distance from the access point to the traffic calming area is 45m. Our measurements indicate this is 18 metres.
3. They claim from the site to nearest bus stop is 250m. This is clearly incorrect as the bus stops have now moved. The near-by Bus stop and shelter is no longer on the bus route at all.

Measurements need to be taken to check the visibility splays which according to the reports should be 47m looking left and 40-41m looking right. Yet it appears OCC have approved a visibility splay of 2.4 x 46.2m (paragraph 3.4 of the Transport report).

Also on visibility looking right from the entrance, the only tree that is to be retained stands plumb in the line of sight as you are approaching the road.

In 're-opening' the long closed access into the rear field at the top of this development site, warning luminescent posts marking the dangerous bend to the north of the site on the A 4095 were illegally removed and have not been replaced. This has given the impression that the road running along this site from the bend presents little or no hazard. The PC know of historical deaths on this stretch of road that do not appear on the traffic data with the application as they fall outside the time frame for the information given.

As a result of these inaccuracies we submit it is a matter of urgency for all these measurements to be re-checked. We also suggest a site visit by OCC so they can see for themselves the danger of the siting of this development

Transport

The Transport reports refer to 'regular public transport' and bus stops and shelters with seating 'in close proximity to the site'. Again, these statements are both misleading and inaccurate. There is no regular bus service following recent cuts and the bus stops no longer exist.

The developers claim that their proposed site is a 'convenient distance to the bus' that gives access to 'Swindon, Oxford, Faringdon and Abingdon'. On numerous occasions they refer to the 18 bus, an hourly service for the 19 and bus stops 250m South, West and in Bushey Row. None of this is now true.

The actual position is that buses which are routed along Aston Road, Market Square and Bridge Street, serve the local service centres of Carterton and Witney. They run at 2 hourly intervals Monday to Saturday only and from 6.30 in the morning to 7 pm in the evening.

As a consequence of these factual errors, we feel this report needs to be re-written to reflect the actual situation as of today.

### Parking and Pavements

The development is for 9 two storey dwellings; 8 x 2 bedrooms houses and 1 x 3 bedroom house with their own private garden areas as well as shared areas. The documentation indicates there will be 18 parking spaces (some in garages) on site for the dwellings and visitors. Bearing in mind that many people use their garages for storage, many couples over the age of 55 have a car each, and the manager needs to park somewhere, this does not seem to be enough space for the residents let alone visitors as well.

The houses are designed to be purchased by those described at various times as the elderly, older people or the active retired. There will be an age limit of over 55 (or possibly over 65). Several assumptions are made because of this mainly that the residents will make only a 'low number of trips' by car and that these journeys will be out of the 'peak' hours but as the retirement age is now 68 this seems somewhat implausible.

There will be a turning head on site. All will be maintained by a Blue Cedar employee and/or a management committee. There is also a manager's office and sundry services such as a bin store (which may have originally been intended as a dwelling).

The reports states that there is no restriction on parking in Station Road and indicates that people do not usually park there. This is because there is traffic calming which causes queues and two junctions already so it is impossible to park there. Yet all waste collections will be made from Station Road which will inevitably cause havoc at any time let alone at peak times when this collection is likely to take place.

There is varying information about pavements with Figures 13a (current), b & c (future) showing no pavements. Yet in the D & A statement they state that there is no pavement at the moment do they will extend the current one by Manor View (4.12 D & A statement) to provide access (and a continuous footpath) from the development to the centre services. Yet in the Transport report paragraph 2.7 they discuss the fact that there is a pavement about 1.5 metres wide either side of the road and at 2.20 they say there is a continuous footpath to the centre.

Again, given the inaccuracies of these reports, we submit they need to be re-researched and re-written.

### Need

The development is being justified on the basis of need and the fact that there is no 5 year land supply. The developers also state there is 'a significant shortfall in supply of deliverable housing land ... and no evidence that the gap will diminish'.

In fact evidence is on its way on the form of the Local Plan which is currently out for consultation. The developer claims the Local Plan is suspended while 'the Council gather evidence, principally in relation to

Housing need'. This is not true - the evidence has already been gathered and a preliminary report been compiled which does NOT identify Bampton as a suitable place for such development.

The intended homes are being targeted at the elderly and yet there seems no specific tailoring of the development for their needs. There are NO bungalows, all are two stories and some three bedroomed. There is no evidence that the development is in fact any more suitable for retired people than it is anyone else.

#### Flooding

This site has effectively remained abandoned for 30+ years. There has been no maintenance to keep the ditches open and free flowing and no hedging work has been carried out. The screening of the site is effectively an overgrown hedge which now grows up to the highway, over the verges and is only kept back from the highway by continually passing traffic and high sided vehicles.

Bunds mentioned on the plans are not natural or long term. They are as a result of an adjoining land owner opening up an access into a rear field in 2015 that has been closed for over 40 years and dumping all the spoil and vegetation into this site. We believe this will be harmful to the natural flow of the roadside ditching and drainage and should we experience prolonged or high levels of rainfall, then this will exacerbate or heighten the likelihood of surface water flooding in this area.

Surface Water Drainage is incorrect and assumptions are flawed. This needs much more in depth investigation and the Council would urge the planning officer to ask for considerably more information on this issue.

Flood risk assessment point 5.2 and drawing number 115608/1003 are incorrect.

There is no overall surface water drainage system in Bampton. The small section indicated in Pembroke Place connects into the old partially culverted original field ditch network. This is indicated by an annotated Thames Water plan within Appendix D which is correct and which this site, from the western, eastern and southern ditch of this site on plan drain. All drainage from this field travels towards the New Road open roadside ditch, down New Road to a road crossover between Fox Close and Southby and down through Bampton via a partially culverted and partially open major ditch system. It is along the route of this main ditch network in 2007 that all surface water run-off flooding occurred, including to properties in New Road, Fox Close, The Pieces and onwards.

The lower southern half of the site (the half where building would take place) becomes easily saturated during moderate rainfall. The adjoining PlayPark had a surface water drainage system installed in 1992, which runs the length of the site. The parish council disputes that the ditch to the east of the site could be considered a dry ditch. The park is persistently wet and boggy with any degree of rainfall above light drizzle, and this worsens towards the unmaintained ditch between the site and the playpark and towards the southern end of the site where the former open ditch system was culverted when the properties were built in Pembroke Place. This occurs all year round.

Flood risk assessment point 9.6 is misleading. To state that the 2008 Bampton Parish Flood report does not mention that there were reports of flooding to this site when there were reports of flooding to properties in the close proximity implies there is no issue with this site in terms of surface water run-off. What the report does mean but does not say is that no-one was walking around an unmaintained, unmown and fenced off field to check if there was water in it when a number of people in the adjoining New Road, Pembroke Place and Fox Close had small rivers running through their houses! The bottom of gardens to the housing association owned Manor View Bungalows where the southern ditch runs become readily boggy – residents generally have not sited their garden sheds at the bottom of their gardens once this is known.

#### Foul drainage

The developers fail to address the potential problems with sewage that their estate will bring. Bampton was connected to mains drainage around 1956-1958 with properties previously having drainage via cess pits, septic tanks or bucket collection.

The sewage plant for Bampton must therefore have been built around that time and to our knowledge has not had a significant size increase since. But the village has expanded a great deal over the decades. In the 60s and 70s houses were built in Chandler Close, Colvile Close, Bowling Green Close, Glebelands, the

Pieces and Pockets Close. In the 80s and 90s at Calais Dene, Talbot Fields, Chetwynd Mead, Pembroke Place, Pollard Place and now most recently in 2014 a further 160 at New Road.

We are also now aware, following application 13/1494/P/OP, that sewage from the village of Aston comes to and is treated at Bampton Sewage works. There is currently a further application in that village to build another 30 houses (Land North Of Cote Road Cote Road Aston Bampton Oxfordshire Planning Application - 16/03005/OUT0). In their submission, Thames Water states: 'Following initial investigation, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application.'

According to Aston Parish Council: 'there are already problems with the sewerage system in Aston, which have been well documented, and Thames Water have had to supply tankers to pump out the sewerage from the pumping stations on several occasions in recent weeks. The contractors who have attended have themselves expressed surprise at the proposal that more houses will be built in Aston given the inability of the pumping stations to cope with the current volume of housing.' (Minutes of Aston, Cote, Shifford and Chimney Parish Council Meeting held on Thursday 6th October 2016).

Thames Water engineers regularly have to clear drain blockages in Bampton and have told the Chairman to the Parish Council, following frequently recurring and persistent blockages to part of New Road/Broad Street that no sewage pipe in Bampton is larger than 150mm in diameter. This is one reason blockages occur with more frequency - they are not large enough for the current capacity, let alone increased numbers from houses being currently built and proposed developments.

Residents in Bampton are all too aware of what happens when this sort of planning is not taken into consideration: the sewage plant in Brize Norton appears now to be severely under capacity as a result of large scale development in Carterton and now has to be pumped out by dozens of road tankers on a regular basis. Treated waste water from the Brize Norton Sewage treatment plant discharges into Highmoor Brook which joins the Shill Brook just before entering Bampton from the north-west, thus the flow of water in Highmoor Brook is already elevated now above levels prior to the building of Shilton Park. There have been regular and consistent problems with sewer drainage in the New Road/Broad Street junction area. Blockages regularly occur (as of writing, the most recent being December 14th 2016). The 150mm diameter pipes in the road are now insufficient to meet the ever increasing numbers put on to them. Operatives clearing blockages have stated that sewer pipework is now undersized for demand in Bampton.

For example the sewer that this site will connect into at the Broad Street/New Road/Landells junction served 15 properties, a small doctor's surgery and the Fire Station up until the mid-1980s. Since 1992 it now serves 58 properties, a new bigger health centre and the fire station. There may also be a connection into this system in Landells from a new property currently under construction and also from The Manor House and its ancillary accommodations.

Bampton Parish Council would like its own and all of Thames Water's concerns to be investigated further before the application is determined.

We would like the developers to ask these questions of Thames Water: -

1. What are the known diameters of sewers in Bampton?
2. Confirmation that they are suitably sized for the current demand and increased demand.
3. To provide details of the current designed capacity at the Bampton Sewage Works (presumably by households)
4. The number of households that are currently served from Aston and Bampton by the sewage works.

#### Factual Errors

As well as the errors and omissions aired above there are a number of other mistakes in the developer's proposal:

On the application it says all are now all 2 bedroom houses (although Plots 1, 2, 8 & 9 have upstairs studies that are bedrooms by any other name). But the transport report still says there is 1 x 3 bedroom property

The Transport Report (paragraph 3.10) says there are now 23 parking spaces (shown on the plans as car ports with spaces in front) and 1 for the manager but the supporting statement still says 18 spaces including garages.

The supporting statement still mentions outline planning consent.

The developers claim materials will be sympathetic to the local vernacular but the only parts to be built of stone are the fronts of the buildings which will be seen by the residents only. As the backs and sides of the houses which will be seen by locals and visitors to Bampton, it is imperative that the sections be built of stone rather than render or reconstituted stone.

## Conclusion

As a result of the all the factors above, Bampton Parish Council objects to the current application. We would like to see accurate reports compiled as well as a site visit from the Planning Committee so they can see the potential dangers themselves.

### Officer update

In response to some of the above issues officers will be suggesting an additional condition to cover the parking provision. There will also be a need to secure a 106 agreement to cover the landscape access use and maintenance. An over 55 condition is not being recommended as the houses would be acceptable as general housing