

Appendix 1 - 20/02654/OUT LATEST CONSULTEE RESPONSES FOLLOWING SUBMISSION OF REVISED PLANS/ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN AUGUST 2022

Consultee	Date	Comment
Witney Town Council	25/08/2022	<p>Witney Town Council has no overall objection regarding this application but has the following observations and comments on the revised plans.</p> <p>Members welcome the inclusion of better access to Windrush Cemetery, as shown on the indicative drawings but are disappointed to see the formerly proposed community centre has been removed from the latest set of plans. During the original public consultation, the hall was thought hugely beneficial as it would provide a valuable community asset for East Witney, serving both residents and those attending funerals at the Cemetery, with associated parking and infrastructure. The removal of this proposed community benefit would be a substantial loss to the scheme.</p> <p>The Town Council still has little confidence in the capacity provided by the local water and sewerage company, and would like reassurances that drainage and sewerage infrastructure for Witney as a whole will be able to absorb the increased capacity required from this proposed major development. Witney Town Council has concerns over the height of the proposed buildings, and echoes those concerns made in the accompanying documents, with regard to the contours of the land. Members support concerns from the District Council regarding the comprehensiveness of the pedestrian and cycle path plans, that connections should be in line with the required needs and ongoing proposals. The Town Council still envisages better connections for cycling and walking into the town centre, especially more directly across the river Windrush to Farm Mill Lane, which needs to be delivered at an early stage of the development, rather than on its completion. Witney Town Council also supports the District Council view that the proposed provision of play areas on the site is improved.</p> <p>In terms of environmental and energy sustainability needs, the Council would like to see ambitious proposals from the developer, which go beyond current planning and building regulations. It supports the comments by the District Council on biodiversity at the site and beyond into the Windrush Valley. It is not currently clear to Witney Town Council what Biodiversity Net Gain the developer is prepared to agree to, 10% does not appear to be sufficient, and it therefore agrees with the District Council, that this should be agreed before any approval.</p>
WODC - Policy	23/09/2022	<p>Assessment</p> <p>Quantum of development and extent of developable area</p> <p>The extent of proposed development on both parts of the SDA was previously raised as a key concern as it extended beyond the indicative developable areas shown in Local Plan Figure 9.2c and this was deemed to result in an unacceptable degree of landscape harm.</p>

		<p>The number of houses proposed across the two sites has now been reduced to 450 homes in line with Policy WIT1 and I note that the developable area on Site A is broadly in line with the indicative developable area shown in Figure 9.2c of the Local Plan.</p> <p>There remains however some incursion beyond the 95m contour, the impact of which is exacerbated by the proposed building heights of up to 3-storeys across much of the site. I note the updated comments of the Council's landscape officer highlight this particular issue and suggest that maximum building heights are restricted to up to 2-storey particularly given the neighbouring settlement edge is generally two storeys in elevation and occupies lower ground.</p> <p>Furthermore, I note that no visible amendment appears to have been made to the layout of Site B so the same concerns expressed previously remain. The proposed developable area incurs into the valley floor, which will affect key views and is again exacerbated by the proposed building heights (which remains up to 3 storeys). In terms of the density, this appears to vary in the submitted material with the plans stating 43 dph and the written statement indicating a lower density so this needs to be clarified. We had previously recommended that a low set crescent of housing could be an option on this site but this opportunity does not appear to have been explored.</p> <p>As a general point, it is not the case that the layout should be considered solely at the reserved matters stage as suggested. The outline application needs to set out the parameters and key element of the scheme such as connections/ linkages and landscape to inform the evidence base studies submitted alongside the outline application, as well as the D&amp;AS statement – all of which form a binding part of the application and need to be assessed.</p> <p>Whilst individual house types and street patterns may vary slightly at reserved matters stage, the basic parameters and housing mix need to be established at this stage and need to be reflected in the planning conditions attached to any forthcoming consent (including building heights).</p> <p><b>Community Hub</b></p> <p>As set out in our previous responses, the decision to include a local centre as part of this development is welcome. It is not a requirement of the Local Plan Policy WIT1 but would clearly provide a valuable resource for new and existing residents and is welcome by the community.</p> <p>It is disappointing that despite our consistent support for this facility in principle, the applicant has decided to remove this facility from the scheme altogether.</p> <p>As shown in the previous plans, the community hub was situated on the more elevated part of the site adjacent to the cemetery and its impact on the landscape was deemed inappropriate. In addition, its location was a concern due to it being remote from existing housing and not easily accessed from the proposed new housing. Other locations were suggested by the Council</p>
--	--	---

		<p>and we continue to be open to working with the applicant to facilitate the inclusion of this facility for the benefit of the community.</p> <p>Active Travel Routes</p> <p>There are many important aspects to consider in successfully planning for this SDA but as we have always communicated; we consider opportunities for walking and cycling to be a fundamental element. In light of the climate emergency we face, we must adopt an aspirational approach and reducing the need to travel is an important element.</p> <p>West Oxfordshire is also placing increasing emphasis on healthy place shaping principles in line with the Oxfordshire Strategic Vision and an important part of that is providing the opportunity and encouragement for people to walk and cycle with the aim of achieving healthier and happy residents. Priority therefore needs to be given to planning around an effective and permeable active travel network with 'walkable' communities so that residents can access a range of services on foot.</p> <p>As we are all aware, this site is uniquely situated to encourage high levels of walking and cycling within an attractive environment due to its relationship with Cogges, the Windrush Valley and its proximity to the town centre and it is vital that opportunities to provide excellent connections are fully embraced.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.2.35 of the Local Plan emphasises the importance of facilitating links to the Town Centre across the Windrush Valley to increase the integration of the SDA with the existing built area.</p> <p>Reflecting this, Local Plan Policy WIT1 criterion d) stipulates that development of the East Witney SDA should be supported by a comprehensive network for pedestrians and cyclists with good connectivity provided to adjoining areas, including a particular emphasis on improving the linkages across the Windrush Valley into the town centre. This approach is also consistent with the general principles of Policy OS2 as well as national policy.</p> <p>In his report into the Local Plan regarding this site, the Inspector concluded (at paragraph 138) that the requirement for improved pedestrian/cycle connectivity across the River Windrush is reasonable as this would provide direct access from the western site to the supermarket and employment areas which lie to the south of the town centre.</p> <p>As such, it is extremely disappointing that the applicant continues to remain unwilling to commit to providing fully comprehensive active travel routes through the Windrush Valley to link to the Town Centre and surrounding environs, despite a willing landowner (Witney Town Council) who is supportive of the necessary works. It is not considered to be appropriate for the applicant to only construct part of these routes and fund the remainder 'subject to viability' as it is not clear if this would be funded in full and who would be responsible for constructing the final sections. As such, this risks the completion of these routes, which are considered to be a fundamental element of the overall</p>
--	--	---

		<p>scheme and would be of no benefit if they were to remain only partially completed.</p> <p>I also note that OCC have been advocating a cycle route running along the south of the SDA, linking this to the town centre via the Windrush Valley and to the A40 cycle path to the east and this should be reflected on the plans.</p> <p>The proposed link to the bus stops on Oxford Hill is considered below.</p> <p>Finally, the internal linkages discussed previously have not been reflected in this latest plan and these are important in supporting internal movements as well as wider connections beyond the site itself. I remain concerned that the internal layout continues to prioritise private cars rather than walking and cycling.</p> <p>Other Issues previously raised</p> <p>I note that an additional bus stop has been included in the plans close to the Cogges Hill junction, which is welcome, however this needs to be made easy to access via a new footpath from the Oxford Hill traffic lights to the entrance of the Cemetery. As previously stated, the provision of bus stops further along Oxford Hill towards the A40 are considered to be remote from development and are not supported by WODC. As previously explained, we have strong reservations regarding the attractiveness and safety of the proposed pedestrian route, which does not appear to have been given much consideration in terms of its alignment. It will run across an otherwise open field with a steep gradient and with no surveillance. Nor will it link directly to the bus stops along Oxford Hill. As such, it is considered to be illogical and represents poor planning.</p> <p>No amendment has been made to the location of the allotments on Site B where this would affect the setting of the Windrush Valley. We previously recommended that this is relocated to Site A where it can be easily reached on foot via footpaths, perhaps closely aligned to other green space. I acknowledge that consideration needs to be given as to how this can be accommodated within the site alongside the other built forms so it may be useful to see a worked up example on a masterplan.</p> <p>With regard to the play space requirements, Policy EH5 is quite broad and specific advice in terms of the need should be gained from the leisure team who I note have provided advice in relation to the latest scheme. I note the comments made by the agent regarding the inability to provide the play space sought due to space requirements but has this been demonstrated on a plan? In addition, has the upgrading of the existing play area on land owned by Witney Town Council to the south of Eton Close and Witney Town Council been explored?</p> <p>In terms of the proposed biodiversity enhancements, I note that this includes additional modified grassland and additional scrub and wildflower grassland, totalling a BNG of 12.87%. This appears to be a positive outcome exceeding the emerging national benchmark minimum of 10% but additional input from the Council's biodiversity officer on this aspect of the application should be sought and followed.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Conclusion</p> <p>As outlined above, at the present time the District Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land and as such the 'tilted balance' of the NPPF is engaged whereby there is a presumption in favour of planning permission being granted unless significant and demonstrable harms would arise.</p> <p>Whilst the site is allocated for housing within the adopted Local Plan and the principle of development therefore already established, the updated comments above demonstrate that notwithstanding the most recent revisions to the scheme, there remain a number of concerns. The two most fundamental issues are landscape impact on both sites A and B and the lack of effective connectivity with the Town Centre across the Windrush Valley. Other concerns have also been raised in relation to the proposed pedestrian route to Oxford Hill, the location of the proposed allotments and lack of on-site play space.</p> <p>The decision to no longer provide a community hub building is disappointing however as the local plan does not include a specific requirement for such a facility, there is no direct policy conflict.</p> <p>Clearly granting outline permission for 450 homes will assist the Council in terms of its current housing land supply but the key issue is whether the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh those and any other benefits associated with the scheme including the provision of new affordable homes and the economic benefits arising from a development of the scale proposed.</p>
OCC – Transport	10/10/2022	<p>Recommendation: Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor connectivity - The amendments to the proposed application fail to deliver on the essential connections identified in the document, 'Identification of Selected Cycling Infrastructure Enhancements in East Witney' dated May 2020 and also fails to make good connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists to the Windrush Valley and Hanborough Station as required by Policy WIT1.</li> <li>• Proposals inconsistent with provisions of Policy WIT1 (d) in the following ways – not yet agreed to making appropriate financial contributions towards LTP4 schemes.</li> </ul>
OCC – LLFA	30/06/2022	No objection subject to drainage conditions being attached to any permission granted.
OCC – Education	15/12/2020	No objection subject to S106 Contributions towards education infrastructure
OCC – Property	15/12/2020	No objection subject to S106 contributions towards library facilities, waste management, archaeological storage and children's services.
OCC – Specialist Housing	15/12/2020	No objection
OCC Archaeology	30/06/2022	No objection subject to conditions.

OCC – Minerals and Waste Management	15/12/2020	No objection
Lower Windrush Valley Project	15/12/2020	<p><u>Greenspace land within the Windrush Valley</u>  The area of open space to the West of the site appears to be referred to as both a 'greenspace / nature area' and the 'biodiversity net gain area'. We would welcome more information on the plans for this area and future management. In order to deliver biodiversity improvements, appropriate management needs to be secured for the long term, preferably in perpetuity. There would be mutual benefits if the management plan for the land included in this application could compliment the work of the Lower Windrush Valley Project to the south, the Windrush in Witney Strategy and the objectives of the Lower Windrush Valley Conservation Target Area.</p> <p><u>Access to the Lower Windrush Valley (south of A40).</u>  As highlighted in our response to the East Witney SPD issues paper, residents wishing to travel south of the A40 to access the Lower Windrush Valley for leisure and other purposes, will use Cogges Lane/Tar Road. It is the only vehicular access south, and the most direct route on foot. Cogges Lane/Tar Road extends from Cogges to Stanton Harcourt and is a single-track road with no formal passing places, although many informal passing places have formed along its length over time. There are currently no public transport links to the road and no designated pedestrian or cycle paths. The Down Valley Way permissive bridleway runs alongside the western side of part of the road, which is the only formal place for pedestrians to walk without exposure to the highway. The road verge is very narrow in places, and pedestrians are often observed walking on the road. The road is not in a suitable condition for an increased number of vehicles to regularly travel down the road – the single track nature of the road will mean that increased vehicle use will lead to increased frequency of drivers meeting, which will in turn lead to worsening of the existing potholes and wear of informal passing places and soft verges. We would welcome provision of passing places along the route, and a contribution towards this as part of this scheme.</p> <p>We would also welcome the provision of a safe pedestrian route in to the Lower Windrush Valley south of the A40. This would minimise vehicle pressure on Cogges Lane and encourage active travel by allowing residents of the proposed development to safely access Ducklington, Tar Lakes, Rushy Common nature reserve and the rest of the Lower Windrush Valley. This could be achieved through creation of a bridleway or footpath running parallel to Cogges Lane in the adjacent field and linking up to the Down Valley Way and Northern Cross Valley Way bridleways (see attached map). This proposal is supported by the Oxfordshire County Council Public Rights of Way team. Alternatively, a footway could be created alongside the highway to improve pedestrian safety.</p> <p><u>Lower Windrush Valley Project contribution</u>  The proposed development borders the core operating area of the Lower Windrush Valley Project (LWVP), an Oxfordshire County Council hosted project which improves landscape and biodiversity and provides community benefits from access to the natural environment in the Lower Windrush Valley. The proposed development, will increase the demand for the</p>

		<p>services and benefits the LWVP provide and therefore, should the proposal be granted planning permission we would request a contribution towards the LWVP for creation, enhancement and management of natural and amenity greenspace in the Lower Windrush Valley.</p> <p>This comprises two elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contribution towards the provision of countryside enhancement functions that the LWVP provides and for which there will be greater demand should the development take place. Requested contribution: £2,271 per year for 10 years from the commencement of development, giving a total of £22,707.</li> <li>2. Contribution towards capital infrastructure improvement projects already identified in the District Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Lower Windrush Valley area. The total cost of the identified projects to be delivered in the Lower Windrush Valley is £315,000. Using the same proportional basis as above, £11,004 is requested to deliver infrastructure improvements within the Lower Windrush Valley.</li> </ol>
OCC – Climate Change & Energy	15/12/2020	No objection
OCC - Landscape/Green Infrastructure/Open Space	15/12/2020	<p><u>General Observations</u></p> <p>We note that the application is outline with matters of layout, landscaping, scale and appearance reserved. As such a potential consent would give permission for the development quantum and access, but most other matters including layout, design, open space, green infrastructure would not be fixed and could change with subsequent reserved matters applications. This creates uncertainty with regard to the quality of the development and it seems important that as much detail as possible is secured alongside the development quantum. It is important that issues of phasing, infrastructure provision (including green infrastructure / open space) and long-term management (including funding) are agreed and secured at this stage of the process as this is the only time when the development will be considered in its entirety.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Impact</u></p> <p>We note that the LVIA concludes that the proposed development can be successfully integrated into this context, without significant, long term, adverse effect, provided that the detailed mitigation measures outlined above is implemented and managed as envisaged. When reaching these conclusions, the assessment relies on the retention of existing trees and hedgerows and the provision of tree and hedge planting within the scheme and along the boundaries to help assimilate the development into the surrounding landscape context.</p> <p>Limited level of detail is provided at this stage and care will have to be taken at reserved matters stage that the landscape proposals are as substantial and effective as envisaged to mitigate adverse effects.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure (GI)</p>

		<p>The Illustrative Masterplan includes some GI links for the Cogges Triangle site, which are welcomed, however, the links appear to be limited to retaining existing hedgerows within the development area. Whilst the retention of existing green links is important and welcomed, we recommend that further thought be given to whether there are other opportunities the two sites present with regard to enhancing GI within and beyond their boundaries, e.g. with regard to habitats and access links to the adjacent countryside including the Lower Windrush Valley on the South side of the A40. It is also important to remember that Green Infrastructure works at different scales. It is not only important that strategic GI links are being created in the layout but that it also forms an integral part of the development areas. For example, development areas should include sufficient space in streets and gardens for planting of large trees that are allowed to mature. This will not only help with creating an attractive living environment but can also help with achieving a biodiversity net gain as required by policy. Similarly, the use of green roofs, green walls and climbers should be considered which can deliver a range of benefits with regard to minimising visual impacts, provide open space, offer space for growing food, allow for the creation of habitats for the benefits of biodiversity, provide SUDS and improve microclimatic conditions. As such they could assist in delivering green infrastructure and open space in high density areas.</p> <p>The Building with Nature benchmark developed by the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust can help with developing a comprehensive GI approach.</p> <p><u>Open space</u></p> <p>We have not seen a break-down of the open space provision but the Illustrative Masterplan and Landscape Parameter Plan suggest that much of the green space provision comprises green infrastructure links, movement corridors and boundary planting, which are important in GI, landscape, visual and biodiversity terms, but which offer limited recreational functions. It is important that sufficient alternative open space for dog walking, children's play, and outdoor sport is also provided in line with the Council's open space requirements.</p> <p>The landscape areas will need to address a range of competing needs (e.g. green movement corridors, landscape/visual mitigation, protection/enhancement of habitats for biodiversity, formal / informal open space), which will require appropriate zoning and management to ensure that access to the most ecologically sensitive areas is restricted in order to protect them from negative recreational impacts. The plans currently don't appear to differentiate between different requirements, and we recommend that more details are requested to ensure that open space and biodiversity requirements can be successfully accommodated alongside each other in the proposed layout. It is also important that a realistic assessment is made with regard to the accessibility, usability and quality of green space available for public use to ensure what sufficient usable open space is provided. A proportion of the landscape and open space provision is along the edges where the quality of these areas will be compromised by the adjacent uses (e.g. roads), changes in</p>
--	--	--



		<p>level, or the use of the space for Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS). Whilst the use of SUDS in landscape areas is generally encouraged it can restrict the usability of open space during times of high rainfall. We recommend that clarification on open space provision with regard to quantity and quality is sought prior to a decision to ensure that sufficient open space is provided as part of the development.</p> <p>We also recommend that due consideration is given to the long-term management of GI and open spaces from the outset.</p>
County Cllr Enright	30/06/2022	<p>The development will require important infrastructure to support it, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding towards new slip roads on the A40 at Shores Green (Access to Witney)</li> <li>• Access off the new development into the Windrush Cemetery</li> <li>• Community hall - multipurpose and at the heart of Cogges</li> <li>• School places and GP surgery capacity</li> <li>• Shared footpaths/cyclepaths across the meadow to the town centre</li> <li>• Amenity land for informal play</li> </ul> <p>Witney Town Council have made extremely pertinent comments.</p>
Environmental Health - Noise	08/10/2020	<p>No objection in principle subject to criteria conditions and embedded mitigation requirements to manage traffic noise from the A40.</p>
Environmental Health - Air Quality	23/02/2022	<p><u>Technical Observations - Sensitivity analysis</u></p> <p>The assessment includes a sensitivity analysis where Defra background concentrations and emission factors for the current baseline of the proposed development as at 2018 have been used. These concentrations are assumed to be higher than those predicted for later years, such as 2024 and 2031. The report Section 7.6.3.1 states, in relation to the sensitivity analysis: "For NO<sub>2</sub>, in 2031 (full build out year – 495 units), 1 existing receptors exceed the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> AQS objective. According to the EPUK/IAQM guidance, the impact on annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations for all existing receptors range from major adverse to negligible. Under this case, mitigation should therefore be considered for those receptors where an impact above negligible is predicted. All proposed receptors are compliant with the annual mean AQS objective for NO<sub>2</sub>, therefore no mitigation is required".</p> <p>Although I accept that this is assuming no improvement in vehicle emissions between 2018 and 2031, I don't understand reason for the conclusion here. The sensitivity assessment has indicated a potential major adverse effect on air quality at one point within the AQMA by 2031. At this point the modelling has determined that the Air Quality Objective will be exceeded in the vicinity of Bridge Street, Witney. It is not explained why this would not require mitigation.</p> <p><u>Other Observations - The operational phase assumptions</u></p> <p>In each of the five modelled scenarios (2018 baseline to 2031 opening year) various assumptions have been made as to completed infrastructure and other development schemes. By the time of the completed development it is assumed that key</p>

		<p>highways mitigation will be in place, including the Shore Green Slip Roads, West End Link Road, Bridge St Amendments and the Northern Distributor Road.</p> <p>However, it is far from clear how these will be provided, how the various schemes that make up the Witney SDAs will be brought together. What appears not to be available presently is a masterplan for the SDAs and in particular timelines for constructing the various mitigation schemes such as the West End Link Road and the Northern Distributor Road that are an essential part of this. The SDAs require a means by which these schemes will be delivered in a coordinated and timely fashion. Without these it seems to me to be unfeasible that the Planning Officers would allow any one scheme to proceed in isolation and in advance of other proposed schemes, some already formalised, and ahead of a means by which collectively the mitigation schemes can be delivered. As far as I'm aware there is no masterplan and means by which any mitigations obligations set into S106 agreements can realistically be brought forward.</p> <p>So whilst these highway schemes, if brought forward, would be beneficial in reducing air quality concerns in relation to this development, there appears to be no guarantee that they would be completed in time for 2031, as is relied upon by this assessment.</p> <p>Without any commitment to the schemes and timetable to bring them forward a revised assessment of air quality would presumably produce a worst outcome for the AQMA.</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to improve air quality especially in those areas where it exceeds the national quality objective. An AQMA is the embodiment of the type of area that LAs are duty-bound to address. It would not be appropriate for a local authority to ignore potential worsening of air quality within an AQMA. I cannot lift my objection to the scheme until I have assurance that there is a mechanism for providing the mitigation relied upon by the consultant's assessment.</p>
Strategic Housing and Development Officer	18/08/2022	<p>The updated details confirm the intention to provide policy compliant provision of affordable homes with mix to be confirmed at detailed application stage. Recent housing evidence obtained by the Council has highlighted the importance of providing affordable homes at Social Rent tenure and I would request that this is taken in to account. I would also request that affordable and market sale homes to be provided compliant with policy H4 with respect to Building Regulations Requirements M4(2) and M4(3) are scheduled by house type, size and tenure at the earliest possible stage. Oxfordshire County Council have highlighted need for a small number of smaller homes designed for people with learning disabilities. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss whether this site could accommodate this type of housing with the applicant.</p>
Natural England	22/08/2022	<p>The proposed amendments to the original application are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.</p>
Thames Water	21/10/2020	<p>Following initial investigations, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing foul water network infrastructure to</p>

		<p>accommodate the needs of this development proposal. A 'Grampian Style' condition is requested.</p> <p>The application indicates that surface water will not be discharged into the public network and as such Thames Water has no objection, however approval should be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p>
Environment Agency	30/08/22	No objection
ERS - Contamination	07/09/2022	<p>The following document has been submitted in relation to contamination and updates to the above referenced planning application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HM Letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> July 2022. East Witney – Revised Illustrative Framework – Contaminated Land</li> </ul> <p>In general the consultant does not consider that the proposed amendments affect the outcomes of the previously submitted Phase 1 report.</p> <p>Please could they confirm that the conceptual site model presented in Phase 1 report is not affected by the proposed changes? Assuming this can be confirmed the previously requested condition remains applicable.</p> <p>1. No development shall take place until a site investigation of the nature and extent of contamination, as identified in the Phase 1 Environmental Assessment, reference 26578-RP-IF003, has been carried out in accordance with a methodology which has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The results of the site investigation shall be made available to the local planning authority before any development begins. If any significant contamination is found during the site investigation, a report specifying the measures to be taken to remediate the site to render it suitable for the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins.</p> <p>2. The Remediation Scheme, as agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved timetable of works and before the development hereby permitted is first occupied. Any variation to the scheme shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance of works being undertaken. On completion of the works the developer shall submit to the Local Planning Authority written confirmation that all works were completed in accordance with the agreed details.</p> <p>If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been identified in the site investigation, additional measures for the remediation of this contamination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The remediation of the site shall incorporate the approved additional measures.</p>

		<p>Reason: To ensure any contamination of the site is identified and appropriately remediated.</p> <p>Relevant Policies: West Oxfordshire Local Planning Policy EH8 and Section 15 of the NPPF</p>
Landscape Consultant	21/09/2022	<p>Overall, it is considered that the development omissions on the high ground are positive in landscape terms when considered against the previous design iteration. With the removal of these built features, there is an opportunity for far greater planting along the ridgeline. This would create a more treed skyline that supplements the existing hedgerow and trees. This increased vegetative provision would also provide a softer backdrop to the development, reinforce a Green Infrastructure corridor and increase biodiversity.</p> <p>The proposed development is beyond the 95m contour highlighted within the 'Landscape and Visual Review of Submissions for Carterton and Witney Strategic Development Options' (October 2012). If building beyond the 95m contour is deemed to be appropriate in this instance the development edge would need to be appropriately considered. This may be achieved through lower density development on the edge alongside a less formal and linear building pattern. The roofscape on the edge could also be broken up with additional tree planting to soften the transition between the development edge and the more rural undeveloped ridge.</p> <p>The effect of positioning development beyond the 95m contour would likely be exacerbated by the maximum storey heights proposed on the 'Parameter Plan Building Heights'. Given the elevated slope the proposed development is positioned on this should be revisited and maximum storey heights restricted to 'up to 2 storey' as the block of development near the centre of the site already is. The height of the proposed development is particularly pertinent given the neighbouring settlement edge is generally two storeys in elevation and occupies lower ground. I defer to others on the appropriateness of overall development density.</p> <p>Recommendation: Further revision required. Although an outline application with all matters reserved, the framework and parameters for the development need further work.</p>
WODC – Arts	29/10/2020	<p>Should this proposal be granted planning permission, then the Council would favour the following approach:</p> <p>A contribution of £77,480 based on £210 per unit of market housing (excluding social housing) for the engagement of a part-time Community Connector over 2 years to develop and lead creative activities in this space and in the local community with a community grant budget.</p> <p>The developer to incorporate a dedicated creative space into the design of the community hub for residents to come together for creative and well-being activities.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to be involved in the discussion around the development of the Community Hub and especially the creative space.</p>

<p>Biodiversity Officer</p>	<p>13/09/2022 &amp; 22/09/2022</p>	<p>Amendments to the proposed development have not adequately addressed objections previously raised by the Biodiversity Officer.</p> <p><u>Protected Habitat and Species' Surveys</u></p> <p>The submitted EIA Holding Statement (prepared by Hilson Moran, dated 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2022) states protected habitat and species' surveys were undertaken in 2019 and concludes <i>'impacts from the previous application on protected species were to be avoided through appropriate mitigation outlined in the 2020 Ecological baseline report. Given the minor adjustments, assuming the update surveys do not find any significant changes in baseline conditions, the revised proposals are unlikely to affect this conclusion. Mitigation measures outlined in the 2020 report are likely to remain appropriate to cover the likely impacts from the new cemetery access.'</i> This is not an acceptable approach, the 2019 surveys are considered out-dated and as a result, the proposed site should be re-surveyed to confirm the validity of the existing surveys and update where necessary to ensure proposed mitigation and compensation proposals are sufficient. This information should be submitted with the planning application to ensure all material considerations are taken into account as stated in the Circular 06/2005 <i>'It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision.'</i></p> <p><u>Biodiversity Net Gain</u></p> <p>The amended biodiversity net gain metric calculation should be submitted as the actual excel spreadsheet metric (not screenshots) this is in accordance with the guidance note published on the WODC website. Currently the information submitted is insufficient to demonstrate the proposed development complies for policy EH3 of the Local Plan. Further, baseline and proposed hedgerow units should be included within the re-calculated metric to ensure any proposed hedgerow loss is adequately compensated (a 10% in linear habitats is required).</p> <p>If the above cannot be resolved, refusal is recommended for the following reasons:</p> <p>Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate the proposal will not result in significant biodiversity harm as insufficient survey, mitigation and compensation details have been submitted to ensure that impacts on protected/priority species and priority habitats are minimised or adequately compensated. Further, insufficient information has been submitted with regards to demonstrating a measurable biodiversity net gain. Therefore, the proposal does not comply with the requirements of the Local Plan policy EH3 and paragraphs 174, 179 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Strategic contributions as outlined in Local Plan policies WIT1 and WIT6 should be considered separate to BNG requirements. This is not to say that enhancements off site in the Windrush in Witney project areas cannot contribute to BNG but the developer must first demonstrate that the mitigation hierarchy has been applied on site to first secure no net loss in biodiversity. In some circumstances this is not achievable due</p>
-----------------------------	--	--

		<p>to site constraints however, this must be explored. The most recent masterplan has incorporated few biodiversity enhancements on site, further biodiversity enhancements on-site should be explored to achieve a no net loss as described in comments dated 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Once this has been demonstrated, off-site contributions can be considered however, strategic contributions should be considered first, demonstrating landscape targets can be met then the metric should be applied. For further detail and guidance, please refer to comments dated 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>If the above cannot be resolved, refusal is recommended for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed contribution towards the local landscape projects is inadequate therefore, the development proposals do not comply with the requirements of Local Plan policies WIT1 and WIT6.</li> </ul> <p><u>Strategic contribution towards the Windrush in Witney project and Conservation Target Area</u></p> <p>The submitted masterplan has not addressed concerns previously raised by the biodiversity team. The submitted masterplan and ecological baseline report (prepared by BSG Ecology) have provided few details regarding biodiversity enhancements or restoration measures within the Windrush in Witney project area. Further, the proposed enhancement parcels are limited in connectivity, this area is a conservation target area, identified for its potential to deliver large habitat areas and/or networks of wildlife habitat. I recommend the parcel to the south as shown on the masterplan to be retained in agricultural use is instead appropriately managed in line with the outlined conservation targets for the Windrush in Witney project and Conservation Target Area. Please refer back to previous comments from the Biodiversity Team for further guidance and detail.</p>
<p>NHS Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group</p>	<p>18/08/202388,</p>	<p>Objects unless there is additional investment through developer contributions in expanding local primary medical care capacity.</p> <p>OCCG seek a contribution of £388,800 based on published formula.</p>
<p>WODC – Design and Conservation Architect</p>	<p>11/11/20</p>	<p>Site A – whilst on a hillside, it appears that the area doesn't rise high enough for the proposed buildings to feature in any significant views from, or towards the Conservation Area. Suggest that two or possibly two-and-a-half stories should be maximum height as development will effectively add to broad swathe of existing development and would not want cumulative effect to be too urban.</p> <p>Proposed development would not be visible from Cogges Farm, even distant glimpses, would unlikely make any significant difference to setting.</p> <p>Site B – Any development here would feel like an encroachment. The field lies in fine view of St Mary's spire from the road to Standlake as it crosses the A40. Should</p>

		resist development or it should be tightly restricted to the north corner.
Leisure & Communities	25/01/21  15/09/2022	<p>Play Facilities - £404,910 for the provision and maintenance of an on-site NEAP play area to include a flood lit Multi Use Games Area and wheeled sports track/skate park (specification to be agreed).</p> <p>The Council seeks to secure, by way of planning obligations off site contributions for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Sport Hall provision of £195,494 toward the cost of a replacement Sports Hall.</li> <li>b. Swimming pool provision of £215,806 towards the cost of a replacement pool.</li> <li>c. Outdoor pitch provision £805,500 towards improvements to pitch provision in the catchment area.</li> </ol> <p>We will assess contributions towards equipped play facilities on the basis of providing and maintaining a NEAP that will meet the needs of 1,000 people. The contribution per person will therefore be £143 for provision and £198 for maintenance. This equates to an overall contribution of £818 per dwelling (at an average occupancy of 2.4 persons per dwelling).</p> <p><math>£818 \times 450 = £368,100</math> for the provision and maintenance of an on-site NEAP play area to include a flood lit Multi Use Games Area and wheeled sports track/skate park (specification to be agreed). This is index-linked to second quarter 2022 using the BCIS All in Tender Price Index published by RICS.</p>
Sustainability Planning Specialist	23/12/2021	Detailed sustainability Assessment provided.