

West Oxfordshire District Council  
Planning Department  
Elmfield  
New Yatt Road  
Witney  
OX28 1PB

Mayfield House  
256 Banbury Road  
Summertown  
Oxford  
OX2 7DE

T: 01865 511444  
F:

Your ref: 20/02654/OUT  
Our ref: J0024597

2nd January 2023

Dear Joan,

## **FORMAL AMENDMENTS TO OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION REF: 20/02654/OUT AT LAND SOUTH EAST OF OXFORD HILL, WITNEY, OXFORDSHIRE**

### **APPLICANTS: THE MAWLE TRUSTEES AND TRUSTEES OF NORTHFIELD LIFE INTEREST**

I refer to the above-mentioned outline planning application and write further to my email to you dated 6<sup>th</sup> December; your email to my colleague James Stone dated 21<sup>st</sup> December, in which, without any prior notice or indication, you informed James that you intended to take the application to the 4<sup>th</sup> January meeting of the Council's Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee with a recommendation for refusal; and my response to you of the same date.

If the intention was to give my clients and the consultant team the shortest possible window in which to reply, your email of the 21<sup>st</sup> could not have been better timed: in common with many businesses, my office closed for the Christmas break on the evening of the 22<sup>nd</sup>. We reopen on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of January.

At paragraph 5.4 in your report to the Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee you state that, "should further information be submitted, Members will have the option of deferring consideration of the application to allow full consideration of this information and to enable any required re-consultations to take place." In light of this letter and the various and the amended plans and updated supporting information provided with it, and having regard to the fact that that we are dealing here with an allocated housing site that is capable of delivering circa 450 market and affordable homes, I would hope that in introducing this item to Members, you will recommend that they take the option of deferring consideration of the application to a later date.

### **Context and Background**

By way of context and background, I have set out below extracts from the emails referenced above. Starting with my email to you dated 6<sup>th</sup> December, I stated that:

"As I mentioned to Phil Shaw when I spoke to him recently, we are in the process of putting together a formal and comprehensive response to the comments received in connection with the revised proposals that we submitted in July. I had hoped to get that response to you this week. However, I am still waiting for the master planners and highway consultants to complete some detailed survey work/levels analysis (as you know, it is quite a steeply sloping site) on the now reduced built platform so that we can better understand the impact that that reduction and the proposed reduction in storey

heights will have on the scheme, and to provide us with the reassurance that we (and the Council) need that we can fit circa 450 homes on the site.

While we wait for this work to be completed, I wondered whether we might have a Teams call so that I can explain where we are, our thoughts on S106 matters and to ensure that we are on the same page in terms of the road map to getting this application to Committee.”

I had hoped that that email would have provided you with the reassurance that we were working through the various outstanding matters that we identified in our discussions held at the end of September. I had also hoped that it would elicit a response from you as regards a meeting to discuss S106 matters (which we have not discussed at all to date) and, as I said, to agree a “road map” for getting the application to Committee. However, I did not receive the courtesy of a reply: the next correspondence was your email of the 21<sup>st</sup> inform us that the application was going to Committee on the 4<sup>th</sup> of January with a recommendation for refusal.

My response to you later that same day read as follows:

“See the attached email [of 6<sup>th</sup> December], to which I never received a reply.

See also the attached email from Rashid Bbosa, which you and we received yesterday, and which is a response to an email from the applicants’ highways consultants, Glanville dated 22 February 2022!! Clearly, this needs some consideration by us, and presumably by you. It also goes to my email of 6<sup>th</sup> December, in which I explained the reasons behind the delay in getting back to you on the outstanding technical issues and asked you for a meeting to discuss S106 and other matters.

In the circumstances I would be grateful if you could confirm:

- a) That you will not take my client’s application to committee in January; and
- b) That you will agree to an early meeting in the New Year, ideally with OCC present, to discuss OCC’s belated email and other S106 and outstanding matters.

In return, I can confirm that:

- a) we are happy to agree a further extension of time; and
- b) subject to consideration of Rashid Bbosa’s email, we will be responding comprehensively on all the outstanding issues after Christmas.”

You and we only received Mr Bbosa’s email on 20<sup>th</sup> December, the same day that the Council published the agenda for the 4<sup>th</sup> January meeting of the Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee and the day before you wrote to my colleague, James Stone informing him that my clients application was on the agenda for that meeting with a recommendation for refusal.

As you know, Rashid Bbosa is a Senior Transport Planner in Oxfordshire County Council’s Transport Development Control Team. As you also know (because you were copied in on the email), his email was a response to a letter from the applicants’ Transport Consultant’s, Glanville some 10 months prior – the letter in question was dated 17<sup>th</sup> February 2022(!).

In that letter, Glanville set out the applicants’ position with respect to S106 Contributions, S278 Agreements and Planning Conditions. There were eight attachments to Mr Bbosa’s email ranging in length from 9 to 44 pages, which together constituted OCC’s response to Glanville’s February submission. For completeness, the text from Mr Bbosa’s email is reproduced below:

“Kindly receive my sincere apologies for an unprecedented late response to your email below with respect to the s106 and s278 schemes. I acknowledge this delay has been an inconvenience to you and may have affected how the application has since been approached. Our response relied on a

chain of teams in order to commission Stantec to undertake the scheme costs and breakdowns you requested.

Attached is OCC's position on the s106 and s278 schemes we consider necessary for EWSDA to be implemented alongside. Also attached are the costed-out schemes for your reference.

With the schemes now costed out, I take it this shall now form the basis of any future negotiations and we would be happy to discuss further."

Based on Mr Bbosa's email alone, the sensible and most appropriate course of action is for the Sub-Committee to defer consideration of my clients' application, both to allow my clients' transport consultants and you (as the Case Officer) time to go through the comprehensive suite of documents received from the OCC, and to allow for "future negotiations" as anticipated by Mr Bbosa. I note also that in paragraph 5.4 of the report to the Sub-Committee you state that:

"... Further discussions were held with the applicant in September 2022, in an attempt to resolve outstanding issues, but no further information or revisions has been submitted. The agent has commented that a formal and comprehensive response to the comments received in connection with the revised proposals is being prepared but given the length of time that has now passed and the continuing failure to address the conflicts with Policy WIT1, detailed below, the application is being reported to Committee in order to meet the now agreed extension of time for determination in January 2023. **Should further information be submitted, Members will have the option of deferring consideration of the application to allow full consideration of this information and to enable any required re-consultations to take place.**"

(My emphasis)

Accordingly, and consistent with the undertaking to submit additional information, as recorded in your report and confirmed in my email of 6<sup>th</sup> December, I am attaching to this letter the following updated plans and supporting documents:

J0024597\_006-V3 Illustrative Masterplan Proving Layout to demonstrate that the proposed quantum of development can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site in a form that will deliver a high quality of design and development

An updated Illustrative Framework Plan Drawing No. J0024597\_015\_V6

Updated Parameter Plans:

- J0024597\_009\_V5\_East of Witney Access and Movement Parameter (amendments made to coordinate with Glanville highways proposals)
- J0024597\_010\_V4\_East of Witney Building Heights Parameter (2 storey housing shown further up the hill)
- J0024597\_011\_V4\_East of Witney Density Parameter with Figures (2 storey housing shown further up the hill)
- J0024597\_012\_V4\_East of Witney Land Use Parameter (Updated to reflect changes to BNG related landscape proposals)
- J0024597\_013\_V5\_East of Witney Landscape Parameter (Updated to reflect changes to BNG related landscape proposals)
- J0024597\_015\_V5\_East of Witney Detailed Development Framework Plan (Updated to reflect changes to BNG related landscape proposals)

An Updated Ecological Baseline Report

An Amended Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) metric calculations submitted as Excel spreadsheet metric

Improved Pedestrian and Cycle Crossing at Cogges Hill Road to LTN1/20 Figure 10.6 Drawing No. 818094/6130

Proposed Improvements to Existing Facility to Provide a 3m Footway/Cycle Way from Cogges Hill Road to the Windrush Valley Drawing No. 8181094/6129

In addition, and for ease of reference, I have set out below in tabular form the applicants’ comments on the consultee responses to the revised information that we submitted in August of this year (see Table 1) and the actions that the applicants have taken in response to the agreed minutes of the meeting held with the Council on 29<sup>th</sup> September (see Table 2). The right-hand column in each table explains how we say the applicants have satisfactorily addressed the points raised with reference, where appropriate, to the relevant supporting information.

For the avoidance of doubt, the comments in Table 1 are made in response to the following consultee responses:

- Oxfordshire County Council (17.08.22)
- OCC Transport / Highways (30.09.22)
- WODC Contamination (07.09.22)
- WODC Ecology (07.09.22 and 13.09.22)
- WODC Landscape (21.09.22)
- WODC Leisure (15.09.22)
- WODC Policy (23.09.22)
- WODC Strategic Housing (18.08.22)
- Witney Town Council (uploaded 25.08.22)

I note that those responses are also summarised in the Report to the Sub-Committee.

**TABLE 1**

EXPLANATION AS TO HOW THE REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSAL ADDRESS CONSULTEE COMMENTS	
<i>Consultee</i>	<i>Applicants’ Response</i>
<b>OCC Transport / Highways (30.09.22)</b>	
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.	The applicants have agreed to either deliver or contribute towards the majority of the measures in the document referred to, <b>subject to receiving costings and justification from OCC.</b>  Good connections across the Windrush Valley are proposed as shown on the revised Access and Movement Parameter Plan. The District Council confirmed in its meeting with Carter Jonas on 29.09.22 that the proposed connections across the Windrush Valley illustrated on the [then] Access

	<p>and Movement Parameter Plan could provide greater benefits than the indicative connection across the Windrush shown in Figure 9.2c of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Contributions to Hanborough Station are not proposed as the County Council has failed to provide the calculations as to how such contributions are proportionate to the development.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is demonstrated later in this Table (see response to bullet point ‘how the residents shall access the existing A40 cycle infrastructure towards Eynsham/ Oxford as well as connections to Hanborough Station’) that the potential uptake of such a route from the site would be marginal and as such contributions would not meet the tests set out at paragraph 57 in the National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”).</p>
<p>Proposals inconsistent with provisions of Policy WIT1 (d) in the following ways – not yet agreed to making appropriate financial contributions towards LTP4 schemes</p>	<p>The applicants have sought to agree the package of contributions from the time the first consultation response was received from the County Council. However, OCC has been slow to reply and has only provided partial responses. As such the applicants sought to activate the process by providing its proposed approach to contributions in the letter from Glanville (the applicants’ transport consultants) dated 14/02/22. A response was received from OCC on <b>20<sup>th</sup> December 2022 some 10 months after Glanville’s letter</b> and is being assessed by Glanville.</p> <p>A summary timeline of the key correspondence in this regard is set out below, which demonstrates that the applicants have made best endeavours to progress matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15/12/20: OCC issue consultation response, many items in the S106 table marked therein as £TBC.</li> <li>27/01/21: Glanville request that OCC provide costs identified as TBC.</li> <li>02/02/21: Glanville chase OCC for response.</li> <li>24/02/21: Glanville chase OCC for response.</li> <li>23/03/21: Glanville chase OCC for response.</li> <li>13/04/21: Glanville chase OCC for response.</li> </ul>

	<p>19/04/21: Glanville chase OCC for response.</p> <p>27/04/21: OCC provide consultation response with partial information on S106 and S278.</p> <p>07/05/21: Glanville requested the outstanding information on S106 and S278 from OCC.</p> <p>21/05/21: Glanville chase OCC for response.</p> <p>25/06/21: Glanville chase OCC for response.</p> <p>30/07/21: Glanville chase OCC for response.</p> <p>04/08/21: OCC provides partial S106 information.</p> <p>11/08/21: Glanville chase OCC for outstanding items.</p> <p>17/02/22: Glanville submits to OCC applicant's S106/S278 offer in light of lack of response from OCC.</p> <p>01/03/22: Glanville chase OCC for response.</p> <p>28/03/22: Glanville chase OCC for response.</p> <p>22/04/22: Glanville chase OCC for response.</p> <p>27/09/22: Carter Jonas chase OCC for response.</p> <p>30/09/22 OCC object to latest proposal but with no significant S106/S278 details.</p>
<p>Key Point - Removal of the community hub shall likely increase the need to make outside journeys into town.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (Issue 3: 31 July 2020), on which OCC has based its consideration of the impact of the development on all modes of transport, makes no allowance for the internalisation of residential trips due to the inclusion of a community hub. It therefore considered a 'worst-case' with respect to the residential trip generation.</p> <p>Given the above, it is the case that OCC has already concluded that the impact of the development, without the internalisation of residential trips due to a community hub, would be acceptable (see consultation response dated 16/04/21). Therefore, no further assessment is required in this regard.</p>

It is also worth noting that the residential development, and by extension the trip generation for all modes of transport, has reduced from that already found acceptable by OCC, as up to 450

houses are now proposed as compared to the up to 495 referenced in the original application.

This last point notwithstanding, it is the case that the development with or without a community hub would have slightly different trip characteristics, which are explored below for completeness.

OCC's conclusion is that the active travel connections to the site were appropriate in terms of their number, location and capacity when the development included a community hub but are now no longer acceptable given that the community hub has been removed.

In any discussions in this regard the modest nature of the facilities that the community hub was anticipated to comprise is relevant. The Transport Assessment (Issue 3: 31 July 2020) outlined the community hub as comprising the following modest facilities, a church; farm shop (140m<sup>2</sup> GFA); and community centre / nursery (110m<sup>2</sup> GFA).

Given the modest scale and nature of the community hub if it were to be provided the residents would nevertheless still need to travel to "convenience stores and supermarkets" off site.

**OCC's assertion that the removal of the community hub would generate new trips to these uses is therefore incorrect as they would be generated in either case.**

A community hub within the site would be used by residents living within the site and in the surrounding areas. For example, residents both inside and outside the site might choose to walk to the proposed nursery or farm shop.

As such removing the community hub would result in a reduction in people walking to the site from the surrounds and an increase in those walking from the site to alternative facilities outside of the site. The removal of the community hub from the proposals would therefore not result in a significant effect on active travel movements in and out of the site.



	<p>In conclusion, it has been demonstrated that OCC’s assertion that removal of the community hub increases the “need for direct and attractive walking and cycling connections between the development and the town centre” is groundless.</p>
<p>Key Point - For these journeys to remain walking and cycling trips, much thought must be placed on active travel connections between the site and the town centre.</p>	<p>The conclusion of the response to the previous point was that removal of the community hub would not increase the need for attractive travel connections. There is therefore no requirement to provide further emphasis on active travel measures.</p>
<p>Key Point - Clarity is required to how the development shall link on to the improvements around the Shores Green junction.</p>	<p>Residents would access the A40 via the proposed link to Oxford Hill from the centre of the site.</p>
<p>Comment - The previous assessment has assumed that the community hub would generate a meagre impact on the network from outside of the development. However, it was also assumed that such a facility would have internalised a significant proportion of trips. The resultant of such a movement matrix more than before increases the need for direct and attractive walking and cycling connections between the development and the town centre if such related trips are to remain non car trips.</p>	<p>Regarding the ‘meagre’ impact, for the purposes of clarity, it is the case that the traffic generation of the community hub would be so small as not to affect the findings of the prior modelling work. A fact which was agreed by OCC in its response dated 16/04/21.</p> <p>No reduction to the traffic generation of the proposed new houses was made in the assessment to account for internalisation. OCC’s assertion in this regard is therefore incorrect.</p>
<p>Comment - Parameter Plan ‘Access and Movement’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lacking and/or shows poor connectivity between the proposed development and the existing walking/ cycling infrastructure including the town centre.</li> <li>- Plan labels access point 5 and 6 which are potential pedestrian and cycle link to open space at Eton Close and link towards Witney, respectively. The onward connectivity beyond these markers has not been clearly laid out in the application.</li> </ul>	<p>In its previous consultation response (16/04/21), OCC found the proposed active travel infrastructure, and approach to delivery thereof, to be acceptable. OCC concluded in the same response that it had no objection subject to S106 Contributions, S278 agreements and Planning Conditions.</p> <p>Since OCC provided a positive response on 16/04/21 the proposed connectivity of the site has been further improved as shown on the revised Access and Movement Parameter Plan (drawing no. J0024597_V5_009). As such, it is hoped that as the connectivity now proposed is better than the scheme that OCC previously recommended for approval, it will confirm that its objections in this regard now fall away.</p> <p>The revised Access and Movement Parameter Plan has been updated to clarify access points 5 and 6 as well as the onward connectivity.</p>



	<p><b>The applicants agree to contribute towards the link across Witney Town Council land to Eaton Close, subject to viability.</b></p>
<p>Comment - Not clear how the residents shall access the existing A40 cycle</p> <p>infrastructure towards Eynsham/ Oxford as well as connections to Hanborough Station.</p>	<p>Residents would access the A40 via the proposed link to Oxford Hill from the centre of the site.</p> <p>With respect to Hanborough Station, in its previous consultation response (16/04/21), OCC requested a contribution of £1,000 per dwelling towards these links.</p> <p>In response to the above request, Glanville asked OCC (via an email dated 07/05/21) to clarify the total cost for the delivery of this scheme and what contributions have been previously secured (in value) and on what basis they were secured including a detailed cost breakdown to show how the total cost of delivery has been reached.</p> <p>However, the HA failed to provide this information. Given the lack of clarity in this regard, Glanville responded in its letter of February 2022 as follows:</p> <p><i>“Hanborough Rail Station is located over 9km from the site, well beyond the normally accepted maximum cycling distance of 5km.</i></p> <p><i>As such, even if a dedicated cycle facility were to be provided between the site and the rail station it would be expected to have a very low uptake of commuter trips. It therefore follows that the cycle route cannot be considered to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, the County Council has not provided details of the total cost of the scheme, what contributions have already been provided and how the proportion of the scheme attributable to East Witney has been calculated, despite the applicant requesting such details more than 6 months ago.</i></p> <p><i>It is therefore considered that the requested contribution does not meet the tests in paragraph 57 of the NPPF, which is a requirement when seeking planning obligations”</i></p> <p>To quantify the potential uptake of a cycle link to Hanborough, Census data for the four Lower Super Output Areas that include and surround the site (West Oxfordshire 008A, 008B, 008G and</p>

	<p>008H) suggest that 1.1% of the residents currently take the train to work whereas 77.6% take the car.</p> <p>Applying these percentages to the traffic generation in the Transport Assessment suggests that 3-4 residents per hour would be expected to take the train to work from the site. Given that the station is 9km from the site (circa 30 min cycle) it would be reasonable to assume that only a minority of those taking the train would cycle on a regular basis.</p> <p>The above assessment therefore quantifies the assertion in Glanville's letter of 14<sup>th</sup> February 2022 to OCC that the requested contribution does not meet the tests set out at paragraph 57 in the Framework.</p>
<p>Comment - Parameter Plan shows dots across the Windrush that are labelled "pedestrian/ cycle connection", there is no commitment to how these shall be delivered and by whom.</p>	<p>As noted previously, the measures referred to have not altered from those which OCC previously found acceptable and as such they should remain acceptable now.</p> <p><b>The applicants will deliver the links within its land and where facilities rely on third party land the applicant will fund their delivery by way of S106.</b></p>
<p>Comment - Amended application's access strategy seems to focus on the very local connectivity but fails to recognise the need for the strategic/ wider active travel connectivity onto the network.</p>	<p>The proposals include both local and wider connectivity measures.</p> <p>As shown on the amended Access and Movement Parameter Plan, the proposed local connectivity measures will connect the development with the existing active travel infrastructure surrounding the site on all sides and provide new and improved linkages through the site. This will ensure access to the local and wider network for the residents of the development and also greatly improve the permeability of the site for the benefit of all.</p> <p>Again, as shown on the amended Access and Movement Parameter Plan and the accompanying more detailed highway drawings, <b>a range of wider connectivity measures are also proposed to enhance the connectivity to Witney with a focus on the town centre as a key destination as well as to the route to the A40 in the north.</b></p>

<p>Comment - Green dashed "New path along existing hedgerow corridor" is shown on the Parameter Plan those cuts across the developable part of the site from Blakes Avenue onto the existing PRow to the south east of the site and along the A40. The application does not provide any detail to what of path this shall be.</p>	<p>This link is anticipated to be a footpath.</p>
<p>Comment - As part of the Shores Green junction improvements, the section of PRow (410/41/30 and 410/41/40) from the B4022 shall be upgraded to a shared pedestrian/ cycle facility to link onto the onward A40 cycle infrastructure that currently exists. It would be a missed opportunity for the development to align to such committed infrastructure that residents shall improve access to the wider network;</p>	<p>The proposed footpath will provide additional connections to the PRow network for the residents of the development and greater permeability through the site for all.</p> <p>Upgrading the PRow has been proposed by OCC, but it is not a committed scheme. Furthermore, the applicants, whose land the PRow runs through, are not supportive of this proposal. Their view is that their proposed pedestrian/cycle connection from the middle of the allocated site up to Oxford Hill will provide a more direct and more attractive route for existing Witney residents and residents of the proposed development.</p> <p>Also, we note OCC's proposed A40 shared use path would require a departure from safety standards for the crossing of the B4022 A40 slip at Shores Green which the applicants cannot support if a standards compliant alternative is available.</p>
<p>Comment - Route that runs from Oxford Hill across the open field may have issues with gradient. The County will require details of the vertical geometry which adheres to LTN 1/20 guidelines.</p>	<p>Glanville have reviewed the topography and can confirm that <b>it is possible to achieve gradients in compliance with LTN1/20.</b></p> <p>Plans to be shared with and discussed further with OCC Highways.</p>
<p><b>WODC Contamination (07.09.22)</b></p>	
<p>Have requested confirmation that the conceptual site model presented in Phase 1 report is not affected by the proposed changes.</p>	<p>James Gibson from Hilson Moran has confirmed that the conceptual site model presented in Phase 1 report is not affected by the proposed changes.</p>
<p><b>WODC Ecology (07.09.22 and 13.09.22)</b></p>	
<p>Protected Habitat and Species' Surveys - The LPA is requesting that all surveys are updated because they are out of date. Could you let me</p>	<p><b>The applicants' ecology consultants have undertaken an updated phase 1 survey of the site and offsite habitats included in the development.</b> The mobile species surveys have</p>

<p>know when these surveys will be completed as I am aware you are working on them?</p>	<p>been updated following CIEEM guidance. This includes an updated badger survey (although limited due to the time of year), a targeted water vole and otter survey and a re-assessment of the trees around the site for bats and barn owl. The Ecological Baseline Report has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Further survey updates from current 2019 data are not seen as necessary for protected species given the land use and habitats remain largely the same. Together the 2019 and 2022 surveys provide a robust baseline for this assessment.</p>
<p>BNG - The amended biodiversity net gain metric calculation should be submitted as the actual excel spreadsheet metric (not screenshots).</p>	<p><b>See the amended calculator that accompanies this submission.</b></p>
<p>BNG - 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>The accompanying calculator includes hedgerow data (area to be lost and the area required to achieve 10% - assuming species rich hedgerow is planted to compensate for loss).</p>
<p>BNG - Strategic contributions as outlined in Local Plan policies WIT1 and WIT6 should be considered separate to BNG requirements.</p>	<p>The applicants accept the point being made about the requirements of WIT1 and WIT6 and BNG regulations being separate targets but contend that any measures taken can be put against multiple targets and requirements. <b>The revised BNG calculator shows a net gain of 6.80 Habitat Units equating to 12.93% in total with the bulk of this being focused on the Lower Windrush CTA. Accordingly, the applicants' view is that they are fulfilling the requirements of WIT1(g) 'biodiversity, landscape and public access enhancements within the Lower Windrush Valley...' and WIT6 '...protect and enhance the intrinsic landscape, character, ecology and cultural value of the valley...[and]...maximising opportunities for enhancements within the Conservation Target Areas (CTAs).'</b></p> <p>There has been a reorganisation of areas to be set aside for wildflower meadow and scrub grassland in the Windrush Valley (as shown on the Illustrative Framework Plan and Illustrative Masterplan) to ensure enhanced BNG in the Windrush Valley.</p>

	<p>It should also be noted that BNG calculations are worked out on the totality of proposals and cannot be separated out depending on the location of one particular element compared to another. On the contrary, the BNG calculator encourages BNG proposals to be located in strategic positions. Under the strategic significance the habitat proposals clearly meet “Within area formally identified in local strategy” i.e., the CTA as opposed to non-strategic.</p>
<p>BNG - Must first demonstrate that the mitigation hierarchy has been applied on site to first secure no net loss in biodiversity.</p>	<p>It is recognised that the first principal of biodiversity net gain is to apply the mitigation hierarchy and to avoid loss and losses where possible, but this principle also recognises that compensation for losses within the development footprint should not take priority over proposals that generate most benefit for nature conservation including delivering biodiversity net gain off-site. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied in this case in that the development layout has sought to avoid loss of the more valuable habitats (scrub hedge and woodland) and where this is not possible this has been minimised. Compensation for these small losses is provided. However, in line with the first principle, this is provided off-site because it is considered this provides the best outcome for conservation. A good proportion of which is in the CTA which is the best place to be providing habitat enhancement.</p>
<p>BNG - Further biodiversity enhancements on-site should be explored to achieve a no net loss. 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.</p>	<p><b>There is no planning or legal requirement to achieve no net loss on site rather that development delivers a 10% net gain overall.</b> As stated above, the first principle of net gain is to avoid loss, but it also recognises that compensation for losses within the development footprint should not take priority over proposals that generate most benefit for nature conservation including delivering biodiversity net gain off-site. As such strategic off-site compensation has been considered first as a priority over minimising loss on site which would not generate as good an outcome for nature conservation. If net gain were</p>

	<p>maximised within the redline this would mean that less off-site compensation would be required.</p> <p><b>The proposed measures within the CTA off site meet the objectives of the Witney in Windrush project</b> and generate the best outcomes for nature conservation whilst exceeding the future Environment Act 2021 requirement for 10% net gain. It should be noted that the Environment Act 2021 net gain requirements are not expected to come into force until Autumn 2023 whilst the LPA currently don't have any adopted numerical requirement for net gain and so the net gain proposed by the scheme exceeds the requirements of the Local Plan.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the boundaries of the Lower Windrush CTA do not match the boundaries of the Windrush In Witney project area. The CTA boundary runs along the Harwick Brook; it excludes the applicants' Wimpies field and pump house field i.e., the long thin field with boot at the south end and the field in which the Site B housing is located.</p>
<p>Strategic contribution towards the Windrush in Witney project and Conservation Target Area - The submitted masterplan and ecological baseline report have provided few details regarding biodiversity enhancements or restoration measures within the Windrush in Witney project area.</p>	<p><b>The current baseline report has been updated and accompanies this submission.</b> The report currently covers the enhancement of the large arable field within the Windrush project area which is still part of the project. The report will be updated with details for the additional habitat enhancements planned within the Windrush project area.</p>
<p>Strategic contribution towards the Windrush in Witney project and Conservation Target Area - Enhancement parcels are limited in connectivity.</p>	<p>The habitat parcels are within the Windrush Conservation Target Area (CTA) area which is a wildlife corridor and already has large scale connectivity and small-scale connectivity (hedgerows).</p> <p>As shown on the amended Illustrative Framework Plan, the applicants are enhancing an additional field (parcel of land south of the Cogges Heritage Trust main car park) which falls within the CTA as well as creating a large area of habitat in the existing arable field to the west of the site along</p>

	<p>The areas of existing habitat (grassland, scrub, hedgerow and woodland) will be connected with the proposed new grassland and scrubby grassland to replace the existing arable field which does not offer as much connectivity currently. Therefore, the applicants are strengthening the green corridor within the CTA with additional enhanced habitat along the Windrush and creating more biodiverse friendly habitat replacing arable.</p> <p>Along Site B the applicants are proposing further woodland along the back of the development, this will create a further extension to the existing woodland parcel along Stanton Harcourt Road, which in turn runs along the edge of the A40 and into Site A. Existing woodland along the site A boundary to the south is being enhanced creating an improved corridor which connects Site A and B. The corridor running through the middle of Site A will also be strengthened with scrubland edge planting proposed along parts of the existing woodland.</p> <p><b>Again, as shown on the amended Illustrative Framework Plan, the applicants have also added a community orchard on the land south of the cemetery.</b></p>
<p>Strategic contribution towards the Windrush in Witney project and Conservation Target Area Recommend the parcel to the south is appropriately managed in line with the outlined conservation targets for the Windrush in Witney project and Conservation Target Area.</p>	<p>Recommendation noted. However, this is not part of the proposed scheme and is not required to meet net gain objectives. The project is already contributing to the CTA project area. The amended plans submitted in August 2022 and again with this submission illustrate the additional areas of wildflower meadow and scrub grassland in the Windrush CTA (see notes 12 and 13 on the Plan).</p>
<p><b>WODC Landscape (21.09.22)</b></p>	
<p>If building beyond the 95m contour is deemed to be appropriate the development edge would need to be appropriately considered including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lower density development on the edge alongside a less formal and linear building pattern;</li> </ul>	<p>The Building Heights Parameter Plan (Drawing no. J0024597_V4-010) has been amended to illustrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key has been updated to show the maximum height in m of each storey;</li> </ul>



<p>- The roofscape on the edge could be broken up with additional tree planting to soften the transition between the development edge and the more rural undeveloped ridge;</p>	<p>- 2 storeys now proposed across whole of Site B and eastern edge of Site A. This marks a reduction in maximum building heights when compared to previous versions of the Building Heights Parameter Plan.</p> <p>NB. Layout and Landscaping is a reserved matter and so the location of tree planting will be addressed at the reserved matters stage.</p>
<p>Given the elevated slope the proposed development 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.</p>	<p>The Building Heights Parameter Plan has been amended as noted above with significantly more of the site limited to 2 storeys.</p>
<p><b>WODC Leisure (15.09.22)</b></p>	
<p>Financial contributions have been requested towards the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sports Hall Provision;</li> <li>- Swimming Pool Provision;</li> <li>- Outdoor Pitch Provision;</li> <li>- Play Provision.</li> </ul>	<p>Contributions to be discussed with WODC as part of S106 negotiations.</p>
<p><b>WODC Policy (23.09.22)</b></p>	
<p>District Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Two most fundamental issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- landscape impact on both sites A and B; and</li> <li>- lack of effective connectivity with the Town Centre across the Windrush Valley.</li> </ul>	<p>The Building Heights Parameter Plan has been amended as noted above with significantly more of the site limited to 2 storeys.</p> <p>At the meeting between the LPA and Carter Jonas on 29.09.22 it was accepted that the proposed connection across the Windrush Valley shown on the Access and Movement Parameter Plan could provide greater benefits than the indicative connection across the Windrush shown in Figure 9.2c of the Local Plan. Planning conditions and the S106 can control triggers for completion of routes.</p>
<p>Other concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proposed pedestrian route to Oxford Hill;</li> <li>- location of the proposed allotments and;</li> <li>- lack of on-site play space</li> </ul>	<p>We have reviewed the topography of the land where the pedestrian route is proposed to Oxford Hill and can confirm that it would be possible to achieve gradients in compliance with LTN1/20. Please see accompanying Drawing 'Road 2 &amp; Footway Cycleway Longitudinal Sections 8181094-SK06 P1' which illustrates the feasibility with regard to LTN 1/20.</p>

	<p>The Land Use Parameter Plan illustrates that the scheme will provide an allotment measuring 0.69ha in area in addition to Open Space provision (including retained hedgerow/tree planting, new woodland planting, modified grassland and scrub planting) measuring 9.53 ha.</p> <p>The West Oxfordshire Open Space Study (2013) proposes the following standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allotments: 0.25 ha/1000 people;</li> <li>- Amenity Green Space: 0.75 ha/1000 people;</li> <li>- Natural and Semi-Natural Green Space: 2.0 ha/1000 (for new provision this can be combined with the 0.7 ha/1000 amenity green space standard)</li> <li>- Parks &amp; recreation grounds: For new provision a standard of 1.0 ha/1000 of publicly accessible space is required</li> <li>- Play Space (Children): 0.05 ha/1000</li> <li>- Play Space (Youth): 0.02 ha/1000</li> </ul> <p><b>The proposal is therefore significantly overproviding for a site of only 450 dwellings with regard to allotments and open space and so there will be more than adequate space for on-site play, the details and funding of which can be agreed as part of S106 negotiations.</b></p>
<b>WODC Strategic Housing (18.08.22)</b>	
Policy compliant provision of affordable homes	Noted and agreed
Provision of social rent is important	Policy H3 states that affordable housing mix and tenure will be responsive to identified local needs and site-specific opportunities. Affordable Housing breakdown to be agreed as part of S106 discussions. As required by Policy H3, the proposal will generate 40% affordable housing, subject to viability.
Affordable and market sale homes should be provided compliant with policy H4 with respect to Building Regulations Requirements M4(2) and M4(3)	Policy H4 requires as a minimum the provision of at least 25% of market and affordable homes to the M4(2) standard. As a minimum the Council will seek the provision of at least 5% of homes to the M4(3) standard. Where M4(3) homes are


	<p>provided they will be counted as contributing towards the 25% M4(2) requirement. It is proposed that the scheme meets the standards of Policy H4. The precise market housing mix will be confirmed at the reserved matters stage.</p>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council have highlighted need for a small number of smaller homes designed for people with learning disabilities – could this be accommodated?</p>	<p>The supporting text to Policy H3 (see para’s 5.94 and 5.95) explains that OCC is aiming to deliver 390 homes for working age adults with various disabilities across Oxfordshire by 2020. The strategy has a particular focus on Witney and incorporates 3 main models of delivery of which ‘Conventional homes with limited adaptations and communal facilities but for groups of adults with a learning disability or mental health need to live in as a group’ is one. To be considered further as part of the discussions on conditions and S106 planning obligations.</p>
<p><b>Witney Town Council (uploaded 25.08.22)</b></p>	
<p>No overall objection.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Welcome the inclusion of better access to Windrush Cemetery.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Disappointed to see removal of formerly proposed community centre.</p>	<p><b>As has been agreed with the LPA the community centre is not a policy requirement.</b></p>
<p>Little confidence in the capacity provided by the local water and sewerage company and would like reassurances.</p>	<p>The application is accompanied by a ‘Utilities &amp; Foul Drainage Appraisal’ which explains that a sewerage company has a duty under the Water Industry Act 1991 to develop its sewerage network in order to meet increasing demand through new connections. The Water Industry Act 1991 also requires water companies to undertake reinforcement works with regard to potable water.</p>
<p>Concerns over the height of the proposed buildings / concerns with contours.</p>	<p>The Building Heights Parameter Plan has been amended to show the maximum storey heights.</p> <p>2 storeys now proposed across the whole of Site B and more extensively along the eastern edge of Site A.</p> <p><b>This is a material reduction in maximum building heights when compared to previous versions of the Building Heights Parameter Plan.</b></p>

<p>Concerns regarding pedestrian and cycle path plans. Connections should be in line with the required needs and ongoing proposals. Still envisage better connections for cycling and walking into the town centre, especially more directly across the river Windrush to Farm Mill Lane, which need to be delivered at an early stage of the development, rather than on its completion.</p>	<p>The LPA accepted at the meeting with Carter Jonas on 29.09.22 that the proposed connection across the Windrush Valley shown on the Access and Movement Parameter Plan could provide greater benefits than the indicative connection across the Windrush shown in Figure 9.2c of the Local Plan. Planning conditions and the S106 can control triggers for completion of routes.</p>
<p>Supports the District Council view that the proposed provision of play areas on the site is improved.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Would like to see ambitious environmental and energy sustainability benefits which go beyond current planning and building regulations.</p>	<p>The proposal is providing an overall BNG of 12.93%, which exceeds the requirements of both local adopted policy and national emerging guidance.</p>

TABLE 2

<p><b>EXPLANATION AS TO HOW THE PROPOSAL ADDRESSES COMMENTS FROM LPA MEETING ON 29TH SEPTEMBER 2022</b></p>	
<p><b>Landscape</b></p>	
<p>Carter Jonas to provide additional information for the Building Heights Parameter Plan to state the maximum height (in m) of each storey; Carter Jonas to see if it is possible to provide 2 storeys on eastern edge of parcels at Site A and across whole of Site B whilst still achieving 450 dwellings across wider site at acceptable density. Once submitted, WODC will review this info/plans in terms of landscape impact and site context/setting of the town. In this respect, it would also be useful to identify where 2.5 and 3 storey development exists within the immediate locality of the site.</p>	<p>The Building Heights Parameter Plan has been amended to show the maximum storey heights.</p> <p>2 storeys now proposed across the whole of Site B and the eastern edge of Site A.</p> <p>This is a material reduction in maximum building heights when compared to previous versions of the Building Heights Parameter Plan.</p>
<p>Carter Jonas to discuss the updated Parameter Plans (Building Heights, Density, Landscape) with WODC Landscape Consultant once updated Parameter Plans produced (if</p>	<p>The Building Heights, Density and Landscape Parameter Plans have all been amended to address the LPA’s concerns about the landscape impact of the proposed development.</p>

<p>considered possible to accommodate 450 dwellings).</p>	
<p><b>Ecology</b></p>	
<p>WODC Officers accepted that the wording of adopted Policy WIT 1 (part g) does not necessarily mean the proposal has to enhance all of the lower Windrush Valley. Carter Jonas to provide further ecology information requested and confirm what BNG enhancement figure is provided in the Windrush Valley as opposed to the wider enhancements, which it is stated will achieve a BNG of 12.87% across the wider site. WODC will review this information in terms of addressing biodiversity issues raised including whether the enhancement proposed addresses WIT 1 (part g).</p>	<p>See the updated Ecological Baseline Report and BNG metric calculations.</p>
<p>WODC accepted that proposal significantly exceeds what is required by Policy regarding biodiversity net gain (BNG).</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>WODC restated previous correspondence that Policy EH3 requires an overall net gain in biodiversity and that the Environment Act which gained royal assent in autumn 2021 requires a 10% biodiversity net gain, although it is accepted that this is not yet mandatory.</p>	<p>Incorporating both onsite and offsite habitat creation, an overall net gain in excess of 10% is being achieved.</p>
<p>WODC has sought to achieve a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain on new development proposals. Nevertheless, in this case Policy WIT1 (g) specifically states the development should include biodiversity, landscape and public access enhancements within the Lower Windrush Valley including arrangements for future maintenance.</p>	<p>We are following the net gain principle by providing the best outcome for conservation by proposing the better habitat creation within the Lower Windrush Valley – i.e., biodiversity in terms of Policy WT1(g). The management of habitats will be set out in a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP), which will be produced prior to commencement of development to address a suitably worded planning condition. The LEMP will set out who will be responsible for its implementation.</p> <p>As shown on the amended Access and Movement Parameter Plan, the proposed development will secure significant public access enhancements across the Windrush Valley.</p> <p>The applicants note that Natural England did not object to the application even before these latest amendments: its view is that “the proposed development will not have significant adverse</p>

	impacts on protected landscapes or designated sites.”
<b>Non-Vehicular Connections</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LPA accepted that the proposed connections across the Windrush Valley could provide greater benefits than the indicative connection across the Windrush shown in Figure 9.2c of the Local Plan.</li> </ul>	Agreed.
<p>Given that WODC Officers accept the location of the proposed link across the Windrush is acceptable then Carter Jonas needs to discuss delivery of these links internally and in particular the links referred to by the text from the plan below:</p> 	<p>These links will be secured by way of a mix of direct delivery and S106 contributions, the details of which will be discussed and agreed as part of the discussion on conditions and S106 obligations.</p> <p>In this regard, see the additional detail provided on the amended Access and Movement Parameter Plan and the accompanying, more detailed technical highway drawings.</p>
<p>Carter Jonas to review the response from Glanville on highway issues including walking and cycling connections dated February 2021. WODC stated that the matter of connections including the requirement under Policy WIT1 for the provision of a comprehensive network for pedestrian and cyclists with good connectivity to adjoining areas including the town remain unresolved. As previously advised regard should be had to the report entitled 'Priority Interventions for cycling and walking required by the East Witney development'. WODC require those links identified as essential, i.e. are direct mitigation for the site, are expected to be brought forward by the developer. Carter Jonas to address these concerns.</p>	<p>The applicants position regarding the 'Priority Interventions for cycling and walking required by the East Witney development' has been clarified by the comments in Table 1 and the narrative below.</p>
<p>WODC Officers to await OCC Highways comments before confirming whether or not the proposed wider site connections address part d of Policy WIT 1.</p>	<p>OCC Highways comments have since been received and have been addressed in Table 1 above.</p>

## The Council's Proposed Reasons for Refusal

In this letter I do not consider in detail your *Planning Assessment* as set out in section 5 of the Report to the Lowlands Area Sub-Committee. However, I will address the proposed reasons for refusal.

**Reason 1:** *The application conflicts with Policy WIT1 (part b) in that it does not propose a comprehensive development which is led by an agreed masterplan.*

On any reasonable view, the application does propose a comprehensive development: it includes the entirety of the allocated site and with the now amended/extended off-site connections and contributions to/improvements in public transport provision will provide a comprehensive network for pedestrians and cyclists with good connectivity provided to adjoining areas, including improved linkages across the Windrush Valley into the town centre and to the B4022 and A40 shared use path.

As to the reference to “an agreed masterplan”. We remain hopeful that the revised information submitted with this letter will result in agreement that the amended Illustrative Masterplan Proving Layout and Framework Master Plan and other supporting documents do provide an appropriate template for the development of the site.

**Reason 2:** *The proposed development fails to demonstrate that the proposed quantum of development can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site and fails to demonstrate a high quality design and development that would be sustainable and that would provide an integrated community that would form a positive addition to Witney in conflict with Policies OS2, OS4 and WIT1 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan to 2031, the West Oxfordshire Design Guide, relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and the National Design Guide.*

The Illustrative Masterplan Proving Layout and the amended Framework Master Plan and Parameter Plans address this concern and show that “about 450 new homes” with associated infrastructure, services and facilities can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site, as required by Policy WIT1.

Remembering that this is an outline application and that matters relating to detailed design are reserved matters, the amended plans and other supporting documentation do demonstrate that the scheme can achieve a high level of design consistent with the requirements of Policy OS4.

As to sustainability and the objective of Policy OS2, which is to locate new development in the right places, the site is inherently sustainable, evidence its inclusion in the adopted Local Plan as an allocated housing site.

### **The 95m Contour**

The Proving Layout demonstrates that in order to achieve “about 450 homes” as required by Policy WIT1, built development will have to extend beyond the 95-metre contour. However, as suggested at paragraph 5.36 in the Report to the Lowlands Area Sub-Committee, we have “revisited” the amended Building Heights and Density Parameter Plans to ensure that the majority of homes above that contour line are limited to 2 storeys. This is then reflected in the Illustrative Masterplan Proving Layout.

This last point notwithstanding, I would again make the point (as I did in my letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2022) that:

- 1) The Local Plan Inspector appointed to examine the Submission Draft WODC Local Plan 2031 was not persuaded as to the significance of the 95m contour. If he had been, he would have proposed a modification to the Plan that limited the allocation to circa 300 homes and made it clear that there should be no development above that contour line;
- 2) The Inspector also acknowledged that while around 450 dwellings would likely cause some harm to the landscape, that did not mean that that harm would necessarily be “unacceptable” in a planning sense, especially when weighed against the need for housing (N.B. the Council’s 2021 – 2026 Housing Land Supply Position Statement (December 2021) assumes that the site will deliver at around 450 homes);



- 3) There is no reference to the 95m contour in Policy WIT1 or the supporting text to that policy;
- 4) Paragraph 9.2.34 in the Local Plan makes it clear that “the extent of the developable area shown on Figure 9.2c is indicative only; and
- 5) Paragraph 9.2.35 in the Local Plan makes it clear that the smaller parcel to the south of Cogges Lane Site B will deliver circa 30 new homes; and paragraph 3.2.36 states that the remaining circa 420 homes will be provided on the Cogges Triangle which, by definition means development above the 95m contour line - the provision of 420 dwellings below the 95m contour would require a very urban, dense development that would not be appropriate in this edge of town location. The updated Illustrative Framework Plan Proving Layout includes a line depicting the location of the 95m contour which clearly illustrates that 420 dwellings cannot be provided at a sensitive density below the 95m contour line.

**Reason 3:** *The proposed development fails to provide a comprehensive network for pedestrians and cyclists with good connectivity provided to adjoining areas, including improved linkages across the Windrush Valley into the town centre and to the B4022 and A40 shared use path in conflict with Policies T1, T3, EH4 and WIT1 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan to 2031, the West Oxfordshire Design Guide, relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and the National Design Guide.*

Also, WIT1 requires the “provision of 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 consistent with the aims and objectives of the Windrush in Witney Project and to Hanborough Station.” The applicants proposed pedestrian and cycle links, as shown on the amended Access and Movement Parameter Plan and accompanying technical drawings, are on any reasonable view, comprehensive, will provide good connectivity to adjoining areas and do include improved linkages across the Windrush Valley into the town centre. Indeed, save for shared use pathway 14 on the Priority Interventions Plan at Appendix 3 to the Sub-Committee Report, the scheme will deliver/facilitate/contribute to all the ‘priority interventions’ shown on that plan. With regard to shared use pathway 14, the applicants have been consistent in their view that their alternative link from the middle of the development site up to Oxford Hill is a safer, more direct and more attractive route by which to provide cyclists and pedestrians with a direct link to Oxford Hill and the long-distance cycle network from which there is access to Hanborough Station via the A40 cycle way.

The provision of these improvements is a matter for further discussion with the Council and OCC Highways as part of the negotiations around conditions and S106 Planning Obligations.

The relevant section of Policy T1 reads as follows:

“All new development will be designed to maximise opportunity for walking cycling and the use of public transport...”

The amended Access and Movement Parameter Plan and the written responses set above, demonstrate how the proposed development will meet this aspiration.

Policy T3 is about encouraging non car travel. The afore-mentioned pedestrian and cycle links coupled with OCC Highways limitations on car parking provision and requirements for on-plot cycle storage, both of which have been factored into the Proving Layout, will assist meeting the requirements of this policy.

Policy EH4 is concerned with public realm and green infrastructure. The parameter plans, the Illustrative Framework Plan and the Proving Layout demonstrate that the proposed development will not have an adverse effect on the functionality of existing green infrastructure; will provide opportunities for walking and cycling; and will provide opportunities for improvements to existing green infrastructure, particularly in the Windrush Valley.

**Reason 4:** *The proposed development would 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, and the proposed contribution towards the local landscape projects is inadequate. The development proposals therefore do not comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policies, EH2, EH3, EH4, WIT1 and WIT6, and relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.*

This reason for refusal is addressed comprehensively in the new Ecological Baseline Report and the BNG calculator.

**Reason 5:** *The applicant has not entered into a legal agreement or agreements to secure the provision of affordable housing; or contributions to sport and leisure; public transport; highways improvement schemes/connection; education; waste; biodiversity net gain; or the Lower Windrush Valley Project. The proposal conflicts with West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 Policies H3, EH3, EH4, EH5, T1, T2, T3 and OS5*

The applicants have on several occasions confirmed their willingness to engage in discussions regarding a legal agreement or agreements to secure the provision of affordable housing; contributions to sport and leisure; public transport; highways improvement schemes/connection; education; waste; biodiversity net gain; or the Lower Windrush Valley Project and I am instructed to do so again in this letter.

In conclusion, I would ask that this letter is reported to the Lowlands Area Sub-Committee before it considers your report and, given the amount of detail it contains and the positive way in which it seeks to address the outstanding objections to this application, I would reiterate the request that I made just before the Christmas break:-

Will the Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee please defer consideration of this application to a later date:

- a) to allow you and your colleagues time to consider this new information;
- b) to allow you and the applicants time to engage further with OCC Highways following the extensive material included with its email of 20<sup>th</sup> December; and
- c) hopefully to allow time to resolve the outstanding issues such that the application can be brought back to a subsequent meeting of the Sub-Committee with a recommendation for approval.

Yours sincerely

