
APPLICATION NO.	P10/W1201/O
APPLICATION TYPE	Major
REGISTERED	16 August 2010
SITE	Land north of A4130
PROPOSAL:	Residential development of not more than 380 dwellings, a 60 bed extra care facility, a primary school and access - As amplified by additional information received 28 October 2010 on air quality, transport, housing land supply, addendum to flood risk assessment) and further addendum to FRA received 6 December 2010
APPLICATION NO.	P10/W1530
APPLICATION TYPE	Minor
REGISTERED	2010
SITE	Land to the west of Reading Road Winterbrook, Cholsey
PROPOSAL:	Pedestrian cycle link As amplified by additional information received: 22 November 2010 (Ecology and Arboriculture) 25 November 2010 (Levels) 26 November 2010 (Visual Impact assessment) 7 December 2010 (Flood Risk assessment)
PARISH	Cholsey
WARD MEMBER(S)	Cllr F Aska Cllr P Dawe
APPLICANT OFFICER	Berkeley Homes Ms C D Scotting

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Outline permission is sought for 380 dwellings and a 60 bed care home on land at Winterbrook. The site is within the parish of Cholsey but adjoins the market town of Wallingford. This site forms part of Site E, one of the preferred options considered for a strategic site allocation for Wallingford during the preparation of the Core Strategy. The other part of Site E is in the control of Wates and a separate application has been submitted for housing on this site (P10/W1589). A further application by Berkeley Homes has also been submitted for a pedestrian / cycle link from the principal site across the Wates land to the Reading Road (P10/W1530). Both the two Berkeley Homes applications are considered in this report and the Wates application for 98 dwellings is also on this agenda.

1.2 In view of the strategic importance of these proposals the Development Manager has decided that the application should be determined by the Planning Committee.

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 Site plans are attached. The site lies to the south of the built up area of Wallingford and west of Winterbrook, which is a linear settlement along the Reading Road. The site is bounded by the A4130 Wallingford bypass to the south. The Reading Road is situated some 190m east of the site and runs north from the A4130 White Cross roundabout leading into Wallingford town centre. The Chilterns AONB lies to the south and east and

the North Wessex Downs lies to the south and west.

- 2.2 The principal site is about 26 ha and the elevation of most of the site falls between about 46 and 48 m above Ordnance Datum (Newlyn) however there is a rise within the north west of the site to 49m. The site is divided east-west by Winterbrook Lane which crosses the site from the Reading Road in the east and exits onto the bypass at the west. Winterbrook Lane is an adopted highway without a footway serving 24 dwellings which then becomes a footpath after 220m. The site is currently in agricultural use. North of Winterbrook Lane the fields are used for pasture and to the south the land is ploughed for crops. The soils comprise Grade 2 and 3a under the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC). Bradford's Brook runs along the northern boundary of the sites and the areas along the banks are in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The site lies within an area of archaeological interest and two areas of national importance are situated in the area south of Winterbrook Lane.
- 2.3 Bradford's Brook forms the northern boundary of the site and abuts the rear gardens of residential properties in Brookmead Drive and Barley Close. The eastern boundary north of Winterbrook Lane abuts the land owned by Wates within lies a linear belt of hedgerow along the boundary. Further south the eastern boundary adjoins the rear gardens of properties in Winterbrook Lane, Wintergreen Lane, Brookfield Close and Wallingford Road, many of which have mature trees and vegetation along the boundary. The A4130 bypass forms the southern boundary and vegetation along the boundary partially screens the site. The Wallingford – Cholsey railway line runs alongside the western boundary of the site.
- 2.4 The proposed footpath link (P10/W1530) is situated in the northern part of the fields owned by Wates, also bounded by Bradfords Brook to the north. Reading Road is at the eastern most extremity and properties in Winterbrook, Reading Road back onto this land. To the north of Bradfords Brook is the Wallingford Community Hospital. A full description of the Wates site is set out in the report of P10/W1589.

3.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The principal application (P10/W1201/O) for outline permission proposes:

- 380 dwellings
- 60 bed care home
- Primary school
- Open space
- Play area

No information has been given on the amount of land devoted to each use.

- 3.2 The separate application (P10/W1530) would provide a pedestrian and cycle link emerging on to the Reading Road north of No 2 Winterbrook and south of the Bradfords Brook and community hospital. This land is controlled by Wates and the Council has received a letter (4 October 2010) stating that Berkeley Homes, Wates and the Ryman family have an agreement that will allow the delivery of this link. However the Council have not had sight of this agreement and do not know if the details are satisfactory to ensure the timely provision of this link. As it stands there is no evidence of a legal mechanism in place to secure the delivery of this path.
- 3.3 Access: Access to the principal site is from the A4130 bypass via an arm to be created from the existing A4130/Wallingford Road roundabout. A second access from Winterbrook Lane is shown leading on to the A4130 for emergency access and will be controlled by collapsible bollards. Pedestrian access to the Reading Road is gained via Winterbrook Lane.

- 3.4 Density and Mix: The application states that the proposed density would be 30dph. Although the application says that there will be a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings no breakdown of the mix has been provided. All of the extra care home dwellings would be affordable housing but no information has been provided on the amount and mix of general needs affordable housing.
- 3.5 Design and Layout: An illustrative layout is **attached**. At this outline stage the layout is indicative but certain parameters are provided. The extra care home and school are identified within the more central parts of the site. The overall built development is served by a series of circuitous roads many of which culminate in cul de sacs. Much of the parking is shown in rear parking courts. The internal layout of the site could allow for a possible link through in to the proposed Wates development however at this time there is no enforceable mechanism (i.e. a legal agreement) to secure this connection. A play area is identified on the western periphery of the site and except for the main access entering the site, the land to the south of Winterbrook Lane is open space. No details as to what this open space is to be used for are confirmed yet the applicants suggest, for example, a community orchard, allotments, ecology enhancements and the intention would be to engage with the public on how they wish the land to be used. The application proposes that development would be one and two stories high with a limited amount of two and a half and three storey buildings. The extra care home would be two storeys and the school one storey high.
- 3.6 A number of documents have been submitted in respect of drainage. Flood Risk Assessment Addendum No 4 now includes the creation of a number of infiltration basins and swales within the ecology buffer between the development and Bradford's Brook and an underground tank to deal with surface water. The precise details would be submitted at a detailed stage.
- 3.7 Additional information has been submitted with each application. This has been available on the website as soon as possible from date of receipt.
- 3.8 P10/W1201/O :The following information has been submitted with application:
- Application Drawings
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Environmental Statement
 - Planning Statement
 - Flood Risk Assessment
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment
 - Transport Assessment
 - Framework Travel Plan
 - Extra Care Travel Plan
 - Statement of Community Involvement
 - Sustainability Statement
- Further Information received 22 October 2010:*
- Letter from Kemp & Kemp dated 27 October 2010
 - Air Quality – Letter from Giffords dated 15 October 2010
 - Highways – Letter from Glanvilles dated 20 October 2010
 - FRA addendum – dated 22 October 2010
 - Housing Supply update Kemp & Kemp - Oct 2010
- Further Information received December 2010*
- FRA addendums dated 2 December and 9 December 2010

3.9 P10/W1530 :The following information has been submitted :

- Location and Site Plan drawings,
- Arboricultural report by Simon Jones September 2010
- Technical note by I Transport 28 September 2010
- Ecological impact Table (extract)

Further Information received (various dates):

- Arboricultural report by Simon Jones September 2010 Rev A received 22 November 2010
- Ecological Statement by Ecosulis dated 8 October 2010 received 22 November 2010
- Levels received 25 November 2010
- Visual Impact Table received 29 November 2010
- Flood Risk Assessment received 7 December 2010

4.0 **CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

4.1 Cholsey Parish Council - Object

- Site is not in Local Plan
- Access onto the Reading Road is not guaranteed
- Access via the bypass and Reading Road will lead to congestion
- Over development and out of character with Winterbrook and Wallingford area

On P10/W1530: Not in accordance with the Local Plan, is essentially part of P10/W1201/O and Parish have recommended refusal, exit onto Reading Road close to medical centre would be hazardous.

4.2 Wallingford Town Council – Object

- Application is premature in relation to the LDF, it is not in the interests of the long term planning of the town
- Loss of greenfield land and contrary to current Local Plan
- Assumes integration with Wates site, access through Wates land cannot be assumed
- Only vehicular access is via roundabout at end of Cholsey Road. Will result in most traffic entering town through Reading Road which is inadequate when viewed in conjunction with additional traffic from Fairmile Hospital and likely housing in Cholsey
- Development does not integrate with town and connectivity is poor. Even with the 'hints' of pedestrian access on to Reading Road and beside the railway to Hithercroft, it remains isolated. With positioning of main vehicular access will be outward looking towards Didcot, Reading
- Is a homogenous isolated estate on edge of settlement and not designed as a natural outward progression
- Unacceptable that Berkeley Homes are deciding on future of primary education
- The location of the school within the site is inappropriate, pupils will need to travel along Reading Road and likely that parents will resort to driving
- Particularly due to lack of connectivity the site is remote from most of the main services e.g. Wallingford School, Castle Leisure Centre, Shops etc
- Without LDF difficult for undertakers to commit to significant investment
- Maximum number of homes that can be accommodated in Wallingford is 350.

On P10/W1530: Application is premature, not in the long term planning interests of the town.

4.3 Neighbours:

P10/W1201/O:
Neighbour Object (189)
Neighbour Support (6)

P10/W1530:
Neighbour Object (100)

There are a few letters of support stating that we need more housing. The majority of representations are objecting to the development and the comments are summarised below. Full comments are available on the website. Comments relate to:

Overall Development:

Is speculative, is in advance of LDF, Core Strategy which should decide where development goes.

Disproportionate size of development in relation to town

Dormitory estate – not part of Wallingford

Not integrated with Wallingford

No reference to history of Wallingford

Destruction of greenfields

Need land for growing food

Negative effect on character of Winterbrook

Combined development of Fairmile, Wates and Berkeleys is a significant amount of development in this part of Wallingford.

Question need and viability of development

High density, 3 storey too high

Traffic / Access

Will increase amount of traffic

The only access will force cars onto the bypass and away from facilities in Wallingford.

Narrowing of Reading Road is unsuitable for buses

Reading Road not suitable for increase in cyclists, pedestrians

Increase in school children on dangerous road

Distance to town and facilities will encourage car

A link north to Brookmead Drive would bring danger to a quiet area.

No indication of combined traffic volumes (Wates and Berkeley sites)

No obvious bus stops, unlikely bus companies will route through this site.

Squires Walk is unlit, Reading Road has single width discontinuous pavements – safety concerns

Parking appears limited.

Access path onto Reading Road

Dangerous access onto Reading Road including mobility scooters

Too close to medical centre

Is part of larger development and unacceptable

Is a footpath to nowhere

Detail of works to road and pavement not clearly identified

No indication of responsibility of maintenance

Landscape / Trees

Felling of trees has affected character of Winterbrook

Unacceptable loss of landscape setting

Destroying attractive route into Wallingford

Independent landscape experts against Site E

Ecology /Wildlife

Detrimental to wildlife
Loss of pond
Road and access too close to nesting birds
Disturbance of habitat of a bird in decline

Flooding

Danger of flooding, loss of floodplain

Social issues

Health and safety concerns re proximity to brook
Antisocial behaviour on isolated footpath
Loss of security (path)

Infrastructure

Existing schools and facilities already stretched in Wallingford
School only part funded by developer, the rest will be borne by the taxpayer – likelihood of that happening?
A replacement school is contrary to the community's wishes
Pressure on existing facilities and services – health, police, schools etc

- 4.4 Amongst the above representations are submissions from local groups and organisations including “Save Winterbrook”, the Wallingford Sports Trust and the Medical Centre.

4.5 Highway Authority:

P10/W1201/O – Object and recommend refusal on grounds of sustainability. Presently this site does not integrate well with the surrounding area and does not provide suitable links to encourage walking and cycling. Residents also do not have access to a frequent bus service within 400 metres walking distance of their residential dwellings. This is likely to lead to encouraging more car dependency trips and therefore contrary to PPG13.

P10/W1530 – Object and recommend refusal - This cycle and pedestrian link is in isolation as it is not overlooked and is not secure or safe in pedestrian safety terms. The link is not lit and therefore is not likely to be used at certain times of the year. It is therefore likely to lead to an increase in car trips as opposed to encouraging trips by walking and cycling as laid down in PPG13.

4.6 Environment Agency

Require a condition for the detailed surface water drainage of the site. Consent from the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the Bradfords Brook, which is designated a ‘main river’.

Although at an outline stage and detailed design is yet to be considered, surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management (SUDS). Even if infiltration is not feasible, open SUDS in the form of swales and ponds can still be used to store and convey surface water, providing further biodiversity and water quality benefits.

4.7 Natural England

Re Landscape and visual impacts: Agree with the conclusions in the Environmental Statement. Low visual impact except a few glimpses from some higher ground. The Chilterns AONB appears unaffected by the visual impacts and while glimpses can be seen from the North Wessex Downs AONB impacts are minor. In order to minimise impacts on the surrounding landscape the LPA should secure:

- the retention of a large area of open land to the south east of the footpath on site
- retention of existing planting along the boundaries of the site
- tree and scrub planting along the eastern boundary of back gardens
- tree and scrub planting to reinforce existing vegetation along the northern boundary to Bradford's Brook

Also comment on green infrastructure, biodiversity, protected species and hydrology.

4.8 Thames Water

Suggest conditions in respect of foul drainage and water supply.

4.9 Thames Valley Police (Contributions)

Request contributions towards police infrastructure.

4.10 Thames Valley Police (Crime Prevention)

P10/W1201/O: No objection at this time but there are opportunities to reduce crime and promote community safety. Makes comments in respect of bollard lighting, cycleways, active surveillance, car parking and secure by design.

P10/W1530: The submitted application does not give any details of the environment surrounding the proposed link route. There is no opportunity for surveillance which will make it isolated and uninviting particularly during darkness making users feel vulnerable and raising their fear of crime. Isolated unobserved pathways can generate antisocial behaviour and provide routes for offenders to move unnoticed. I am not objecting but there are significant opportunities to design out crime and suggest conditions in respect of a wider width and lighting.

4.11 Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust

Due to the impact on Wallingford Health Centre request contribution to deal with increased capacity.

4.12 National Grid

No response

4.13 Scotland Gas Networks

A gas main crosses the site. No adverse comments.

4.14 Oxfordshire County Council

Object because it would be unsustainable in transport terms giving rise to a need to travel by private car without sufficient opportunity to enable and encourage travel by other means. This would be contrary to government policy guidance in PPS1 and PPG13 and Oxfordshire 2030 Sustainable Community Strategy and County Council Priorities of environment and climate change.

Should the District be minded to allow the development:

- (1) permission should be subject to a legal agreement to secure developer contributions to necessary transport, education and other non-transport supporting infrastructure, a Travel Plan together with appropriate conditions.
- (2) we would wish to work with the developer and South Oxfordshire District Council to ensure the best possible location for the new primary school.

4.15 County Archaeological Services

There are two areas of potentially nationally important archaeological deposits – these areas are not incorporated in the development and landscaping proposals in order to preserve these areas in situ. Evidence shows there are Iron Age and Roman settlements and there are Bronze Age beaker burials. The features identified in the northern part of site will need further investigation. Condition recommended.

4.16 CPRE -N J Moon (Rights of Way) – Object as the proposed development would swamp public footpath FP24 and destroy its recreational value.

4.17 Countryside Officer

Initial comments re compensation for farm breeding birds, surface water drainage and landscape management plan. In relation to further information: 1) I am pleased to see that they accept the need for compensation (impact on breeding farmland birds) and are prepared to offer a contribution towards off site mitigation for farmland birds. 2) I have some serious concerns about the potential impacts of this proposal (underground tanks) on the landscaping and functioning of this area as a landscape and ecology buffer to the brook. 3) The basic principles for a management plan including the type of planting, indicative species lists and management regimes is an appropriate document to request at outline stage. In relation to the revised drainage proposals, careful management will be required and a condition to ensure this is necessary.

4.18 Forestry Officer

Object: For such a large site there are few trees that would be considered a constraint to development. The open space provision is positive however there should be more green space within the development to provide a more open less dense feel. The current scheme fails to provide sufficient separation between trees and dwellings to allow growth. The dwellings directly against existing shelterbelts will be due north and shaded. The road will be within the root protection areas of existing trees in No 24 Wallingford Road – the revised information does not address this constraint to the development.

4.19 Monson

The additional information provided in the FRA addendum 4 is satisfactory to deal with the drainage on this site.

4.20 Housing – Acting Development and Regeneration Manager

Ongoing work with the county council on the future need for Extra Care Housing (ECH) schemes for older people across Oxfordshire has identified a need for 60 units of affordable ECH for Wallingford at the present time. If this site is considered suitable for inclusion of an ECH scheme then up to 60 of the flats could count towards the overall affordable housing obligation.

The location of any ECH scheme should be considered in terms of safe and easy access to facilities such as a health centre, shops and public transport. If an ECH scheme is included in this development then it will need to be located in a part of the site closest to paths and roads leading in to the town centre. Any footpaths included in the development to provide access to the main routes in to the town should be safe for residents of an ECH scheme to use, in terms of level access, and consideration should be given to lighting and personal safety.

Overall, 40% affordable housing will be sought across the whole site, in line with the council's policy H9, and should provide the a mix of property types and sizes where possible, depending on the proposed layout.

4.21 Health & Housing - Env. Protection Team

The air quality report submitted was dated July 2010, with the last contact from the applicant being quoted as being in July 2009. I would have expected the applicant to have included the most recent air quality data when making their assessment. The air quality data for the last three years clearly shows an increasing trend in measured NO2 pollution levels in Wallingford.

Agree with applicant that any development of this scale around Wallingford is going to have a detrimental impact on local air quality unless a large number of 'transport emission focussed' mitigation measures are implemented. In addition to the proposed measures the provision of footpaths, cycle routes and public transport links throughout the site should be maximised to provide alternate modes of travel for the future occupiers of the site and the broader population of Wallingford. I would also expect the applicant to deliver Wallingford and Cholsey cycle route to improve Wallingford's links to the main rail network to further encourage the use of green travel and other proposals through the Travel Plan plus contributions for air quality monitoring and modelling.

4.22 Waste Management Officer

Comments regarding collection points and access.

5.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

5.1 P09/W0489: Demolition of 10 Winterbrook, and development of land to the west so as to accommodate 106 dwellings together with associated new access and landscaping works. Applicant: Wates. Planning Permission was refused and the Appeal dismissed 31 March 2010.

5.2 In summary, the appeal inspector found the scheme unacceptable on the basis of:

- (i) unsatisfactory pedestrian and cycle links which would encourage residents to undertake the majority of their journeys by car (para 35);
- (ii) the proposed access (through 10 Winterbrook) would damage the linear nature and sense of enclosure that is a prime component of the character and appearance of this part of Reading Road (para 42);
- (iii) the proposed pedestrian access onto Winterbrook Lane would affect the character of the lane and the increase in pedestrians would cause a

- (iv) diminution in the quiet nature of the lane (para 45); and the new road junction works would intrude into the street scene and unacceptably diminish the setting of listed buildings Winterbrook House and, to a lesser but still significant degree, Winterbrook Lodge (para 55).

5.3 The appeal inspector did not agree with the Council that the development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the landscape and found that the development (on the Wates site) would create a strong edge to the settlement, if needed. Although agreed by all parties, the inspector was also of the view that the contributions requested for various schemes under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act did not properly satisfy the tests in Circular 05/2005 (para 59).

5.4 P08/W0038: Erection of 10 flats at 2 Winterbrook – refused.

5.5 In the 1960's and 70's a series of applications for residential development on land forming part of Site E were refused.

6.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

6.1 The Development Plan consists of the South East Regional Spatial Strategy 'the South East Plan' and the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan and saved policies. The emerging Core Strategy published on 3 December is also relevant to the policy considerations.

6.2 South East Plan

Policies: SP1 (co-ordinated planning in the sub regions), SP3 (urban focus), CC1, CC2 (climate change), CC7 (infrastructure and implementation), H1, H3, H4 (type and size of new housing), C5 (rural urban fringe), C6 (countryside access and rights of way), S6 (Community Infrastructure), BE1 (management for an urban renaissance), BE4 (role of small rural towns), CO1 (Central Oxfordshire Core Strategy) and CO3 (scale and distribution of housing).

NRM1 (Sustainable water resources), NRM2 (water quality), NRM5 (conservation and improvement of biodiversity), NRM9 (air quality), NRM10 (noise).

6.3 National Planning Policy Documents:

- PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development
- PPS 3 Housing
- PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment
- PPS 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
- PPS 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- PPS 12 Local Spatial Planning
- PPG 13 Transport
- PPG 17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- PPS23 Planning & Pollution Control
- PPS24 Planning and Noise
- PPS 25 Flooding

6.4 Adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan and saved policies.

The South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP) was adopted January 2006 and covers a 5 year period up until 2011. Policies have been saved and include:

- General: G1, G2, G3, G4, G5, G6
- Protecting Natural and Built Environment: C1, C2, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9
- Historic Environment: CON5, CON12, CON13

- Environmental Protection: EP1, EP2, EP3, EP6, EP7
- Encouraging sustainable and high quality development: D1, D2, D3, D4, D6, D7, D8, D10, D11, D12
- Housing: H2, H4, H6, H7, H8, H9
- Recreation: R1, R2, R3, R6, R7, R8
- Transport: T1, T2

6.5 Proposed Submission Core Strategy

On 3 December 2010 the South Oxfordshire Proposed Submission Core Strategy was published in accordance with Regulation 27 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). It is scheduled for submission to the Secretary of State before the end of March 2011 and it is expected that the examination of the document will be held over the summer (2011). Guidance on the weight to be attached to emerging core strategies is given at paragraph 18 of 'The Planning System: General Principles' (2005). Now that the Proposed Submission Core Strategy has been published it carries more weight than it did before. However, publication may elicit representations that the document is not sound and if so then it is possible some of these representations may not be finally dealt with until the Planning Inspector reports on the findings of their examination of the core strategy. The Proposed Submission Core Strategy is therefore not of overriding weight and care must be exercised in its application to issues where the Local Plan would lead to a different conclusion, especially if the relevant part of the core strategy is subject to representations that it is unsound. This not the case with the current application which is contrary to the provisions of the Local Plan and the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. The overall picture of representations received to the Regulation 27 consultation is unknown as the consultation is currently open and will close on 21 January 2011.

- 6.6 The Council's Proposed Submission Core Strategy carries forward the housing figures contained within the South East Plan. To comply with government guidance of ensuring at least a 15 year supply of housing from adoption of the core strategy, the Council need to plan for housing to 2027. There is therefore a need to plan for 10,940 houses to 2026 plus an additional 547 dwellings for the period 2026 to 2027, making a total of 11,487 dwellings.
- 6.7 To meet the need for the new housing identified in the SEP the Proposed Submission Core Strategy allocates strategic sites for development and is also relying on some unallocated sites coming forward to meet the overall SEP number. The Proposed Submission Core Strategy removes the Central Oxfordshire sub-region and divides the District into two compartments, namely Didcot and the Rest of the District. The housing figure for the Rest of the District is derived by adding together the housing figures for Central Oxfordshire and the Remainder of the District, as contained in the South East Plan.
- 6.8 The Proposed Submission Core Strategy allocates a strategic site in Wallingford (Policy CSWAL2) at Slade End Farm also known as Site B. The process of identifying a site for Wallingford has been long and thorough and housing numbers required have altered over time. At the Issues and Options stage in November 2007 views on five possible directions for growth (for 1300 dwellings) were invited (A, B, C, D and E). Following this at the Preferred Options stage in March 2009 views were sought on two preferred options (B and E for 850 dwellings). A further consultation in January 2010, specifically on Wallingford, added a further preferred option (A) for 750 dwellings. In a further consultation in October 2010 the Council altered the numbers to allocate and redistributed the SEP growth based on proportional growth (of settlements) and included some unallocated sites in the future housing supply. Following this the preferred sites in Wallingford were re appraised for a lower number of 400 dwellings.

6.9 The reason for preferring Site B in the Proposed Submission Core Strategy is set out in the Background Paper on Wallingford:
<http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/evidence-studies/>.

In summary the reasons are:

- The landscape is less sensitive
- The site is in one ownership
- The site has more has more pedestrian and cycle links to existing areas
- The site has closer access to a greater range of services and facilities including the secondary school, allotments, sports facilities and employment areas

It is acknowledged that Site E is closer to the town centre but the links are not as favourable as Site B.

6.10 Other Material Considerations:

- Localism Bill December 2010
- Proposed CIL Regulations
- 'The Planning System: General Principles' (2005)
- Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations
- Circular 01/ 2006
- Chief Planning Officer Letters (various)
- Manual for Streets (2010)
- Better Places to Live by Design: Companion guide to PPG3 (2001)
- By Design: Urban Design in the Planning System - Towards Better Practice (2000)
- Annual Monitoring Report 2010
- SODC 5 year Land Supply April 2010
- SODC Interim Assessment 5 Year Land Supply December 2010
- South Oxfordshire Housing Needs Assessment 2008

7.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The key issues to determine are :

- i. Is there an in principle objection to the development of this site?
- ii. Are the transport and highway proposals acceptable?
- iii. Is the development satisfactory in relation to other environmental considerations (landscape, drainage, ecology, archaeology, air quality)?
- iv. Are the layout and design are acceptable?
- v. Does the proposal make adequate provision for an appropriate mix and include affordable housing to meet housing needs?
- vi. Does the proposal make adequate provision for the necessary infrastructure facilities and services to meet the needs of the development ?

i. Is there an in principle objection to the development of this site?

7.2 The proposed site is not an allocated site (Policy H2 SOLP). It is not within the built up limits of Wallingford and the proposal does not constitute infill development. Both the size and location of the site are such that they do not meet the requirements of Policy H5. Policies G4 and H6 state that planning permission will not be granted for development in the countryside or on the edge of settlements where the built up area of the settlement would be extended. Policy C4 also aims to protect the landscape setting of settlements. Development of this site is contrary to the saved policies of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

7.3 Both the Wates and Berkeley Homes applications propose development beyond the built-up area of Wallingford and are therefore contrary to policy H6 of the Local Plan. The applications are also in conflict with the Proposed Submission Core Strategy as the strategy does not allocate any of this land (in Site E) for development. The consistent line between the Local Plan and the Proposed Submission Core Strategy therefore gives weight to the core strategy and there is an in principle objection to the development of the site.

Housing supply

7.4 In accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 71 the Council must also consider the position in respect of a 5 year housing supply and whether development might then be justified, in principle, on the basis that there is insufficient housing supply. With the advancement of the Core Strategy to publication the Council has updated the five year supply of land for housing in the 'Interim Assessment of the 5 year supply of Deliverable Sites for Housing in South Oxfordshire December 2010'. The calculation uses the same figures as the published 5 Year Supply Assessment 2009/2010 dated April 2010 except that it now includes the supply of strategic sites in the Proposed Submission Core Strategy.

7.5 In assessing housing land supply we have divided the district into two compartments: Didcot and the Rest of the District. This division or 'ringfencing' has been contested on two earlier planning applications that have been considered at appeal¹. The different Inspectors each took a different approach to this question and the Council has raised this inconsistency of approach with the Planning Inspectorate. The reply from the Planning Inspectorate is **attached** at Appendix 1, and supports the Council's 'ring fencing' of Didcot.

7.6 In April 2010 the Council's housing supply was:

Table 1: 5 yr Housing Supply - summary of requirement against supply April 2009 to March 2010 (April 2010)

	5 year requirement	5 year projected supply	Surplus / shortfall
Didcot	1833	1192	- 641
Rest of Central Ox	583	511	-72
Total for Central Ox	2416	1703	- 713
Remainder of district	652	584	- 68
Total	3068	2287	- 781

7.7 The Interim Assessment (December 2010) which factors in the core strategy sites shows the following updated housing land supply:

Table 2 Interim Assessment: Summary of requirement against supply, April 2010 to March 2011(December 2010)

¹ 1) Benson Lane by Hallam Land and Bloor Homes - Ref: P09/W0201/O – APP/Q3115/A/09/2107586 dated 2 December 2009 and 2) Winterbrook by Wates - Ref: P09/W0489 – APP/ Q3115/A/092113256 dated 31 March 2010.

	5 year requirement	Supply including Core Strategy projected supply	Surplus / shortfall
Didcot	1813	1242	- 571
Rest of district	1235	1405	170
Total	3048	2647	- 401

7.8 On this basis and at the current time there is a more than five years supply of land for housing in the District, outside of Didcot. As the Council does not consider there is a housing shortfall the advice in paragraph 71 of PPS3 does not need to be followed.

Predetermination

7.9 Also of significance is the guidance at paragraph 17 of 'The Planning System: General Principles' (2005). This identifies those circumstances where it may be justifiable to refuse planning permission on grounds of prematurity. It advises that this may be appropriate where a proposed development is so substantial, or the cumulative effect would be so significant, that granting planning permission could prejudice the Development Plan Document (DPD) by predetermining decisions about the scale and location of new development which are being addressed in a policy in the DPD. Either application (Berkeley's or Wates) on its own would predetermine the outcome of the core strategy DPD. This is because either site on its own would provide for so many dwellings that it would give rise to the need to reassess the level of development to be allocated to the strategic site for Wallingford, as identified in the core strategy DPD.

7.10 Development on the site(s) would therefore predetermine the decision about where and how future housing growth should be accommodated in the town. Both schemes taken together would not only predetermine the location but also, at 478 houses plus a 60 bed care home, the scale of development to be accommodated on land beyond the built-up limits of the town. Both schemes should be refused planning permission on prematurity grounds because they would both cumulatively and individually predetermine decisions about the scale and location of new development, decisions which should form part of the considered outcome of the core strategy DPD.

7.11 There is an in principle objection to the development on the grounds that it is contrary to the adopted Local Plan and the emerging Core Strategy. There is no housing shortfall outside of Didcot and therefore no requirement to consider favourably sites which are contrary to policy. Allowing this development would predetermine the outcome of the core strategy.

ii. Are the transport and highway proposals acceptable?

7.12 National advice ² states that the success or the failure of a new development depends significantly on how it connects to existing areas, especially in terms of access to local services. The quality of the development will depend upon the integration of the new development into existing routes and the provision of maximum choice in how people make their journeys. Walkable neighbourhoods are promoted to enhance the vibrancy of the community and reduce the reliance on motor transport. New development should create the right conditions to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport and pedestrian routes should be accommodated on multifunctional streets, or be well overlooked.

Vehicular Access:

² By Design: Better Places to Live, Manual for Streets and PPG 13

- 7.13 The single vehicular access is proposed from the A4130 Wallingford bypass. It is acceptable in highway safety terms. The access has sufficient capacity such that it will not have materially harmful impact on the wider highway network in and around the Wallingford area. Visibility is considered acceptable for cars exiting the development on to the roundabout but will require cutting back the hedge to provide for the required visibility splay. The splay required and therefore the amount of cutting will depend on further evidence concerning approach speeds.
- 7.14 Apart from the emergency access onto the bypass from Winterbrook Lane footway, there is only the one vehicular access proposed. Even if the site could be accessed via the Wates development, the highway authority considers that this should only be for buses. The highway authority considers that there should only be a limited increase of movements onto the Reading Road.

Public Transport:

- 7.15 To access existing bus services serving the Reading Road residents will need to walk along Winterbrook Lane. On the basis of the indicative layout the walking distances will vary between 300 and 900 metres. The proposed footway or development of the Wates site would allow an alternative route which would reduce walking distances – however as these developments are not integral to the Berkeleys scheme these options cannot be guaranteed. Notwithstanding this, were a route to be achieved through the Wates site a significant number of dwellings would still remain over 400 metres away, which is the maximum recommended distance for walking to bus stops (PPG13).
- 7.16 At present, the County Council does not consider that a commercially viable public transport service could be provided into the site. The site could be served via a loop (from the bypass roundabout and looping back) and it is understood that this option is not attractive to bus operators. An alternative route via the Wates site could be provided, but again this is not within the power of the applicant to deliver. In addition the Wates development is a full planning application with a fixed layout. The route through the Wates site is not easily navigable and direct for buses to connect with the Berkeleys site and this is evidence that the segregated planning of the two (Berkeley and Wates) sites is leading to difficulties in achieving an integral and well designed development.
- 7.17 Notwithstanding the difficulty of physical routes into the site, there is no confirmation that a service into the site would be commercially viable to a bus operator. Discussions indicate that an hourly service could be provided but even to provide this, a huge subsidy (payable by the developer) would be required to start up the service. If it is not viable after 5 years it is likely the service would cease. An hourly service is not considered frequent enough to support sustainable travel and the lack of certainty over viability will not promote long term sustainable travel.
- 7.18 The distance from homes to the existing bus service and the unlikelihood of a frequent and long term bus service into the site mean that the development will not be well served by public transport and will not promote sustainable travel. This contrary to planning policy including PPS1, PPS3 and PPG13 and SOLP policies T1 and D1.

Pedestrian and cycle connections

- 7.19 The principal application (P10/W1201/O) provides only one pedestrian / cycle route into the site from Winterbrook Lane. This lone link is unacceptable as residents would have a tortuous walking route into town. The Reading Road footways are of limited width and are discontinuous along either side of the carriageway. The Reading Road is an important route into and out of Wallingford. This route will be used not only by the increased number of residents on the development but also existing residents going to

the site which could be considerable given the proposed re-location of the primary school. Winterbrook Lane is further south and further away from the town centre than the access previously proposed (in the former Wates scheme) and this was found to be unacceptable in terms of connectivity and permeability and access to the towns' facilities and services. The only other route is from the bypass which would assist with links to Cholsey but not to Wallingford, where the closest facilities are.

- 7.20 The route proposed under application P10/W1530 does link the site with the Reading Road across the Wates land. At the point of egress on to the Reading Road there is no footway north or south on this side of the road. Whilst Berkeley Homes have indicated a willingness to provide improvements to the footway on the Reading Road, no detailed designs have been submitted. (The provision of a footway at this point on the Reading Road is proposed in the Wates scheme). Whilst the delivery of this link path is not guaranteed it is also unacceptable on grounds of design. The 230m path will travel over an open field which is isolated and not overlooked from dwellings. It will not provide a safe, secure and attractive route for residents and for schoolchildren coming to the site. Lighting would not overcome the isolated and insecure nature of the path and could bring further issues in relation to landscape and effects on ecology. This link will not be safe or useful and as such it will encourage car based travel.
- 7.21 A route provided through the Wates site, were the Wates site developed for housing would be a different prospect. The housing on this land would overlook the path and the link, entering the Reading Road at the northern most point possible would assist with access to facilities and services. There are concerns over this access in relation to the character of the area and this is covered in the report (P10/W1589). However even if the Wates development were to go ahead and the route was provided before development on the Berkeleys site, the development is still unacceptable on the grounds of inadequate connections and links to existing areas and services, explained below.
- 7.22 The development will involve the re-location of St John's School onto the Berkeleys site. The existing St John's school has a high proportion of pupils (over 86%) who walk to school. The proposed walking distance from the existing school to the proposed school is 1100 m (through the Wates site via Squires Walk) or 1600m (via Winterbrook Lane and Squires Walk) and for the majority of pupils this will be an additional distance to their route. Many of the representations received highlight the inconvenience and potential danger for schoolchildren who will have an increased walk and have to negotiate the main road. Very few primary school pupils travel unaccompanied to school and with the increased distance and perceived safety issues this will deter a significant amount of school journeys being made by foot or cycle and increase the amount of journeys to school by car.
- 7.23 Although the site is physically close to the existing residential areas to the north and the distances are not far, as the crow flies, to other key facilities in Wallingford e.g. Kinecroft Recreation Ground, Hithercroft Industrial Estate and Hithercroft Sports Ground, the actual walking distances are considerably longer as residents will have to walk via the Reading Road (or Squires Walk). An appropriate pedestrian / cycle connection(s) across the brook to the north would integrate the new development into existing routes and would make more attractive journeys by foot or cycle. The applicants have indicated that such a route could be provided but have been unwilling to commit to this or identify the link.
- 7.24 An additional pedestrian / cycle link(s) to the north across Bradfords Brook is considered necessary to provide an adequate choice in how people make journeys, reduce reliance on the car, integrate the development with existing areas and

communities and to enhance the activity and vibrancy of the locality. Without at least one further link to the north (in addition to two links, via Winterbrook Lane and another practical link to the Reading Road further north) this site will be secluded, relatively inaccessible and isolated from other areas in Wallingford. Getting good connections is a fundamental requirement of sustainable design and from this perspective this application is unacceptable.

- 7.25 The Berkeleys development has only very limited and unsatisfactory connections to existing areas. The paucity of pedestrian and cycle links and limited access to public transport is unsustainable in transport terms as it will give rise to a need to travel by private car without sufficient opportunity to enable and encourage travel by other means. This lack of opportunity for means other than the private car and the unsuitability of walking connections to other areas will also hamper the vibrancy and establishment of a community within the development and impede integration with other existing communities. The development is unsustainable and contrary to PPS1, PPS3, PPG1 and SOLP policies T1, D1 and D6.

iii. Is the development satisfactory in relation to other environmental considerations?

Landscape

- 7.26 The appeal inspector on the previous Wates scheme considered the open area of the site to be pleasant urban fringe. He concluded that the development proposed on the Wates site would satisfactorily relate to the larger context of the built form of Wallingford and Winterbrook as a whole and that there would be no deleterious effect on character and appearance of the area from the west. The Berkeley Homes development incorporates a far larger area of land than the Wates development and extends further west to the bypass raising a more significant impact on the landscape than the Wates development alone. The Inspectors comments do not apply to this larger site.
- 7.27 This part of Winterbrook is considered to provide an attractive setting to the landscape character of the edge of Wallingford. The significant trees and hedges along the boundary of the bypass and within the site along Winterbrook Lane and along the east and northern boundaries all contribute to the character. In particular the land south of Winterbrook Lane is important to the countryside setting of Winterbrook and Wallingford, as recognised by Natural England. This area of land allows the countryside to 'flow into' the edge of Wallingford and helps to define the integrity of Wallingford and Winterbrook.
- 7.28 Although the layout shows this southern part of the site is shown to be kept open the major vehicular access into the site crosses this parcel. This significant infrastructure plus the movements and lighting will intrude into this area harming the landscape setting of Winterbrook and Wallingford. The impact could be reduced by moving the main vehicular access further west along the bypass, so that the road could sit more within the built form. However the highway authority has previously advised against an access at this location due to the inadequate distance that would remain between the White Cross roundabout and the new roundabout.

Drainage

- 7.29 The principal application is in outline and detailed proposals for drainage are not required at this stage. However the Council needs to be satisfied that the development is acceptable in relation to flooding risk and also needs to know there is sufficient land to deal with drainage in terms of the overall design and layout. Parts of the site in proximity to Bradford's Brook are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Over most of the site Zone A, (mainly Flood Zone 1) surface water would infiltrate to the ground however in Zone B (mainly Flood Zones 2 and 3) there is not the capacity to accept infiltration due

to high groundwater levels. Addendums to the FRA have suggested possible solutions e.g. storage tanks below the path and open attenuation, e.g. swales. There is now no objection to the drainage strategy on the basis that the proposals can fit within the suggested land use zones.

- 7.30 The proposed footway /cycle link also has land within Flood Zones 2 and 3. No adverse comments in relation to this application have been received.

Ecology

- 7.31 The drainage proposals will have consequences for the ecology of the site. A sustainable design with open attenuation could provide enhanced habitat whereas an underground tank could negatively impact on the ability to plant trees and vegetation and undermine ecology proposals. The latest addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment addresses the concerns in respect of ecology and planting and is now considered acceptable. The applicants have agreed to fund mitigation for nesting birds and this would need to be covered by legal agreement. Proposals for the future maintenance and management of the open space would also be required.

Archaeology

- 7.32 The proposed site is located in an area of known archaeological interest – evaluation on this and adjacent sites have found evidence of Iron Age and Roman settlements and Bronze Age burials. Two areas of potentially nationally important archaeological deposits on the southern side of Winterbrook Lane have been excluded from built development and formal landscaping. Their presence is a significant constraint to developing the site and in accordance with PPS5 these areas should remain in situ. There are features on the northern part of the site that will need further investigation and mitigation that could be secured by condition.

Air Quality

- 7.33 It is recognised that development in this location will negatively impact upon the Wallingford Air Quality Management Area and the Lamb Garage crossroads is a key problem area, however this will be the case regardless of where housing is developed in Wallingford. It is therefore particularly important that the provision of footpaths, cycle routes and public transport links throughout the site are provided for alternate modes of travel. The lack of good connections will encourage car based travel. Other proposals to reduce emissions should also be achieved through the Travel Plan and infrastructure e.g. welcome packs re public transport etc, electric car charging points. Monies are also required towards air quality monitoring and modelling.

iv Is the layout and design acceptable?

- 7.34 Although this is an outline application with only access to be determined at this stage, national regulations³ require that sufficient information must be submitted for consideration at the outline stage. Circular 01/2006 states that the following information should be submitted:
- Use – the use or uses proposed for the development and any distinct development zones within the site identified.
 - Amount of development – the amount of development proposed for each use. Indicative layout – an indicative layout with separate development zones proposed within the site boundary where appropriate.
 - Scale parameters – an indication of the upper and lower limits for height, width and length of each building within the site boundary.

³ The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure Order) 1995 (as amended) and Circular 01 2006 'Guidance on Development Control Changes to the Planning System

- Indicative access points – an area or areas in which the access point or points to the site will be situated.

Although the layout is indicative the significant constraints and broad land use zones must be identified at this stage.

- 7.35 The layout shown on the accompanying plans is indicative but there are strategic constraints to the overall development, as identified above (e.g. archaeology deposits, buffer to Bradford Brook, maintaining an attractive setting to Wallingford). Although these constraints are acknowledged, in part, a quality design and layout is being hampered by the piecemeal approach to the development of Site E and the uncertainty over proposed connections.
- 7.36 Crucially the routes within the site are convoluted, not permeable and do not link well to the limited existing routes. Many of the footways and cycleways are not overlooked and are in many places obscured by proposed planting, mitigating against a safe travel environment. The segregated cycleway / footway (adjacent to the main access) secluded by planting is also unsatisfactory from the point of security.
- 7.37 The scheme does incorporate existing screening and proposes to keep open the southern part of the site and use as open space. Within the layout, the school has been located so that the school field can assist in maintaining a landscape margin to the existing Winterbrook properties. These proposals are important strategically for the landscape setting but the proposed form of the development is creating other problems. The intrusion of the main access to the landscape setting is discussed above under Landscape. The proposed access is also unacceptable as it encroaches in to the root protection areas (RPAs) of existing, off-site trees. The forestry officer has also advised that within the built up area there is insufficient space given over to create areas of substantial tree planting. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of built development with both existing and proposed vegetation belts is raising concerns in respect of shade, and surveillance and security.
- 7.38 No firm proposals have been set out for the open area to the south of Winterbrook Lane. Formal recreation is unlikely to be appropriate due to the site's segregation from existing sports facilities and the archaeology deposits. Whilst it could be used informally and provide an asset to the town the space is compromised by the major access into the site. The play area is shown on the western periphery of the site, and not placed along walking routes which is recommended in design guidance. The extra care home is situated in a part of the site that is not well placed to access other facilities and services by foot. The optimum locations for any facilities are restricted by the lack of integral and comprehensive planning on both sites making up Site E.
- 7.39 Some of the issues identified above can be overcome with an amended layout which the applicants have expressed a wish to submit. However the more fundamental problems lie in the unsustainability of the site due to its poor connections and the detrimental impact on the landscape setting.

v Does the proposal make adequate provision for a different mix and affordable housing?

- 7.40 The developers have not confirmed the mix of housing (bedroom sizes) or the percentage and mix of affordable housing. It is proposed that the extra care home would all be affordable housing (60 units). The Council's housing officer has confirmed that there is a need for one extra care facility in Wallingford. It is agreed that this facility can represent part of the overall proportion of affordable housing (rather than the extra care development be 40% affordable / 60% market). The percentage of affordable

dwellings sought in accordance with the Council's policies is 40% and the general needs affordable housing required is therefore 116 dwellings. No confirmation of this or the tenure and bedroom mix has been given to the Council.

- 7.41 The developers have not provided a detailed mix of dwellings (bedroom numbers) for the development although they have stated that a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings would be provided and have not included any 1 bedroom properties. The Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) highlights the need for small dwellings (60% 1 and 2 bed) and whilst on a development of this size it might not be appropriate to have such a large proportion of smaller units (as the HNA) there would still need to be a fair proportion. A variation could be considered to ensure the needs of a wider spectrum of people can be met and a more balanced community can thrive. Despite requests for information the mix has not been provided and the Council do not know if housing needs could be met.
- 7.42 As the mix has not been identified and there is no agreement to secure affordable housing the development is unacceptable on both these grounds. A satisfactory agreement to provide affordable housing and a condition ensuring an appropriate mix on the site would overcome these reasons.

Vi Does the proposal make adequate provision for the necessary infrastructure facilities and services to meet the needs of the development?

- 7.43 The development will impact upon existing services and infrastructure. In line with Circular 2005/05 the Council will seek provision towards the items listed below in relation to new development. These matters have not been discussed in detail with the applicants but they are aware that provision would be necessary.
- 7.44 District:
Street naming
Air Quality Monitoring
Ecology Mitigation
Waste / Recycling collection
Community facilities
Sport and recreation facilities
Health
Police
Indexation
Administration and Monitoring
Bond
- 7.45 OCC
Highways and Transport incl rights of way
Education
Library
Waste management
County museum resource centre
Social and Health Care
Youth
Fire and rescue
Admin
Indexation
Bond

8.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 The proposed development for 380 dwellings and a 60 bed care home is on land outside the built up area of Wallingford and in the open countryside. The site is not allocated for development in the adopted Local Plan and neither does it form a strategic site allocation in the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. In this part of the District there is not a shortfall in housing supply and there is no need to consider additional sites for housing. This development, due to its location and scale would pre determine the proper consideration of the Core Strategy. The development is contrary to PPS1, the saved policies of the adopted Local Plan (G4, C4, H6) and the emerging Core Strategy.
- 8.2 Furthermore the site is unsustainable in that it does not provide sufficient walking connections to existing areas and facilities. Public transport is not easily accessible and residents would not be enabled or encouraged to use transport other than the private car. The proposed link to Reading Road (P10/W1530) is not a safe, secure or attractive route for travel and its delivery cannot be guaranteed. The development is also contrary to PPS1, PPS3, PPG13 and Local Plan policies D1, D6 and T1.
- 8.3 The form of the proposed development, including the main access with street lighting, will intrude into an important open part of the site, vital for maintaining an attractive landscape setting for Wallingford. The development is contrary to Policies G2, C4, D1 and EP3 of the Local Plan and PPS1, PPS3, PPS7. In addition the proposed layout and design, although illustrative, does not demonstrate that a comprehensively planned and that a high quality design can be achieved.
- 8.4 The application does not specify the mix of housing nor does it provide for affordable housing. Neither is there an agreement to secure provision for the needs of local services and infrastructure generated by the housing.
- 8.5 The proposed pedestrian/ cycle link (P10/W1530) is not a safe or secure route to and from the site. It will therefore not provide adequate accessibility and connections to and from the site and existing areas and will encourage car based travel. Furthermore there is no mechanism in place to guarantee the delivery of this path.
- 8.6 The applications are unacceptable for the reasons set out below.

9.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

9.1 **That application P10/W1201/O be refused for the following reasons:**

1. **That the proposed development is contrary to the policies of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan. This development for 380 dwellings, a 60 bed extra care home, a school and associated infrastructure is on land outside of the built up area of Wallingford and in the open countryside. The site is not allocated for development (H2) and it is not infill development (H5). The development would undesirably extend into and encroach upon open countryside and detrimentally affect the landscape setting of Winterbrook and Wallingford, contrary to policies G4, H6 and C4.**
2. **Development of this site is not the preferred option for growth identified in the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. There is no housing shortfall in the district outside the Didcot area and there is no need to bring forward additional sites for development. Development of this site would predetermine decisions about the location and scale of new development and would therefore undermine the Proposed Submission Core Strategy and Local Development Framework which should determine the location and scale of new development. The proposal is contrary to the strategic objectives of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, the Council's Proposed Submission Core Strategy, and South East Plan policies SP3 and BE1,**

C01, and C03 which focus growth at Didcot, and is contrary to the advice in PPS1, PPS3 and PPS12.

- 3. That the development is unsustainable in that it does not provide good vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connections to and from existing areas and local services in Wallingford. The footway/cycle path proposed under application P10/W1530 is isolated and not overlooked by habitable properties and will not provide a safe, secure and attractive route for residents and schoolchildren. There are inadequate vehicular and pedestrian links to existing areas and facilities in Wallingford which will encourage car based travel and undermine the sustainability and vibrancy of the development and the integration of new and existing communities. The proposal is contrary to PPS1, PPS 3, PPG13 and South Oxfordshire Local Plan Policies D1, D6, and T1.**
- 4. That the development is unsustainable as residents would not have a frequent bus service within reasonable distance of their homes. It does not provide walking access to public transport and will not promote sustainable travel. The development is therefore contrary to PPS1, PPS3, PPG13 and Policy T1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.**
- 5. That the form of the proposed development of this site includes the main site access with street lighting through an open area important for the setting of Wallingford. This major access will intrude into the open space and will not result in a satisfactory visual edge to the development. This will not provide an adequate landscape transition between the proposed development and the open countryside to the south. As a result an attractive landscape setting for Wallingford will not be maintained, which will harm the distinctive character and appearance of the area. The proposals will be contrary to policies G2, G4, C4, D1 and EP3 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, and Government advice set out in PPS1, PPS3, and PPS7.**
- 6. The illustrative layout and design proposed does not:
 - i. demonstrate a integrally planned and comprehensive layout that is sustainable in relation to the location and accessibility of facilities;**
 - ii. indicate that the amount of development proposed can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site in a high quality design;**
 - iii. ensure that routes into and within the site promote sustainable and safe travel, legibility and permeability**
 - iv. ensure that there is adequate and sufficient space to achieve a high quality landscaping scheme and mature tree planting within the built environment;**
 - v. ensure the protection of existing trees that contribute to the landscape character of the area;**The development is therefore contrary to guidance PPS1, PPS3, PPG13 and Policies G6, D1, D6, C1 and C9 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.**
- 7. That the proposal fails meet the needs for improved local services and infrastructure generated by the additional housing. The development would therefore have a detrimental impact on existing services and infrastructure contrary to PPS12, Policy CC7 of the South East Plan and Policies C6, R2, R3, R6, D11, D12 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.**

8. **That the proposal fails to demonstrate that an appropriate mix of housing will be provided. The development will therefore not address the housing needs of the District identified in the South Oxfordshire Housing Needs Assessment.**
9. **That the proposal fails to provide affordable housing in accordance with PPS3, Policy H3 of the SEP and Policy H9 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.**

NB Reasons 7 and 9 could be overcome with the completion of an appropriate agreement. Reason 8 could be overcome with the agreement to an appropriate condition.

9.2 **That application P10/W1530 be refused for the following reason:**

1. **The proposed footway / cycle path is isolated and not overlooked by habitable properties. The route will not therefore provide a safe, secure and attractive route for residents and schoolchildren. It will therefore not provide adequate accessibility and connections to and from the site and existing areas and will encourage car based travel. The proposal is contrary to PPG13, PPS3 and South Oxfordshire Local Plan policies T1 and D6.**

Author: Cathie Scotting
Contact No: 01491 823757
Email: planning.west@southoxon.gov.uk