

Site Address: Land And Former Buildings UH11 442 465 466 467 468 470 471 481 492 493 529 593 596 Dow Street, Upper Heyford

Ref: 13/01811/OUT

Ward: The Astons and Heyfords

District Councillors: Councillor Mike Kerford-Byrnes
and Councillor James Macnamara

Case Officer: Andrew Lewis

Recommendation: Approval

Applicant: Paragon Fleet Solutions

Application Description: OUTLINE - Up to 60 dwellings and public open space with associated works

Committee Referral: Major

1. Site Description and Proposed Development

Background and Planning History

- 1.1 The application site for this proposal covers part of the former RAF/USAF Upper Heyford base its military use having ceased in 1994. It is identified on the appended site plan and measures approximately 2.81 hectares in size, the Heyford base being approximately 505 hectares in total. In terms of the uses on site, since its military use ceased it has effectively functioned as a self-contained settlement under the ownership first of the North Oxfordshire Consortium and for the last four years by the current applicants, the Dorchester Group. In that period the base has created approximately 1,000 jobs and homes for around 750 residents.
- 1.2 The base was designated a conservation area in 2006, its primary architectural and social historic interest being its role during the Cold War. The nature of the site is defined by the historic landscape character of the distinct zones within the base. The designation also acknowledges the special architectural interest, and as a conservation area, the character of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance and provides the context and framework to ensure the setting and appearance of sections of the Cold War landscape are preserved. This application is within Area 10B- the RAF Domestic and Residential Section which is described in the appraisal as:

The 1920s, red brick, RAF buildings to the south of Camp Road are laid out around and orientated towards the parade ground. The style of the buildings within the area is again British Military and because of their grid-like orientation the area has a strong 'campus' character distinct from the Technical Site to the north on the other side of the road. The area immediately south of the parade ground was developed during the period of RAF expansion in the 1930s. The area is dominated by the Institute (**488**) and H blocks (**489, 498 and 500**) set around it. This part of the site has a distinct character separate from the 1920s buildings. The general 'military architect' character of the area has been diluted by post-war alterations and the wider area therefore reads less coherently.
- 1.3 No buildings within the application site are listed and in fact all have been approved to be demolished. There are a number of mature trees both individually and in groups, many dating from the RAF occupation.

- 1.4 Adjacent the site is a retail store and a number of community buildings including church, play group and community centre. These are surrounded by residential dwellings many of which are to be retained.
- 1.5 Over the last 10 years numerous applications have been made seeking permission to either develop the whole site or large parts of it and numerous of them have gone to appeal. The most significant was application ref 08/00716/OUT. Following a major public inquiry that commenced in September 2008 the Council received the appeal decision in January 2010 that allowed "A new settlement of 1075 dwellings, together with associated works and facilities including employment uses, community uses, school, playing fields and other physical and social infrastructure (as amended by plans and information received 26.06.08)." The uses and development permitted upon the flying field have been implemented by the applicants under the appeal permission
- 1.6 The development of the settlement and technical areas was delayed as the approved masterplan was refined. As a result, a new masterplan was drawn up which, whilst similar to the one considered at appeal, has been modified. The main reason for a fresh application arose from the desire of the applicant to retain more buildings on site. Apart from that, the most significant changes are a new area of open space centred on the parade ground, the retention of a large number of dwellings including 253 bungalows, and more of the heritage buildings, the demolition of which was previously consented. The retention of these buildings at their existing low density meant the masterplan expanded the development area west on to the sports field. The revised masterplan was submitted as part of the outline application for "Proposed new settlement for 1075 dwellings, together with associated works and facilities, including employment uses, a school, playing fields and other physical and social infrastructure" and was granted permission on 22nd December 2011 (ref 10/01642/OUT). Under this permission the site the subject of this current application was approved as a primary school. The developer and owner of Heyford Park have now changed their aspirations and have sought permission for a through, free school and this has been accepted by the Council which, in principle, has resolved to grant planning permission for such a use in Buildings 74, the former officer's mess, and 583, the former sports hall.
- 1.7 The applicants have already secured consent from the Secretary of State for Education to open a new school at Heyford Park which opened in September 2013 in temporary accommodation. The school will, in theory, be a 2 form entry, through school i.e. for children from 4 to 19, so both primary and secondary education. There would be potential for a total of 840 pupils but the opening is phased with only Reception and Year 7 in 2013, followed by Year 1 and Year 8 in 2014, 2 and 9 in 2015, etc until the school is fully open in 2019.

The Proposed Development

- 1.8 The current application is in outline for up to 60 residential units with all matters reserved. An illustrative masterplan has been produced that shows how the development could be dovetailed into the scheme already approved at Heyford. It is supported by documentation including on Heritage, Design and Access, Transport (together with a revised submission) and Trees. It will front one of the principal internal roads, also to be used as the bus route, and overlook the village green.

2. Application Publicity

- 2.1 The application has been advertised by way of neighbour letter, site notice and press notice. The final date for comment was the 12th December 2013. No public comments have been received

3. Consultations

3.1 Upper Heyford Parish Council: supports this application.

3.2 Middleton Stoney Parish Council: No objection

3.3 Ardley with Fewcott Parish Council: No objection

Cherwell District Council Consultees

3.4 Conservation Officer: A regulatory plan is required, if permitted it should be conditioned to comply with the approved design codes, special attention needs to be made to the setting of the Village Green, and improvements will be required at reserved matters to urban form, layout and typology

3.5 Housing Officer: 30% affordable requirement in a 70/30 split of rented to shared ownership. 50% lifetime standard requirement.

3.6 Anti-social Behaviour Manager: No objections

3.7 Environmental Protection Officer: Condition required, if approved, for a contamination assessment

3.8 Waste/Recycling Manager: Contribution required

3.9 Landscape Architect: Need to assess impact on LAP at reserved matters stage

3.10 Tree Officer: Satisfactory tree survey and constraints plan submitted. No further comments

3.11 Head of Strategic Planning: No objection, generally consistent with Policy H2 (Structure Plan) and Villages 5 of the submitted draft Cherwell Local Plan. Need certainty that school is not required. Need the service provision already approved by previous permissions.

Oxfordshire County Council Consultees

3.12 The County have responded through the One Voice procedure on the original submission as follows:

Transport:

No additional or proportionate mitigation is proposed in line with that previously agreed for the Heyford settlement area in the S106 Agreement of 2011. This application refers to previously negotiated improvements to pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and bus services, however if this development is to come forward independently of the wider settlement area, then appropriate mitigation and trigger points for this will need to be considered through a new or varied S106 Agreement.

The Transport Statement submitted with this application seeks to justify why the proposal will have no material impact on the highway. The main argument centres around the recent economic downturn, stating that actual 2013 traffic levels are less than previously forecast in the 2007 Arup TA and that the traffic generation of these 60 new dwellings can be accommodated on the highway within the traffic thresholds previously predicted.

The Transport Statement and S106 Heads of Terms are inadequate, and the Local Highway Authority is not in a position to recommend approval of this application.

Drainage:

A full surface water drainage design will need to be submitted to the Lead Flood Authority (OCC) and approval given prior to the commencement of the development on site. The developer will need to adhere to the requirements of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 when they design the surface water drainage. Full Suds will be required.

Education:

The proposed development is for the site originally identified to provide a new primary school for the Upper Heyford development. Following the opening of the Heyford Park Free School, the county council is negotiating a Deed of Variation to the December 2011 Section 106 Agreement with the developers of Heyford Park, which envisages release of this site, but not until the new Free School (Refurbished) has been "built" and open to pupils by a given longstop date. Currently, the original Primary School site is protected under the December 2011 Section 106 Agreement, and is not available for housing development. Until the Deed of Variation is agreed, the county council objects to residential development on this site.

If the Free School were to fail or close (and no alternative academy provider found to operate the facility) then the county council would be left with a need to provide additional school capacity for both primary and secondary pupils. Therefore, should this planning application be approved, any S106 agreement should include appropriate mitigation against this eventuality. Contributions should also be sought in line with those agreed for the main Heyford Park development to mitigate against the additional costs to the county council of accommodating children moving into the development of ages not yet catered for by the Free School, until it is accepting pupils in all year groups.

The primary and secondary pupil generation from this development can be accommodated at the Heyford Park Free School, assuming its continuation. In these circumstances no developer contributions towards primary or secondary education would be sought. However, if the Free School were to fail or close (and no alternative academy provider found to operate the facility) then the county council would be left with a need to provide additional school capacity for both primary and secondary pupils. Should the planning application be approved, any S106 agreement should include appropriate mitigation against this eventuality. Contributions would also be sought in line with those agreed for the main Heyford Park development to mitigate against the additional costs to the county council of accommodating children moving into the development of ages not yet catered for by the Free School, until it is accepting pupils in all year groups.

Property:

The County Council considers that the effect of the application forming this development will place additional strain on its existing community infrastructure. It is calculated that this development would generate a net increase of 163 additional residents A legal agreement is required to secure contributions for:

Waste Management £10,432
Libraries £13,855
Museum Resource Centre £815
Social & Health Care £13,200
Adult Learning £1,776

Total **£40,078** plus Administration & Monitoring 5,000

(A full justification accompanied the County response and is set out below in the appraisal. The contributions which are being sought are necessary to protect the existing levels of infrastructure for local residents. They are relevant to planning the incorporation of this major development within the local community, if it is implemented. They are directly related to this proposed development and to the scale and kind of the proposal.)

The developer should ensure the uninterrupted operation and safety of users at the Children's Centre. The County Council would welcome consideration of restricted working hours and a requirement to liaise with managers of the centre regarding operations that may have a detrimental effect on delivery of services such as piling work and disruption of electric supplies and the like

The County Council as Fire Authority has a duty to ensure that an adequate supply of water is available for fire-fighting purposes. There will probably be a requirement to affix fire hydrants within the development site. Exact numbers and locations cannot be given until detailed consultation plans are provided showing highway, water main layout and size. We would therefore ask you to add the requirement for provision of hydrants in accordance with the requirements of the Fire & Rescue Service as a condition to the grant of any planning permission

Further information has been submitted to support the application and on which the County Council has been re consulted. Unfortunately no response had been received at the time the report was drafted but it is hoped the objections and concerns raised by the County have been met).

Other Consultees

- 3.13 Environment Agency: No objection subject to conditions
- 3.14 English Heritage: No objection to housing. A strong frontage should be provided to the Parade Ground./Village Green. Prefer to see larger buildings, maybe terraced

4. Relevant National and Local Policy and Guidance

- 4.1 Development Plan Policy

Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996

The Cherwell Local Plan was adopted in November 1996. Although the plan was intended to cover the period to 2001 it remains part of the Statutory Development Plan. The Cherwell Local Plan was adopted shortly after the former airbase was declared surplus and therefore does not have any policies specifically in relation to the site. The following saved policies are however considered relevant:

C18	Historic Buildings
C23:	Conservation Areas
TR7:	Traffic on Minor Roads
TR1:	Transportation Measures

Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 (OSP)

The Regional Strategy for the South East (Partial Revocation) Order 2013 revoked the South East Plan with effect from 25th March 2013. "The effect of Article 3 of this Order is to revoke all structure plan policies in the region with the ...significant... exception of ... policy H2 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016, which relates to the

former air base at Upper Heyford in Oxfordshire.”

The Structure Plan (OSP) which had effectively been replaced by the SEP included, unusually for such a strategic document, a site specific policy for Upper Heyford. This policy, H2, was saved by the SEP. Although the thrust of the OSP was to direct development towards urban centres, paragraph 7.7 of the Structure Plan advises that; “Land declared surplus by the Ministry of Defence at the former airbase at Upper Heyford represents an opportunity to achieve an appropriate balance between environmental improvements to a rural part of Oxfordshire, conservation of the heritage interest from the Cold War, and reuse of some existing buildings and previously developed land located in the former technical and residential areas of the base.”

4.2 Other Material Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework-March 2012
National Planning Practice Guidance March 2014

At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means:

approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and

where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

4.3 Draft Submission Local Plan (October 2013) (DCLP)

The Proposed Submission Local Plan was published for public consultation in August 2012. A further consultation on Proposed Changes to the draft plan was undertaken from March to May 2013. On 7 October 2013, the draft Submission Plan was approved by the Council's Executive. The Plan was presented to Full Council on 21 October 2013 and endorsed as the Submission Local Plan. It was submitted to the Secretary of State on 30th January 2014 and will be examined in public in June

At the present time the Plan carries limited weight. However, it will not form part of the statutory Development Plan until the Examination process is complete and the Plan is formally adopted by the Council (anticipated late 2014). The policies listed below are considered to be material to this case and are not replicated by a saved Development Plan policy:

Policy Villages 5-Former RAF Upper Heyford
BSC2-Effective and Efficient Use of Land
BSC4 Housing Mix

4.4 Conservation Area Appraisal

The RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area was designated in April 2006. A Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) was produced for the site and adopted by the Council in April 2006. The CAA includes the historic significance of the site, analyses its character and heritage assets, assess the special interest, negative factor affecting the site and summarises the issues. It describes the site as; ‘The landscape setting and hardened concrete structures of the former RAF Upper Heyford have the power to communicate the atmosphere of the Cold War.’

The CAA identifies the following key areas in the summary of issues;

1. Protection of the Historic Buildings and Landscape

2. Vulnerability of the site to fragmentation
3. Reuse of the retained buildings
4. Incorporation of a new settlement

4.5 In addition:
Planning Obligations Interim Planning Guidance (April 2007)

5. Appraisal

- 5.1 The latest scheme raises a number of issues but the main ones are considered to be:
- The Principle of Development and Compliance with the Development Plan and Master Plan for the Site
 - Heritage and Impact on the Conservation Area
 - Transport, Access and Highways
 - Housing
 - Section 106 Agreement

The Principle of Development and Compliance with the Development Plan and Master Plan for the Site

- 5.2 The Development Plan is in a state of transition and despite the revocation of the South East Plan, the old OSP policy H2 is to be retained.
- 5.3 The Structure Plan (OSP) which was replaced by the SEP included, unusually for such a strategic document, a site specific policy for Upper Heyford. This policy, H2, was saved by the SEP and remains in place despite the revocation of the regional plan on 25th March 2013 pending the adoption of the Cherwell Local Plan. Due to the significance of this policy and the development now proposed the policy is reproduced in full:

Upper Heyford

H2 a) Land at RAF Upper Heyford will provide for a new settlement of about 1000 dwellings and necessary supporting infrastructure, including a primary school and appropriate community, recreational and employment opportunities, as a means of enabling environmental improvements and the heritage interest of the site as a military base with Cold War associations to be conserved, compatible with achieving a satisfactory living environment.

b) Proposals for development must reflect a revised comprehensive planning brief adopted by the district council and demonstrate that the conservation of heritage resources, landscape, restoration, enhancement of biodiversity and other environmental improvements will be achieved across the whole of the former air base in association with the provision of the new settlement.

c) The new settlement should be designed to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport rather than travel by private car. Improvements to bus and rail facilities and measures to minimise the impact of traffic generated by the development on the surrounding road network will be required.

- 5.4 The supporting text states (para 7.7):
“Land declared surplus by the Ministry of Defence at the former airbase at Upper Heyford represents an opportunity to achieve an appropriate balance between environmental improvements to a rural part of Oxfordshire, conservation of the heritage interest from the Cold War, and re-use of some existing buildings and previously developed land located in the former technical and residential core area of the base. However, the scale of development must be appropriate to the location and surroundings. The County Council is opposed to the development of a large new settlement due to the site’s relatively isolated and unsustainable rural location, the threat of urbanisation in a rural area, the location of the site in relation to Bicester with which it would compete for investment in services and facilities, and conflict with

the objectives of Government planning policy in PPG13 to provide accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling and to reduce the need to travel by car. Therefore, the Plan provides for modest development of about 1,000 houses. There are about 300 existing houses on the site of which some or all could be retained or demolished, but the total limit of about 1,000 dwellings will be the determining factor. This proposal has been recognised by the First Secretary of State as ‘an exception to normal sustainability objectives as a means of facilitating the remediation of the former airbase to enable the site to present a more environmentally acceptable face than it does now.’*

5.5 Para 7.8 continues:

“Proposals for development must be in accordance with a revised comprehensive planning brief for the site adopted by Cherwell District Council. Care should be taken to ensure that the heritage interest of the site as an air base with Cold War associations, landscape restoration and biodiversity are all taken into account in deciding appropriate measures.”

5.6 The adopted Local Plan is largely silent on Heyford, the non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 reinforced OSP H2 setting out in policies UH1-UH4 a large number of conditions requiring compliance in order to seek a comprehensive approach to its development. It set out the need for a Comprehensive Development Brief for the site and this was produced and approved as supplementary planning guidance (in a modified form) in 2007. It required a neighborhood centre should be established at the heart of the settlement in a location that can also benefit from passing trade. It should comprise a primary school, community hall, place of worship and retail, public house, restaurant, social and health care and private nursery facilities.

5.7 Looking slightly further ahead, the draft Local Plan states:

“This site will provide for a settlement of approximately 761 dwellings (net) and necessary supporting infrastructure, including a primary school and appropriate community, recreational and employment opportunities, enabling environmental improvements and the heritage interest of the site as a military base with Cold War associations to be conserved”. Although this document is material it carries little weight as yet.

5.8 The position in terms of the authorised use for the application site is that planning permission has been granted for its use as a primary school and that is therefore its designation by the masterplan. Subsequently however, the applicant and developer has sought and obtained planning permission, for the change of use of Building 74 and 583 to become a through, free school. (Application references 13/00740/F and 13/00343/F). These permissions have been granted, in principle at least, but remain to be issued because of extended negotiations over the Deed of Variation required to amend the original s106 obligations to provide the primary school. As is clear from the County’s comments on this application, as Education Authority, they object to the proposal until matters are resolved. At the time of drafting this report the Deed is very close to being sealed and Committee will be updated orally at the meeting. The free school has in fact already opened but is in temporary accommodation.

5.9 The form of development at Heyford is still evolving but the change from primary school to provision of a through school is the most significant difference from the approved masterplan. Although work has yet to start on Buildings 74 and 583 it is imminent and contracts have been agreed with a contractor. Therefore, subject to protecting the County Council’s position as Education Authority and insuring land and finance remains in place for educational provision at Heyford, if the Free School fails, there seems no in principle objection to allowing the allocated site to be used in the future for residential development.

- 5.10 To remind Committee, the two buildings to be converted to the through school are the former officer's mess, Building 74, and the former sports hall, Building 583. The latter was originally intended to be demolished before its use as a free school was proposed. Building 74 was to be retained and identified in the past for a possible hotel or care home. It has been demonstrated previously that the hotel was not a viable proposition. The care home has also seemingly been dropped by the developer although accommodation for the elderly and people with disabilities is being catered for in other ways such as retention and refurbishment of the bungalows on site.
- 5.11 In terms of overall numbers of units proposed at Heyford, the Structure Plan advocated approximately 1,000 dwellings. The two planning permissions approved 1,075. The draft Local Plan confirms this and allocates 761 new dwellings, there are 314 existing on site. If Committee agree to an additional 60 units this will take the gross figure to 1,135. This is not considered to conflict with either the OSP or the DCLP.

Impact on the Conservation Area and other Heritage Issues

- 5.12 In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. (NPPF para 131).
- 5.13 When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. (NPPF para 132)
- 5.14 The significance of this part of Heyford was fully assessed for its heritage significance when a Character Assessment was undertaken in 2006. It was considered to be a complex and incoherent landscape. This view was reinforced by the Conservation Appraisal which concluded the character of the area to have become diluted by post war additions and additional buildings. An Environmental Statement in 2011 classified the area as of low significance for heritage. None of the buildings on site were listed of architectural or historic importance, or even of local importance. As a result, their demolition was consented under the appeal decision in allowing the development of the site for the new school.
- 5.15 The approval of the proposed revised masterplan was felt to be a real gain in heritage terms compared with the approved appeal scheme. The expansion of the developable area did not detract from conservation area or setting of listed buildings. More buildings of historical interest were retained. The form of the parade ground was restored. The retention of the bungalows was also a small gain in heritage terms.

- 5.16 The revised masterplan approved under reference 10/01642/OUT accepted the site's limited heritage value but recognised that there were buildings and spaces surrounding it that needed to be taken in to account. Primarily these are the housing to the rear, Carswell Circle, and the open space at the front, representing the former Parade Ground, and Buildings 455 and 457 which frame the parade ground. Government advice is that "Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably. (NPPF para 136), This is the case here although the illustrative drawings submitted with the application do not perhaps do justice to the significance or setting of these assets and both English Heritage and our Conservation and Urban Design Officer recommend a stronger frontage development to emphasise, frame and accentuate the parade ground.
- 5.17 The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. The Environmental Statement produced to accompany application 10/01642/OUT concluded that total demolition of the buildings on this part of the site and erection of the primary school would have an impact of slight significance. The current proposal is considered to have a similar impact. Overall therefore it is considered the proposed development is acceptable and will protect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Transport, Access and Highways

- 5.18 "Transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. Smarter use of technologies can reduce the need to travel. The transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel. However, the Government recognises that different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas." (NPPF para 29). In the case of Heyford, OSP policy H2 required the new settlement to be designed to encourage walking, cycling and public transport rather than the private car. It is recognised that the development conflicts with the objectives of sustainability but that such objectives have to be set aside as a means of facilitating the remediation of the former airbase. This was worked up in the RCPB where three policy objectives are set out in relation to transport:
- MEASURES TO ENCOURAGE WALKING AND CYCLING AND THE USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT FOR TRIPS WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT WILL BE REQUIRED
 - MEASURES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT FOR TRIPS TO OTHER MAJOR CENTRES WILL BE REQUIRED
 - MEASURES TO MINIMISE THE IMPACT OF TRAFFIC ON THE SURROUNDING ROAD NETWORK THROUGH VILLAGES, AND TO THE WEST, WILL BE REQUIRED
- 5.19 A Transport Assessment was provided with the application but following criticism from the County Highway Engineer a revised submission has been made. Confirmation is awaited that the latest details are acceptable to the County which it is understood (verbally) they are. The applicants are prepared to include this proposal into the obligations on the previous s106 agreement and measures previously required to mitigate the traffic and transport implications arising from the

creation of the new settlement.

- 5.20 The main thrust of the Transport Assessment is that traffic levels on the surrounding network have not increased in the last 10 years, in fact it is alleged they have gone down due possibly to people using more sustainable modes of transport, travelling less, to changes in working practice, and maybe because of economic factors. The increase in traffic from the approved scheme is already catered for by a series of traffic calming measures and improvements to local infrastructure including to junctions at Camp Road, Middleton Stoney and Ardley. The increase in traffic from 60 additional units is marginal, 24 vehicle movements in the AM and PM peaks.
- 5.21 In addition to the improvements to the highway network for vehicular traffic, other measures are proposed to cater for movements other than by private car. Bus frequency is to be increased and improvements made to the Oxford and Bicester routes. A sum of almost £1,500,000 is committed by the developer under the terms of the existing s106 agreement. On site facilities will be undertaken to improve bus manoeuvrability and accessibility within the site. An internal bus route is proposed on the masterplan and the application site actually fronts this route. Provision is also made under existing obligations for cyclists and pedestrians. The layout is indicative but improvements could be made to improve accessibility and permeability for future residents.
- 5.22 A travel plan is required to be produced as part of the overall development the basis for which has been set out in a previous transport assessment and transport strategy framework. The concept of the travel plan thus far agreed with the applicant is such that suitable initiatives and targets are agreed which will produce a shift from travel by car onto public transport. Bus service contributions have been agreed to obviate this pressure.

Housing

- 5.23 The Government policy in terms of housing is set out in the NPPF section 6. It require Local Authorities to : “identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land” (para 46).
- 5.24 It goes on to say and :
“To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should:
plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes);
identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; and
where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market

conditions over time.” (NPPF Para 50)

- 5.25 This is backed up by policy H2 from the OSP, the RCPB 2007 and the emerging policies set out in the DCLP. The principle of the residential development accords with these policies in particular in so far as Heyford is already identified for residential development, albeit this additional sum will exceed the identified target, but the development is on brownfield land and it is a site within the proposed settlement area.
- 5.26 The application is in outline so limited details are provided. The density is 30 dwellings per hectare, so fairly modest but not inappropriate in this rural location. The Access and Design Statement set out the design guideline principles and provide sketches of what is proposed in terms of layout. A design code has been agreed for the rest of the settlement and to ensure the proposed housing meets the high quality required by the RCPB the permission should be conditioned that development must comply with a design code agreed in advance with the Planning Authority.
- 5.27 There are two other significant things from the Officers point of view. The first is delivery and bearing in mind the situation elsewhere in the District, this is a site allocated for development where if the permission is in place will contribute to the the 5year housing land supply.
- 5.28 And secondly is the issue of affordable housing. Negotiations have been on-going for some months over the form of social housing, the type, tenure, mix, location etc. These talks have concluded with agreement that what will be provided broadly complies with our guidance set out in the CDC Code of Practice and Obligations Guidelines and the DCLP so 30% will be affordable and 50% built to lifetime standards. This is a significant achievement at this time.

Section 106 Agreement

- 5.29 In the RCPB 2007, it is made clear that “the Council will seek appropriate S106 planning obligation agreements as required to secure the provision of facilities to serve the settlement, appropriate phasing of delivery and the delivery of the requirements of Policy H2.” The applicant has prepared a set of “heads of Terms” in accordance with normal practice and the Council’s validation requirements. The terms have been subject of negotiation both prior to submission of the application and in the course of processing it. They are considered to meet the tests of Government advice in the new Planning Practice Guide together with the policies and terms set out in the Council’s Local Plan policies and SPD’s.
- 5.30 The existing approved scheme for the comprehensive development of the former Upper Heyford Airbase already has a detailed Unilateral Undertaking setting out a range of obligations which apply to the New Settlement Area and the Flying Field. This has been followed up with a new s106 agreement on the settlement area. Some of these obligations have already been triggered and acted upon but as this is a fresh application it will be necessary to include these units within the target and trigger figures, particularly with regard to traffic and transport, and to restate those obligations that relate to the New Settlement Area as set out below.

Affordable Housing:

Due to this being an outline application for 60 units in total the scheme would not technically be encompassed within the existing outline permission for the wider Upper Heyford. Therefore there would be a 30% affordable housing requirement on this site, equating to 20 units.

There will be a requirement for a tenure split of 70/30 rented / shared ownership with the affordable units dispersed into a minimum of two clusters. The units will be required to meet the HCA's Design and Quality Standards including the necessary HQL's. There will be a need to meet code for sustainable homes level 3.

50% of the affordable units will be required to meet lifetime homes standards.

The preferential affordable housing units mix is:

Rent

8x2b4p Houses

5x3b5p Houses

2x4b6p Houses

Shared Ownership

5x2b4p Houses

1x3b5p House

Waste and Recycling.

A Section 106 contribution of £67.50 per property will be required, £4,050 in total

Education

If the Free School were to fail or close (and no alternative academy provider found to operate the facility) then the county council would be left with a need to provide additional school capacity for both primary and secondary pupils. Therefore, should this planning application be approved, any S106 agreement should include appropriate mitigation against this eventuality. Contributions should also be sought in line with those agreed for the main Heyford Park development to mitigate against the additional costs to the county council of accommodating children moving into the development of ages not yet catered for by the Free School, until it is accepting pupils in all year groups.

The primary and secondary pupil generation from this development can be accommodated at the Heyford Park Free School, assuming its continuation. In these circumstances no developer contributions towards primary or secondary education would be sought. However, if the Free School were to fail or close (and no alternative academy provider found to operate the facility) then the county council would be left with a need to provide additional school capacity for both primary and secondary pupils. Should the planning application be approved, any S106 agreement should include appropriate mitigation against this eventuality. Contributions would also be sought in line with those agreed for the main Heyford Park development to mitigate against the additional costs to the county council of accommodating children moving into the development of ages not yet catered for by the Free School, until it is accepting pupils in all year groups.

Strategic Waste Management

Under Section 51 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, County Councils, as waste disposal authorities, have a duty to arrange for places to be provided at which person's resident in its area may deposit their household waste and for the disposal of that waste. To meet the additional pressures on the various Household Waste and Recycling Centre provision in Oxfordshire enhancements to these centres are either already taking place or are planned, and, to this end, contributions are now required from developers towards their redesign and redevelopment.

A new site serving 20,000 households costs in the region of £3,000,000; this equates to £64 per person at 1st Quarter 2012 price base

£64 x 163 (the forecast number of new residents) = £10,432

Library:

Oxfordshire County Council has an adopted standard for publicly available library floor space of 23 m² per 1,000 head of population, and a further 19.5% space is required for support areas (staff workroom, etc), totalling 27.5 m². Bicester library is significantly under-size in relation to its catchment population and this development will therefore place additional pressures on the library. The current cost of extending a library is £2,370 per m² at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. The proposal would also generate the need to increase the core book stock held by the local library by 2 volumes per additional resident. The price per volume is £10.00. This equates to £85 per person at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. The full requirement for the provision of library infrastructure and supplementary core book stock in respect of this application would therefore be based on the following formula:

£85 x 163 (the forecast number of new residents) = £13,855

County Museum Resource Centre:

Oxfordshire County Council's museum service provides a central Museum Resource Centre (MRC). The MRC is the principal store for the Oxfordshire Museum, Cogges Manor Farm Museum, Abingdon Museum, Banbury Museum, the Museum of Oxford and the Vale and Downland Museum. It provides support to these museums and schools throughout the county for educational, research and leisure activities. The MRC is operating at capacity and needs an extension to meet the demands arising from further development throughout the county. An extended facility will provide additional storage space and allow for increased public access to the facility. An extension to the MRC to mitigate the impact of new development up to 2026 has been costed at £460,000; this equates to £5 per person at 1st Quarter 2012 price base.

£5 x 163 (the forecast number of new residents) = £815

Social & Health Care - Day Care Facilities:

To meet the additional pressures on day care provision the County Council is looking to expand and/or improve day care facilities in the locality. A new Day Care centre offering 40 places per day (optimum) and open 5 days per week costs £11,000 per place at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. Based on current and predicted usage figures we estimate that 10% of the over 65 population use day care facilities. Therefore the cost per person aged 65 years or older is £1,100.

£1,100 x 12 (the forecast number of new residents aged 65+) = £13,200

Adult Learning:

The County Council is looking to improve and provide a more sustainable Adult Learning facility in Bicester.

A new 2 classroom facility costs £440,000 at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. This facility will provide for 1,350 learners per annum; this equates to £326 per learner. At least 5% of the adult population are likely to take up adult learning; this equates to £16 per person.

£16 x 111 (the forecast number of new residents aged 20+) = £1,776

Administration:

Oxfordshire County Council requires an administrative payment of £5,000 for the purposes of administration and monitoring of the proposed S106 agreement.

Other Issues

5.31 **Contamination**

The views of the Environmental Health Officer recommends that if permission, is granted, it is appropriately conditioned.

5.32 **Impact on Residential Amenity**

Even without detailed plans it is clear the proposed housing will have limited effect on residential amenity. What is required is a better connectivity between the site and the surrounding area which has not been shown in the submitted documents.

5.33 **Landscaping**

The application contains basic details. Some form of landscaping is required to mediate the impact of new buildings and protection of existing trees and landscape features

5.34 **Drainage**

The County and EA have asked for further information on how the site will be drained This be dealt with by condition.

5.35 **Engagement**

With regard to the duty set out in paragraphs 186 and 187 of the Framework, no problems or issues have arisen during the application. It is considered that the duty to be positive and proactive has been discharged through the efficient and timely determination of the application.

5.36 **Conclusion**

The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and an s106 agreement to ensure, in particular, that a school is provided on site to meet the needs of the local community. The increase in housing numbers is not seen to be a significant departure from the Development Plan and will go some way to assisting the Council meet it housing targets as required under the NPPF.

6. Recommendation

Approval, subject to:

i) The applicant entering into a section 106 agreement with the District and County Council as outlined above and

ii) the following conditions:

- 1 That no development shall be commenced until full details of the layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping (hereafter referred to as reserved matters) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to above shall be carried out as approved.

Reason - This permission is in outline only and is granted to comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and Article 4(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development

Management Procedure)(England) Order 2010.

- 2 That in the case of the reserved matters, application for approval shall be made not later than the expiration of six years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - This permission is in outline only and is granted to comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and Article 4(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2010.

- 3 That the development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last reserved matters to be approved.

Reason - This permission is in outline only and is granted to comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and Article 4(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2010.

- 4 No reserved matters applications shall be made until a Design Code and Regulatory Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Design Code shall comprise:

i) Land use, density, layout of streets and public spaces and character areas;

ii) Landscape, including for the immediate setting of the new settlement, to include retained trees and vegetation, new planting, public open space, amenity space, children's' play areas, sports facilities, footpaths, public spaces, together with adoption arrangements and extent;

iii) Surface water control, including design standards and methodology for sustainable drainage systems, details of specific features, including appropriate options for Sustainable Urban Drainage, swales, together with adoption arrangements and extent;

iv) Public realm, including hierarchy of streets and public spaces, characteristics, dimensions, building line and or set backs, materials, means of enclosure, street furniture, including street lighting, and car parking, methods to control traffic speeds and create legibility, together with adoption arrangements and extent;

v) Built form, including scale, materials, roof treatment, elevational treatment, treatment of landmark and marker buildings, key frontages and gateways;

vi) Sustainable design, including the measures to be incorporated to ensure that the development complies with at least the minimum Code Level required by the Building Regulations in the Code for Sustainable Homes and to assess the impact this would have on appearance;

vii) Car and cycle parking, including standards of provision by land use and dwelling type; and

viii) Waste recycling, including how the Councils standards for individual

householders' waste and recycling bins are to be accommodated within the dwelling curtilage and refuse vehicle access to these obtained.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved Design Code.

Reason: Design Codes, together with the Approved Master Plan, are required at the beginning of the development process to ensure that the subsequent reserved matters applications are considered and determined by the Local Planning Authority in the context of an overall approach for the site consistent with the requirement to achieve a high quality design as set out in the Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief for the site, and H2 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan.

- 5 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme for landscaping the site shall include:-

(a) details of the proposed tree and shrub planting including their species, number, sizes and positions, together with grass seeded/turfed areas,

(b) details of the existing trees and hedgerows to be retained as well as those to be felled, including existing and proposed soil levels at the base of each tree/hedgerow and the minimum distance between the base of the tree and the nearest edge of any excavation,

(c) details of the hard surface areas, including pavements, pedestrian areas, reduced-dig areas, crossing points and steps.

Reason - In the interests of the visual amenities of the area, to ensure the creation of a pleasant environment for the development and to comply with Policy C28 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6 All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with BS 4428:1989 Code of Practice for general landscape operations (excluding hard surfaces), or the most up to date and current British Standard, in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building(s) or on the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees, herbaceous planting and shrubs which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the current/next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason - In the interests of the visual amenities of the area, to ensure the creation of a pleasant environment for the development and to comply with Policy C28 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a landscape management plan, to include the timing of the implementation of the plan, long term design objectives, management responsibilities, maintenance schedules and procedures for the replacement of failed planting for all landscape areas, other than for privately owned, domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved

details.

Reason - In the interests of the visual amenities of the area, to ensure the creation of a pleasant environment for the development and to comply with Policy C28 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved full details of the provision, landscaping and treatment of open space/play space within the site together with a timeframe for its provision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the open space/play space shall be landscaped, laid out and completed in accordance with the approved details and retained at all times as open space/play space.

Reason - In the interests of amenity, to ensure the creation of a pleasant environment for the development with appropriate open space/play space and to comply with Policy R12 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 9 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a desk study and site walk over to identify all potential contaminative uses on site, and to inform the conceptual site model shall be carried out by a competent person and in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place until the Local Planning Authority has given its written approval that it is satisfied that no potential risk from contamination has been identified.

Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy ENV12 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 10 If a potential risk from contamination is identified as a result of the work carried out under condition 10 prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a comprehensive intrusive investigation in order to characterise the type, nature and extent of contamination present, the risks to receptors and to inform the remediation strategy proposals shall be documented as a report undertaken by a competent person and in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place unless the Local Planning Authority has given its written approval that it is satisfied that the risk from contamination has been adequately characterised as required by this condition.

Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy ENV12 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the

National Planning Policy Framework.

- 11 If contamination is found by undertaking the work carried out under condition 11 prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a scheme of remediation and/or monitoring to ensure the site is suitable for its proposed use shall be prepared by a competent person and in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place until the Local Planning Authority has given its written approval of the scheme of remediation and/or monitoring required by this condition.

Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy ENV12 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 12 If remedial works have been identified in condition 12 the development shall not be occupied until the remedial works have been carried out in accordance with the scheme approved under condition 12. A verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy ENV12 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 13 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, no further development shall be carried out until full details of a remediation strategy detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the remediation strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy ENV12 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 14 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to dispose of surface water (that should ensure that no soakaways are constructed in contaminated land) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason

This site is located over a Principal Aquifer. In event that petroleum hydrocarbon contamination is encountered during enabling works, we need to ensure that it is not mobilised by increased infiltration through the use soakaways.

- 15 That prior the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted fire hydrants shall be provided or enhanced on the site in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To secure the provision of essential community infrastructure on site in accordance with Policy CC7 of the South East Plan 2009.

- 16 All site clearance (including vegetation removal) should be timed so as to avoid the bird nesting/breeding season between March-August

Reason - To ensure that the development will not cause harm to any protected species or its habitat in accordance with Policy NRM5 of the South East Plan 2009 and Policy C2 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan).

- 17 Details of the location of all compounds and the associated areas for plant storage and access thereto, as well as a scheme for their subsequent removal and restoration of the land, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their establishment. The compounds and accesses shall be located and subsequently removed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To ensure that site compounds are sited in locations that will not adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents or the environment and to comply with the Policy ENV1 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan.

- 18 No development shall be undertaken until such time as wheel washing facilities have been provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In the interests of highway safety and to ensure a satisfactory standard of construction.

- 19 During the course of building operations or construction works on the site and at all reasonable times, the developer shall afford access to any archaeologist nominated by the Local Planning Authority and shall allow him/her to observe the excavations and record items of interest and finds.

Reason - In the interests of archaeological investigation or recording and to comply with Government advice in PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment and Policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009.

- 20 Prior to any demolition on the site, the commencement of the development and any archaeological investigation, a professional archaeological organisation/building recorder acceptable to the Local Planning Authority shall carry out a full recording of the building concerned and submit the completed record to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To secure the proper recording of the building which is of archaeological or historic importance, to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

PLANNING NOTES

Attention is drawn to a Legal Agreement related to this development or land which has been made pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Sections 111 and 139 of the Local Government Act 1972 and/or other enabling powers.

This permission shall not imply or be deemed to imply approval for the indicative sketch details shown on the plans accompanying the application.

In the submission of reserved matter details for approval, a particularly high standard of architectural design in the external appearance of all buildings is expected in view of the prominence and heritage value of the site.

Your attention is drawn to the need to have regard to the requirements of UK and European legislation relating to the protection of certain wild plants and animals. Approval under that legislation will be required and a licence may be necessary if protected species or habitats are affected by the development. If protected species are discovered you must be aware that to proceed with the development without seeking advice from Natural England could result in prosecution. For further information or to obtain approval contact Natural England on 0300 060 2501.

The applicant's and/or the developer's attention is drawn to the requirements of the Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Clean Air Act 1993, which relate to the control of any nuisance arising from construction sites. The applicant/developer is encouraged to undertake the proposed building operations in such a manner as to avoid causing any undue nuisance or disturbance to neighbouring residents. Under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974, contractors may apply to the Council for 'prior consent' to carry out works, which would establish hours of operation, noise levels and methods of working. Please contact the Council's Anti-Social Behaviour Manager on 01295 221623 for further advice on this matter.

The County Archaeologist has indicated that the proposal does not appear to directly affect any presently known archaeological sites. However, the County Council's records do show the presence of known archaeological finds nearby and this should be borne in mind by the applicant. If archaeological finds do occur during development, the applicant is requested to notify the County Archaeologist in order that he may make a site visit or otherwise advise as necessary. Please contact : County Archaeologist, Department of Leisure and Arts, Oxfordshire County Council, Central Library, Westgate, Oxford, OX1 1DJ (Telephone 01865 815749).

Advice from Environment Agency to Applicant:

The proposed development is located in Flood Zone 1 (low probability) based on our Flood Zone map. Whilst development may be appropriate in Flood Zone 1, paragraph 103 (footnote 20) of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out a Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted for all developments over one hectare in size.

As a part of the Planning application you should therefore prepare a surface water drainage strategy for the site and include this within the Flood Risk Assessment.

We are operating a risk based approach to planning consultations where the site falls between 1 and 5 hectares and are not providing detailed comments on surface water. Instead we are issuing to Local Authorities a guidance note and pro-forma which the developer/applicant should complete. We would recommend you complete the pro-forma and submit this with your planning application. We have attached a copy of the

guidance note and pro-forma.

The pro-forma asks the developer/applicant to confirm that the following surface water flood risk principles have been followed:

That surface water runoff from the development will not increase flood risk to the development or third parties. The pro-forma asks for confirmation that surface water discharge rates will not be increasing and how any increases in discharge volume are being attenuated etc.

That Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) have been explored and used to attenuate to at least pre-development discharge rates and volumes or where possible achieving betterment in the surface water runoff regime.

That an allowance for climate change has been incorporated, which means adding an extra amount to peak rainfall (20% for commercial development, 30% for residential). See Table 5 of Technical Guidance for NPPF.

That the residual risk of flooding has been addressed should failure or exceedence of the drainage system occur. This could include measures to manage residual risk such as raising ground or floor levels where appropriate.

We trust our advice in this letter will assist you in preparing the surface water strategy for the proposed development. We recommend that you liaise with the Local Authority Land Drainage Engineer if you have any additional queries in respect of surface water.

All sewage or trade effluent should be discharged to the foul sewer if available subject to the approval of Thames Water Utilities or its sewerage agent.

STATEMENT OF ENGAGEMENT

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No 2) Order 2012 and paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), this decision has been taken by the Council having worked with the applicant/agent in a positive and proactive way as set out in the application report.