

17 / 03826 / REM

- Parish Council
Representation

Broadway Farm Committee Hearing (DAPC)

The Broadway Farm site was not assigned originally for development but a scheme for 22 houses by Spitfire was initially supported by the PC and CDC only for the landowners, the Co-op, to submit a scheme for 44 houses and to win at appeal, strongly opposed by CDC and the PC. This decision was driven largely by the NPPF but came with strong conditions attached.

We must now ensure the planning process results in a scheme that resolves all the existing concerns with the Sanctuary application, to ameliorate the effects of what we consider an oversized development.

I shall address each of these briefly.

Sewerage

Thames Water had stated that the original development of 22 houses could not be accommodated and it was to be 'self-contained'.

Consequently, the Inspector made sewerage a key condition in the Appeal decision. Even now the system is not reliable and emergency visits to the pumping station are made frequently by tankers. Thames Water's letter of December 2017 to CDC highlights major concerns over capacity and requires further surveys to be undertaken. Forewarned by recent problems experienced in Fairford, it is vital the Grampian conditions set by Thames be strictly enforced. No houses should be built until the mains sewerage is connected, demonstrated beyond doubt to be viable and signed off by the appropriate bodies.

Surface water

The January 2018 letter from GCC LLFA to CDC states an objection to development on current information available and notes concerns as to whether the infrastructure taking water away from Broadway is adequate, particularly with regard to Highways, or whether it might exacerbate periodic flooding elsewhere. A further letter (23 March)

restates the Condition still cannot be discharged, given the information currently available.

Boundary treatment and layout

The site allows for green spaces and buffers, in accordance with our Village Design Statement. However, the developers have not been willing to address remaining issues to the northern end of the site, where existing residents will have building in close proximity. We feel strongly that more can be done to reduce the impact by reviewing the layout again.

Access to highway

The planned junction has a poor visibility splay, particularly to the east where there is a long bend. This is dangerous, especially given the frequent movements created by 44 new houses. Improvements are necessary, perhaps by moving the junction towards the western end of the site.

Shared spaces

We continue to have worries about the demarcation of car/pedestrian zones. We appreciate the visual benefits of 'shared space' in this setting but in light of the 2015 Holmes report, must be reassured over safety, particularly for young children and people with disabilities.

Building materials

A number of buildings within the site have considerable use of red brick, particularly garages and bungalows, and we consider this inappropriate.

In summary, the Down Ampney community is extremely unhappy about the Appeal result and looks for CDC planners to ensure the impact of this enlarged development is ameliorated as far as possible.

ARM 10/4/2018

①

17/03826/REM- Objector's Representation
Put MicroPHONE ON

Good morning.

The Reserved Matters and Compliance issues are very strongly inter-linked and should be considered at the same time, and with the same transparency for comments. The layout of the site, and the number of houses to be built depends heavily on the surface water and sewerage system capacity, and until this is known there is no point in proceeding any further. The appeal Inspector was well aware that there were surface and foul water problems in the village and made it a Condition that technical solutions must be found before construction. We know that the infrastructure is old, fragile, and very limited. But at present, it is assumed by the developers that there is a solution. However, this may not be true and be dependent upon high cost upgrades being undertaken by Thames Water whose letter dated 7th Dec 2017 states very clearly:-

“Development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by, the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy has been completed”. It cannot be made clearer than that. Similar strength comments from the LLFA. **Lead Local Flood Authority.**

As flooding is such an important issue, it is essential that where the soil was removed for the archaeological dig, that it is replaced to the height and gradient direction of the original land? At present, it very clearly has not been replaced as before because there is flood water remaining on site. This requires an action on Sanctuary.

This is a large site with many green spaces so there is no need to have houses on the new development in direct contact with existing houses on the northern boundary. The layout must be revisited at the same time as the drainage study. At the Chesterton site the developer has chosen to retain the green buffer zone in response to public engagement with residents. The same should apply here. This would also help surface drainage, and movement of wildlife.

Snared paths /pavements are still a safety concern and this decision should be re-visited. Read the Holmes report on shared spaces.

This development application must be deferred until the CDC planning, Thames Water, the LLFA, the developer, and Down Ampney village are entirely satisfied that the surface and foul water issues are fully surveyed, problems understood, and solutions agreed. Then it can be decided what number of houses, could be added to the foul and surface water system maintaining a realistic safety margin. A new development layout can then be presented to the village. **This may well require the number of houses to be reduced from 44.**

The villager's opinions must count regarding this application. After all this was the aim of the Localism Act.

Thank you for your time.