



LRM
PLANNING
LIMITED

SANDLEFORD PARK

RESPONSE TO REASONS FOR REFUSAL TO APPLICATION 16/03309/OUTMAJ

Bloor Homes and Sandleford Farm Partnership

May 2020



Report Control

Project: Sandleford Park

Client: Bloor Homes and Sandleford Farm Partnership

Job Number: 16.159

File Origin: [https://lmapplanninglimited.sharepoint.com/16/16.159 Sandleford Park, Newbury/9 Applications/Application 4 December 2019/Response to Reasons for Refusal/200504 Response to Reasons for Refusal.docx](https://lmapplanninglimited.sharepoint.com/16/16.159%20Sandleford%20Park,%20Newbury/9%20Applications/Application%204%20December%202019/Response%20to%20Reasons%20for%20Refusal/200504%20Response%20to%20Reasons%20for%20Refusal.docx)

Document checking

Primary author: Owen Jones

Initialled: OJ

Review by:

Initialled:

Issue	Date	Status	Checked for Issue
A		Draft	
B	10/2/2020	Revised Draft	
C	06/5/2020	Submission	OJ



Contents

Introduction	4
Reason for Refusal 1	5
Reason for Refusal 2	6
Reason for Refusal 3	7
Reason for Refusal 4	8
Reason for Refusal 5	8
Reason for Refusal 6	9
Reason for Refusal 7	9
Reason for Refusal 8	10
Reason for Refusal 9	10
Reason for Refusal 10	11
Reason for Refusal 11	11
Reason for Refusal 12	11
Reasons for Refusal 13 and 14	12
Reason for Refusal 15	12
Reason for Refusal 16	12
Reason for Refusal 17	12
Reason for Refusal 18	13
Reason for Refusal 19	13
Reasons for Refusal 20 and 21	13
Reason for Refusal 22	13
Reason for Refusal 23	14
Reasons for Refusal 24 and 25	14
Reason for Refusal 26	14
Reason for Refusal 27	15
Reason for Refusal 28	15
Conclusion	15



List of Appendices

- Appendix 1** Kirkham Landscape Consultants response dated 4th June 2018
- Appendix 2** BSG Ecology response dated 21st June 2018
- Appendix 3** Historic England response dated 15th May 2018
- Appendix 4** WBC Archaeologist response dated 7th June 2018
- Appendix 5** WBC Conservation Officer response dated 25th July 2018
- Appendix 6** WBC drainage comments dated 11th May 2018
- Appendix 7** WBC email correspondence regarding playing field provision 16th January 2019
- Appendix 8** WBC Highway Officer email correspondence regarding junction improvements (July 2019)
- Appendix 9** Reading Buses Note 10th December 2019



Introduction

1. Bloor Homes and Sandleford Farm Partnership have previously submitted planning applications for development at Sandleford Park. These are explained in Section 1 of the accompanying Planning Statement.
2. The submitted application is similar to that submitted under reference 16/03309/OUTMAJ, which was refused by the Local Planning Authority on the 14th December 2017.
3. This document has been prepared to explain how the proposed development and current planning application responds to those various reasons for refusal.
4. Central to the decision taken by the LPA was the view that the proposed development was piecemeal development as it didn't relate to the whole area allocated in the Core Strategy, there was no evidence that the masterplan was agreed by other landowners (i.e. Donnington New Homes) and there was no application for development at New Warren Farm.
5. A Section of the Officer's Delegated Report is entitled Piecemeal Issues which identifies the need for a co-ordinated approach to development of the allocated site across a range of issues and that *"failure to assess and provide for such matters in a holistic manner will result in a fragmented and incoherent development that would fail to deliver the requirements of Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy and the vision for Sandleford Park, as set out in section b of the Sandleford Park SPD. As such the proposed development was considered to be deficient by the LPA for three main reasons:*
 - i. It didn't consider in a comprehensive fashion how the allocated site could be developed
 - ii. It failed to ensure a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure; and
 - iii. It prejudiced the development of the remaining parcel of the allocation.
6. For these, and other reasons, the proposed development was considered unacceptable. Reason for Refusal 1 captures the above in the following manner:

"The submission of this application for only part of the Sandleford Strategic Site Allocation is contrary to Development Plan Policy GS1 of the HSA DPD and the Sandleford Park SPD which require an appropriately masterplanned scheme which secures the delivery of a comprehensive development and ensures the timely and co-ordinated provision of infrastructure, services, open space and facilities. The proposal to develop only part of the Strategic site fails to achieve overall coherence and a holistic outcome which ensures that the elements of the complete development combine to achieve the adopted policy requirements".
7. The Applicants have considered carefully the reasons for refusal set out in that instance and have sought to address those matters as part of the current application. The purpose of this document is to set out in detail how the proposed development overcomes the 2017 reasons for refusal.
8. "Piecemeal" is defined as something characterized by unsystematic partial measures taken over a period of time.



9. In this context it is instructive to note that development proposals are now being advanced at New Warren Farm. A planning application was submitted in respect of this by Donnington New Homes in March 2018. Those development proposals were formed alongside the Applicants' scheme that was also submitted in March 2018. Both applications are based on a common set of parameter plans (termed 'combined plans') and a Schedule of Infrastructure Commitments appended to a signed Memorandum of Understanding.
10. In December 2019, Donnington New Homes amended their scheme and the Combined Plans have been updated to reflect those changes. It remains the case that the two schemes correspond to and are aligned with each other without prejudicing the ability of the other application to come forward individually.
11. It is evident that the various land use components of Core Strategy Policy CS3 are met by the two applications.
12. The relevance of this is considered when addressing the various reasons for refusal that cite piecemeal development, to illustrate why this criticism is no longer valid.
13. Where relevant, consultation responses from 2018 are cited and included as *Appendices*. Similarly, references are provided to application documents including the Draft Section 106 Agreement dated 24th October 2019.

Reason for Refusal 1

14. Reason for Refusal 1 states that the application for only part of the allocation site is contrary to Policy GS1, which requires an appropriately masterplanned scheme which secures the delivery of a comprehensive development and ensures timely and co-ordinated provision of infrastructure, services, open space and facilities.
15. Whilst there are two current planning applications, these have been prepared together and the respective Parameter Plans and illustrative masterplans align with one another and reflect the arrangement of land uses shown on the Framework Masterplan within the Sandleford Park SPD (Figure 13). Together, the two schemes provide the component parts of Policy CS3.
16. In the case of Sandleford Park, this seeks planning permission for 1000 new homes, extra care housing, the mixed use local centre, the country park, equipped areas of play, a new primary school and land for the extension of park house school. Sandleford Park West also seeks permission for 500 new homes including extra care housing, education, a community facility, and associated open space and green infrastructure.
17. The alignment of the main access route and other pedestrian/cycle links are shown contiguous at the boundary of the two sites. Both applicants have committed to building a road to the boundary of their respective parcels within a prescribed period of time from the commencement of development, which will provide a through route from Monks Lane and the A339 to Andover Road (WYG Planning Statement, December 2019, para 3.2).
18. There are no land use aspects of Policy CS3 which are not being provided by the schemes when viewed together, thus the proposals constitute comprehensive development.
19. Bloor Homes/Sandleford Farm Partnership and Donnington New Homes have set out their



commitment to providing infrastructure for the proposed developments in Appendix 2 of the Memorandum of Understanding. This identifies infrastructure that is directly related to the two schemes individually and infrastructure that is common to both. In preparing a draft Section 106 Agreement, particular attention has been given to ensuring that direct provision of infrastructure or financial contributions towards common infrastructure is provided in a timely way so that development of either site can proceed independently of the other but without the one prejudicing the other in any manner.

20. For example, the trigger clauses for the highway improvements are on the basis of completions irrespective of the origin of the trip within the two developments. On the basis that the latest trigger event is the occupation of the 500th dwelling, were development only to proceed at Sandleford Park then all of the monies for the highway improvements will have been paid to the Council providing surety that the mitigation package can be provided in its entirety (Schedule 4 of the draft Section 106 Agreement refers) .
21. Similarly, for the Country Park, the Applicants for Sandleford Park intend to lay out the Country Park in two phases associated with its development parcels (Schedule 3 of the draft Section 106 Agreement refers).
22. Financial contributions for the expansion of Park House School have also been structured on the basis of four packages of improvements. The trigger events are structured in such a way as to enable additional capacity at the school early in the development's progression so that there is excess capacity being generated through the life of the School expansion project. On this basis, both developments can proceed simultaneously or independently of one another with surety of available secondary school spaces (Schedule 1 of the Draft S106 Agreement refers).
23. For these reasons the developments should be considered to be appropriately masterplanned, comprehensive in nature and co-ordinated in terms of the approach to infrastructure. Moreover, when considering Sandleford Park on its own, this approach provides the basis for granting planning permission independently from Sandleford Park West as it does not prejudice delivery of remainder of the allocation; indeed the Bloor Homes/Sandleford Farm Partnership proposals facilitate development at Sandleford Park West.

Reason for Refusal 2

24. Reason for Refusal 2 states that as there is no Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan for the whole allocated site, there has not been a holistic approach to landscape and visual impact and green infrastructure.
25. Both planning applications assess the respective and combined effects of the proposed developments on landscape and visual receptors and ecology features.
26. Both planning applications are accompanied by a common Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan which identifies the protection and enhancement measures proposed for the two parcels of land.
27. The landscape features within the application site including the Ancient Woodlands, hedgerows and trees are, wherever possible, protected. Particular regard has been had to the design of the Country Park from the perspective of existing and proposed landscape features



and historic landscape and from a visual perspective in views from St Gabriel's School (Grade I Listed Building). The landscape and visual effects of the proposed development and the landscape and green infrastructure measures are generally to the satisfaction of the Council's landscape consultant (Kirkham Landscape Planning response to application 18/00764/OUTMAJ 4th June 2018, see *Appendix 1*). Where additional information has been sought, this has been provided in the Environmental Statement.

28. The effects of the proposed development on ecological assets has been considered in the Environmental Statement. A comprehensive suite of surveys has been undertaken during 2017, 2018 and 2019 and are generally to the satisfaction of the Council's ecological consultant (BSG Response to application 18/00764/OUTMAJ 21st May 2018, see *Appendix 2*).
29. Alongside this, a net biodiversity calculation (Environmental Statement F21) has been provided which illustrates a positive increase in the biodiversity value of the site.
30. A common approach is adopted in both applications to the hedgerow that forms the boundary between the two sites. Detailed design of the treatment of this hedgerow on either side is a matter for subsequent Reserved Matters approval in due course (Draft Condition 1).
31. The approach to green infrastructure on the DNH Site is similarly seeking to retain and, wherever possible, enhance landscape and biodiversity features as shown on their Parameter Plans and the combined Green Infrastructure Plan. Any revisions to the DNH scheme must still meet relevant Local Plan policies so as to ensure an appropriate scheme is delivered and the LPA are able to control this.
32. Accordingly, the proposed developments would provide a planned approach to landscape and green infrastructure addressing this reason for refusal.

Reason for Refusal 3

33. Reason for Refusal 3 states that the submitted Landscape and Visual Assessment does not appropriately assess the visual impact of the proposed development on the public right of way (Footpath GREE/9) running through the Application Site.
34. GREE/9 runs in an east-west direction from the A339 Newtown Road to Warren Road. The eastern half of this route would be situated within the Country Park. The western half would be enclosed by Development Parcel Centre but set within a Green Corridor as shown on the Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan. Both views from this section of the footpath, and the character of the footpath itself, would change as a result of this; but this was always anticipated because of the arrangement of land uses proposed within the Framework Masterplan within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document proposes (Figure 7 refers).
35. The Environmental Statement considers the visual effects on this western half of the public right of way in Chapter 7 and Appendix G10. Management and enhancement of existing vegetation, together with structure planting within the residential areas will help to mitigate the visual effects of the development. This will be secured through the detail design and management arrangements for the Country Park in due course (Draft Condition 21 and Schedule 3 of the Draft S106 Agreement refers), but are explained in outline in the Landscape and Green Infrastructure Design and Management Plan (Environmental Statement Appendix G7).



Reason for Refusal 4

36. Reason for Refusal 4 states that there has not been consideration or definitive assessment of the proposed development on the historic landscape. Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement includes an assessment of the effects on historic landscape and Appendix G9 provides a specific Heritage and Landscape Assessment of the proposed Country Park.
37. Historic England have not objected to previous planning applications submitted for development at Sandlesford Park and have advised that the Council seek conservation and archaeological advice (response 15th May 2018, see *Appendix 3*).
38. The Council's Archaeologist has not raised any objection to the proposed development and advises that a planning condition should be imposed on the grant of planning permission securing a programme of archaeological investigation prior to and during the excavation of the foundations and any related groundworks, in particular for areas of development to the west and north of the site (response 7th June 2018, see *Appendix 4*). Draft Condition 38 proposes this in any event.
39. The Council's Conservation Officer provides the following comments: *"I have not had too much to say on previous applications for "Sandlesford Park", and note that this is an outline application with access to be considered. Accordingly, unless otherwise advised, no building conservation comments are offered for this application"* (response 25th July 2018, see *Appendix 5*).
40. The Council's appointed landscape consultant does not raise comments about the Heritage and Landscape Assessment per se. Comments are, however, made that the playing pitches proposed are considered harmful to the design objectives of the Country Park which were previously agreed. Notwithstanding the fact that playing pitches were proposed to address Reason for Refusal 9, the 2018 scheme was revised to remove the playing fields in the location shown following advice from the Case Officer to this effect (LPA Action Note 15th August 2019).
41. The landscape consultant also refers to a concern that the absence of a detailed design for the road bridge *"remains a problem"* and *"is still an issue on the impact of the development on the historic parkland estate"*. The Applicants have provided further information as regards to the potential design of the road bridge having regard to concerns about the risk of a closure of this highway but it is instructive to note that the Officer's Delegated Report for Application 16/03309/OUTMAJ states that: *"There are differing requirements for this bridge in highways, ecological and landscape terms that need resolving which could result in a very different solution to that indicated in the submitted DAS. As this application is seeking outline permission only, it is considered that details of the bridge and any ancillary landform changes could be dealt with under subsequent reserved matters applications"*. It is therefore clear that the Council have accepted that detailed design of the bridge can be dealt with at the Reserved Matters stage.

Reason for Refusal 5

42. Reason for Refusal 5 suggests green links were not sufficient. In response, the Land Use and Access Parameter Plan, Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan and the Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan propose addition green links both to Monks Lane and the Sandlesford Park West Application Site.



43. In response to this previously, the Council's landscape consultant's comments are as follows: *"I believe this has been largely resolved but the main road access through the site and into Sandleford West, linking Monks Lane to Andover Road, should be designed as a green corridor as illustrated in the Masterplan and shown on the Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan"* (Appendix 1 refers). The appearance of the main access route is a detailed matter that will be determined through Reserved Matters Applications having regard to the Design and Access Statement and the Council's SPD. In this context, the Key Design Principles for the Main Access Road specified in the Design and Access Statement include the following: The Main Access Road will be identified through a strong, formal landscape character defined by landscape verges and regular pattern of street tree planting (page 70).
44. Later comments from the landscape consultant state that the proposed development now provides: *"A higher number and improved green access corridors connecting Monks Lane with the development: This is welcomed and as far as possible is a good approach, applicable as far as possible throughout the design layout."*

Reason for Refusal 6

45. Reason for Refusal 6 states that the "piecemeal" development within the allocated site fails to ensure the co-ordinated delivery of a well-planned, holistic network of green links throughout the whole site nor does it ensure coordinated delivery of the green links.
46. The two current planning applications have been prepared together and the respective Parameter Plans and Illustrative Masterplans for each application have been co-ordinated to align with one another and to ensure that the green links are delivered in a co-ordinated way.
47. The Council did not raise concerns over the location and extent of 'Green Links' shown on the Sandleford Park Parameters Plans and the Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan for Application 18/00764/OUTMAJ and the Council's landscape consultant's comments acknowledge that these reflect and address earlier concerns.
48. On the basis that future reserved matters applications would be required to be in substantial accordance with the approved parameter plans, the Council can be confident that the links identified by the outline permission will be delivered, and that this reason for refusal has been addressed.

Reason for Refusal 7

49. Reason for Refusal 7 states that the submitted ecological surveys were not current and as such the presence of protected species could not be established with sufficient certainty.
50. Up to date ecological surveys were undertaken in 2017, 2018 and 2019 and these have been submitted by the Applicants.
51. The Council appointed BSG to review the submitted ecological material for application 18/00764/OUTMAJ and we note their conclusion that there is no basis for an objection to the proposed development on ecological grounds and any uncertainties can be addressed through detailed design and additional management prescription (Appendix 2 refers).
52. The uncertainties referred to hydrological impact and impacts on ground fauna within the



ancient woodland. Planning Conditions have been proposed that will require both the detailed design of surface water schemes to be agreed prior to the commencement of development and also the design and management of the Country Park which would include the areas of woodland (Draft Conditions 13, 14, 15, 16 and 21 refer).

53. In addition, a net biodiversity calculator has been provided; this concludes that the proposed development will have a beneficial effect on biodiversity.

Reason for Refusal 8

54. Reason for Refusal 8 raises the concern that the delivery of the whole allocated site relies upon the provision of highway accesses onto the A343 via Warren Road and Kendrick Road and that both these means of access have associated landscape and ecological considerations that may require mitigation in the form of new landscaping and green infrastructure. It states that the application has not established this or proposed how this can be achieved. It continues to assert that the piecemeal approach to development prejudices the delivery of the above points of access and the protection and mitigation required in relation to ecology and landscape.
55. The VISSIM modelling undertaken has demonstrated that 1000 new homes and associated uses on the Bloor/SFP land can be accommodated with junction improvements on the local highway network. This is explained in the accompanying Transport Assessment with corresponding improvements identified in the Draft Section 106 Agreement (Schedule 4 refers). The proposed development does not therefore require the construction of the Warren Road and Kendrick Drive points of access nor does it prejudice their delivery as part of the DNH application.
56. DNH have assessed the environmental effects of its development proposals on the landscape and ecology features along Warren Road and Kendrick Drive and proposed mitigation measures are set out in the Sandlesford Park West planning application.

Reason for Refusal 9

57. Reason for Refusal 9 concerns the loss of playing field land at Newbury Rugby Club and the lack of suitable replacement has a detrimental impact on access to high quality open spaces and sport and recreational opportunities.
58. To address this, new playing fields were proposed in the March 2018 scheme, but this drew objections from the Council's landscape officer and this element of the scheme was not supported.
59. Council Officers encouraged these playing fields to be removed from the scheme and promoted an alternative community use of playing field land to be provided as part of the Park House School extension (LPA Action Note 15th August 2019, JB email 16th January 2019, *Appendix 7* refers). Discussions with the Local Education Authority and Park House School indicated support for this as it follows the existing model of community use at the School.
60. The Draft Section 106 Agreement proposes a community use agreement as part of the transfer of land for the expansion of Park House School (Schedule 9 refers).



61. In addition to this, the Draft Section 106 Agreement proposes financial contributions to improve facilities at Newbury Rugby Club (Schedule 6 refers).
62. Both measures ensure that access to high quality open spaces and sport and recreational opportunities continues and thus address this Reason for Refusal.

Reason for Refusal 10

63. Reason for Refusal 10 states that the piecemeal development of only part of the allocated site is considered to prejudice the delivery of sufficient, comprehensive, varied and maintained SUDS infrastructure across the whole site.
64. It is important to recognise that the topography of the allocated site is such that the two application sites operate within separate catchment areas.
65. For the application site, surface water drains in a southerly direction via the Country Park where attenuation features are proposed, as shown on the Illustrative Surface Water Drainage Strategy (10309-DR-02). The Council's drainage officer's consultation response states that *"We have reviewed the proposals for the management and surface water runoff and consider the proposals to be acceptable in principle subject to further design as the layout develops"* (response 11th May 2018, see *Appendix 6*). Planning conditions are proposed requiring detailed design to accord with the principles set out in Brookbanks Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (2019) (Draft Conditions 13, 14 and 15 refer).
66. For New Warren Farm, land naturally drains to the woodland valley behind the existing Farm House (Brick Kiln Copse) and south to the River Enborne. SUDS are proposed by DNH to cater for surface water drainage from its development. There is no basis for BH/SFP's drainage proposals to accommodate additional SUDS infrastructure to cater for the DNH scheme.

Reason for Refusal 11

67. Reason for Refusal 11 states that a comprehensive drainage strategy for waste-water cannot be secured for the whole allocated site and it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that adequate waste water drainage can be provided without prejudicing the comprehensive delivery of such infrastructure. Again, the two sites drain independently of one another and the information submitted demonstrates that waste-water infrastructure can be provided.

Reason for Refusal 12

68. Reason for Refusal 12 alleges that the absence of a site wide Ecological Mitigation Management Plan results in a fragmented approach which prejudices the strategic approach to ecology and the comprehensive delivery of ecological mitigation and enhancement.
69. A Combined Ecological Mitigation and Management Principles document has been prepared (Environmental Statement F19) and this is based on the combined development proposals and the combined Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan.
70. In so far as the application site is concerned, the Council's ecological consultant does not raise an objection to the proposed development. None of the comments from the Council's ecological consultant raise any issues with the Combined Ecological Mitigation and



Management Principles document submitted with Application 18/00764/OUTMAJ. It is therefore concluded that this includes appropriate measures across the Site as a whole which are acceptable to address this Reason for Refusal.

Reasons for Refusal 13 and 14

71. Reason for Refusal 13 states that the application fails to provide additional pedestrian and cycle links and distribute traffic from the development. Reason for Refusal 14 similarly states that appropriate highway mitigation measures have not been provided.
72. The VISSIM modelling undertaken has led to an agreed approach to off-site junction improvements, and improvements to pedestrian and cycle links (WBC Highway Officer email correspondence and mitigation table, *Appendix 8*). These mitigation measures are identified in the draft Section 106 Agreement along with funding mechanism to ensure their timely provision (Schedule 4). As a consequence, we understand that the Council's Highway Officer is satisfied that the proposed development will not have a severe impact on the local highway network and that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Reason for Refusal 15

73. Reason for Refusal 15 states that the Applicants have not demonstrated that there would not be a severe impact on the A34 Strategic Road Network. During the course of the consideration of the application 18/00764/OUT, the Applicants have discussed traffic impact on the A34 corridor with Highways England and consider that it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that additional traffic from the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the strategic highway network. Information has been provided to Highways England in respect of traffic distribution and flows as part of the VISSIM modelling and no further comments have been received. The Transport Assessment demonstrates that the proposed development does not have a severe impact on the Strategic Highway Network.

Reason for Refusal 16

74. Reason for Refusal 16 states that the proposed development does not provide an appropriate scheme of works for off-site mitigation measures to accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.
75. In respect of pedestrians and cyclists, the draft Section 106 identifies the improvement scheme that has been discussed and agreed with the Council's Officers (Schedule 4 refers).
76. In respect of public transport, discussions with the Council and local providers have identified options to service the proposed development in the short and long term and would provide residents of the proposed development with convenient access to a frequent bus service to the town centre. In December 2019 Newbury Buses provided a strategy and scheme to provide public transport to serve the development (*Appendix 9* refers). Financial obligations to fund such a service are included within the Draft Section 106 Agreement (Schedule 6).

Reason for Refusal 17

77. Reason for Refusal 17 states that the proposal fails to adequately integrate the layout of internal circulation routes with the access links needed to successfully deliver an appropriate



access strategy and access location associated with the development of the whole allocated site.

78. The combined Land Use and Access Parameter Plans address this reason for refusal, illustrating points of access and internal circulation routes within the proposed developments. These align with corresponding access and internal circulation routes proposed as part of the DNH scheme and also such locations as Park House School, Newbury College, Newbury College Link Road, and the Public Right of Way through the site between Newtown Road and Andover Road.

Reason for Refusal 18

79. Reason for Refusal 18 states that no comprehensive planning of the site has taken place.
80. Both the Bloor/SFP application and the DNH applications have been developed in an integrated manner to align and correspond with each other and provide a co-ordinated approach to the future development of the entire allocated site. This is illustrated on the combined plans and supporting information.
81. The Infrastructure Schedule appended to Memorandum of Understanding sets out the commitments made by both Applicants to deliver necessary infrastructure associated with the proposed development(s). This is carried forward into the Draft Section 106 Agreement, to the extent that a comprehensive infrastructure package has been identified with appropriate trigger mechanisms to ensure timely provision.

Reason for Refusal 19

82. Reason for Refusal 19 repeats earlier comments about preventing the holistically planned and comprehensive delivery of pedestrian and cycle mitigation and bus services provision which have been addressed in response to RFR13 and 14. It adds to this that there is no comprehensive Framework Travel Plan or Travel Plan co-ordinator.
83. A new Travel Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of this application which includes principles, objectives and measures that can be applied across both schemes. There are common elements to both applications including the provisions associated with a Travel Plan co-ordinator.

Reasons for Refusal 20 and 21

84. Reasons for Refusal 20 and 21 state that the air quality and noise assessments are not based on up to date highway modelling. The VISSIM Modelling undertaken in 2019 has produced more up to date traffic flows which have been used in the current air quality and noise assessments. The Environmental Assessment has in turn considered the air quality and noise effects of 1000 and 1500 dwellings proposed across the allocation (Chapters 14 and 15 refer). Neither assessment predicts an adverse effect that would justify planning permission being refused.

Reason for Refusal 22

85. Reason for Refusal 22 requires the provision of suitable facilities for a warden/ranger for the



Country Park. The location of such a facility is now shown on the Land Use and Access Parameter Plan and would be provided as part of the works to lay out the Country Park pursuant to a planning condition (Draft Planning Condition 21).

Reason for Refusal 23

86. Reason for Refusal 23 states that because of uncertainty around housing mix and therefore future pupil yield, it cannot be established whether contributions towards Early Years, Primary School and Secondary School provision would be sufficient.
87. The Applicants has specified the housing mix it intends to build and this is to be secured as a planning obligation (Schedule 8 Part 2(7) and draft Planning Condition 49). On this basis there does in fact exist certainty through the Council's Pupil Places Calculator as to the number of Early Years and Primary School places that would be generated and the extent to which these can be satisfactorily accommodated at the proposed Primary School.
88. In respect of Secondary School provision, the Applicants have prepared a bespoke School expansion scheme that accommodates the number of places arising from its development, and also the development at New Warren Farm (SPW) and spaces to meet existing needs for which the Council has collected monies from other developments. The scheme meets the space requirements arising from the relevant Design Bulletin and having regard to the current teaching spaces within the School.
89. The School expansion scheme can be provided in four delivery packages and the Section 106 Agreement provides obligations to fund three of the four phases alongside specified triggers. These delivery packages create spaces for more than the number of dwellings concerned so that additional capacity is provided so that both proposed developments can proceed.

Reasons for Refusal 24 and 25

90. Reasons for Refusal 24 and 25 state that the piecemeal approach introduces uncertainty as to the likely total number of dwellings to be provided on the whole allocated site and that this prejudices the ability to determine education and healthcare provision.
91. The two submitted planning applications together propose 1580 new homes (including Extra Care) which is within the parameter set by Policy CS3 and the mitigation measures are all calculated on this basis.
92. Trigger mechanisms in the Draft Section 106 Agreement will determine when monies are provided to facilitate such infrastructure.

Reason for Refusal 26

93. Reason for Refusal 26 states that the absence of an agreed and approved masterplan for the whole allocated site or the ability to secure design principles for the remainder of the allocated site precludes the achievement of holistic planning of the whole site.
94. Both the Bloor/SFP application and the DNH application align and correspond and reflect a co-ordinated approach to future development. This is illustrated on the combined plans submitted by both Applicants.



95. Both the submitted application by Bloor/SFP and that by DNH are accompanied by Design and Access Statements that set out development and design principles, drawing upon the LPA's Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document. The LPA are able to determine whether either proposal is satisfactory in these terms.

Reason for Refusal 27

96. Reason for Refusal 27 states that necessary infrastructure, facilities and services (Education, Public Open Space including play areas and Country Parkland, SuDS, Healthcare, Highways and Transport) have not been secured. This reflects the fact that at the time the application was determined these matters had not been agreed between the parties; it is certainly not the case that the Applicants do not consider that such infrastructure is required. For this application, the Applicants have prepared a Draft Section 106 Agreement that includes provisions in respect of each of these matters.

Reason for Refusal 28

97. The final reason for refusal asserts that the Applicants approach creates uncertainty and increases the burden on future development of the remainder of the site to provide key infrastructure and facilities. This risk prejudicing the delivery of housing, including affordable housing over the plan period.
98. In the context of two planning applications aligned in the way that they are and the commitments made by both Applicants to infrastructure provision, this uncertainty and notion of increased burden falls away. Each application provides it fair share of infrastructure costs to meet the policy objective of a comprehensive development.
99. Granting planning permission for the proposed development in the terms set out both in respect of the components and arrangement of development, and the commitment to be given effect through planning conditions and planning obligations to ensure infrastructure is provided in a holistic and comprehensive manner, facilitates development of the overall allocation.

Conclusion

100. The above demonstrates how the Reason for Refusal relating to planning application 16/03309/OUTMAJ have been addressed in the new planning application for Sandleford Park.
101. Earlier objections to the proposed development on the basis of piecemeal development are not valid on the basis of the joint work and co-ordinated schemes proposed by Bloor Homes/Sandleford Farm Partnership and Donnington New Homes and the fact that both schemes align with and correspond to one another without prejudicing the delivery of either site individually.
102. Moreover, the infrastructure commitments made by Bloor Homes/Sandleford Farm Partnership demonstrate how infrastructure arising from its needs (primary school, areas of play, drainage, access) and infrastructure common to both schemes (namely Park House School Expansion and Delivery Packages, off site highway, pedestrian and cycle improvements, the provision of the Country Park, the Local Centre) can be delivered in conjunction with their development to ensure timely provision of infrastructure required to serve the allocation as a



whole. Elements of infrastructure specific to Sandlesford Park West will be delivered by Donnington New Homes.

103. For these reasons, the Sandlesford Park scheme is consistent with the underlying objectives of Policy GS1 which requires an appropriately masterplanned scheme which secures the delivery of a comprehensive development and ensures the timely and co-ordinated provision of infrastructure, services, open space and facilities.
104. Also, for these reasons, planning permission can be granted for the Bloor Homes/Sandlesford Farm Partnership scheme without prejudicing development at Sandlesford Park West by Donnington New Homes.



Appendix 1 Kirkham Landscape Consultants response dated 4th June 2018

WEST BERKSHIRE COUNCIL

OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 18/00764

SANDLEFORD PARK, NEWTOWN ROAD, NEWTOWN, NEWBURY

Outline planning permission for up to 1,000 new homes; an 80 bed extra care facility as part of the affordable housing provision; a new 2 form entry primary school (D1); expansion land for Park House Academy School; a local centre to comprise flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5 up to 2,150sq m, B1a up to 200sq m) and D1 use; the formation of new means of access onto Monks Lane; new open space including the laying out of a new country park; drainage infrastructure; walking and cycling infrastructure and other associated infrastructure works. Matters to be considered: Access

INTERIM COMMENTS

A. Introduction

- A.1 This current application is in effect a revision to an earlier application 16/03309 which was refused. The landscape reasons which should be addressed included- reason in ():
- A.2 *The lack of a single Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan for the whole of the allocated site, together with inconsistencies between details which have been provided, results in a failure to provide a holistic approach to the landscape, visual impact and green infrastructure for development of the whole of the Sandleford Strategic Site Allocation (2):* Now provided in conjunction with Sandleford West although will need updating as the applications evolve.
- A.3 *The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) fails to appropriately assess the visual impact of the proposed development as seen from the public right of way running through the application site. The Assessment does not provide a consideration from a viewpoint from the public right of way, east of viewpoint 2, which would illustrate and allow assessment of the full visual impact of the development proposed on landscape (3):* Nothing has been done to address this. A new viewpoint east of Viewpoint 2 (see Figure 7.6A) on the edge of the site should be included.
- A.4 *The submitted ES refers to, and relies upon, a Heritage and Landscape study (ref: SLR 2016) which has not been submitted with this application (4).* Now submitted.

- A.5 *Contrary to the submitted Design and Access Statement, the proposed development illustrates a lack of green links within the scheme (5). I believe this has been largely resolved but the main road access through the site and into Sandleford West, linking Monks Lane to Andover Road, should be designed as a green corridor as illustrated in the Masterplan and shown on the Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan*
- A.6 *The proposed piecemeal development within the allocated site fails to ensure the co-ordinated delivery of a well-planned, holistic network of green links throughout the whole of the allocated site (6). See above*
- A.7 *The delivery of the whole of the allocated Sandleford Strategic site relies on the provision of highway accesses onto the A343 via Warren Road and Kendrick Road. The existing landscape and ecology of the area (both on and off the application site), and the impact of the proposed development on that, necessitates attention and mitigation in the form of new landscaping and green infrastructure. The application has not established or proposed that such mitigation can be achieved (8). This remains unresolved – see my Report on 18/00828 Sandleford West.*
- A.8 The current proposals differ from 16/03309 in the following way:
- A greater number and improved green access corridors connecting Monks Lane with the development;
 - New road access leading to Newtown Road;
 - Change to the school site boundary and consequent changes to the housing layout;
 - Road bridge over the valley south of Crook's Copse (replacing the footbridge);
 - Less linear edge to the development adjacent to the north-east side of the main valley;
 - Further slight pulling back of development overlooking the NEAP in the Country Park;
 - Car parking close to the NEAP;
 - Change to central square in Phase 3;
 - Increased areas of higher 3 storey areas in the central square and on the school land;
 - Two sports pitches between High Wood and the kitchen garden to the Registered Sandleford Priory Park and Garden and new linear hedge with trees between High Wood and the kitchen garden linking to southern boundary of the kitchen garden.

B. Comments on ES

Berkshire Landscape Character Assessment 2003

- B.1 The LVIA includes this Study. The site lies in LCA H2: Greenham Woodland and Heathland Mosaic but the ES omits the following guidance:
- To preserve features of archaeological or historic significance including the active management of important parklands;

- To conserve a wooded context to the settlement and the prominent and visually sensitive ridge tops.

Newbury District-wide Landscape Character Assessment 1993

- B.2 The LVIA includes this Study but pays little attention to it. The whole site lies within LCT 18A Degraded Parkland. The Landscape Strategy is of enhancement with the note that the restoration works should be carried in consultation with the then English Heritage. The guidelines are set in the context of restoring the historic parkland. Although the allocation of the site as a strategic development site through the SPD supersedes the current landscape character, much of the site is to be used as a Country Park and therefore the following guidance is still relevant:
- Planting of new tree clumps and single specimens;
 - Thinning, coppicing and replanting of woodlands to maintain semi-enclosed character;
 - Plant new tree screens and woodlands to edges of park particularly to soften visually degraded areas and new development;
 - Encourage restoration to pasture of farmland and open space;
 - Protect streams and ponds from contamination;
 - Maintain public rights of way.

C. Comments on design changes or outstanding matters from previous application

- C.1 The lack of detail on how the road bridge over the valley remains a problem and is still an issue on the impact of the development on the historic parkland estate. I could not find an illustrative scheme in the Transport Statement.
- C.2 The Plans show that the Green Infrastructure Plan Parameters Plan (Boyer) should read in conjunction with the Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan (SLR). I am happy with this. Both should be included as approved drawings under this outline application in due course once all details have been amended and agreed as necessary.
- C.3 The Country Park Phasing Plan shows that the laying out of the western part of the Park will be delayed to coincide with Phase 3. As raised before Parcel North 2 adjoins the valley and the main road access will be required before Phase 3 can go ahead. I suggest that the north part of the Country Park could be delivered (and certainly designed) with the design of the road and the interface with Phase 2.
- C.4 Considerable effort was made in the evolution of the previous application to prevent any adverse effects on views from Sandford Priory. The Landscape Strategy, but not the GI plans or Masterplan, shows a car park within an area

set aside for open space north of the NEAP. This will limit tree planting in the open space and cars could be visually intrusive. Details of what is anticipated should be provided. The NEAP will need to be an unobtrusive facility in keeping with the objectives of the Country Park. If it is of an conspicuous design and more suitable for urban or suburban areas, it will need to be moved into the development area. The detailed design of this area will have to be carefully considered at reserved matters stage.

C.5 The Strategic Planting Plan 04627.00005.16.307.2 which accompanied the previous application showed strategic woodland, tree group and hedgerow planting. The only current plan is Figure 7.7 which shows a small amount of advanced planting. The agreed advanced planting should be shown on a full revised Strategic Planting Plan.

C.6 A number of issues were raised before which are still relevant to the reserved matters design:

- An integrated approach is needed to the landscape design of interface between the Country Park and the development parcels
- Tree planting and hedgerows along Monks Lane should be continuous except for breaks for vehicular or pedestrian access
- The design of the eastern boundary should allow space for vegetation retention and new planting
- Space for internal open space and tree planting within the development areas must be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

D. Comments on new design aspects

- D.1 *A higher number and improved green access corridors connecting Monks Lane with the development:* This is welcomed and as far as possible is a good approach, applicable as far as possible throughout the design layout.
- D.2 *New road access leading to Newtown Road:* I have no objections to this proposal provided the route within the site and beyond up to Newtown Road is set within a green corridor to enhance the landscape structure of the area. Illustrative plans to be submitted.
- D.3 *Change to the school site boundary and consequent changes to the housing layout:* No comment.
- D.4 *Road bridge over the valley south of Crooks Copse (replacing the footbridge):* This is shown on a long curve just south of Crook's Copse and will require careful design to integrate it into the landform and avoid harm to the northern point of the Country Park. It will sever the Copse from the rest of the park so the detailed landscape scheme should seek to create landscape links between the north and south sides of the road.
- D.5 *Less linear edge to the development adjacent to the north-east side of the main Park valley:* This is welcomed.
- D.6 *Change to central square in Phase 3:* This has moved south-west from the building line into the proposed wide Green Link flanking the existing footpath through the site. Although shown planted with trees, the square is essentially a vehicular through route. The Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan shows how the Green Link is now interrupted by the square. This Green Link is a principal landscape corridor within the development and in order to meet policy L6 should 'avoid large areas of built form'. The footpath no longer goes through the green corridor at this point but through southern edge of the main access route. The inclusion of a well landscaped part hard surfaced central square within the local centre might be acceptable as long as it too was traffic free except for the single road link. Otherwise the current scheme would have a detrimental effect on the provision of this strategic Green Link.
- D.7 *Increased areas of higher 3 storey areas in the central square and on the school land:* No objections as this should not be visually intrusive from the wider landscape, in particular Sandleford Priory.

- D.8 *Two sports pitches between High Wood and the kitchen garden to the Registered Sandleford Priory Park and Garden:* These pitches are not in accordance with the objectives for the Country Park. The Park has been designed through several discussions to ensure that the Park is only used for informal recreation and public access in accordance with SPD P1; CA9; CA10; L5; and L8. The site of the proposed sports pitches lie west of the Registered Park and Garden Kitchen Garden and will be visible from Sandleford Priory. As the land is on a slope, changes in levels will be needed. The proposed line of hedgerow and trees will also further isolate the Kitchen Garden from the remainder of the Country Park. I understand that Stewart Souden is also concerned about the lack of road access, parking or facilities for these pitches. The introduction of such infrastructure would have a further detrimental effect on the Country Park, the setting of the Registered Park and Garden and potentially views from Sandleford Priory. As the pitches lie outside of the red line it does not appear that they have been assessed for the impact on the historic landscape and the Registered Park and Garden; been included in the LVIA; or been assessed in the montage views from the Priory.
- D.9 The SPD shows the location of the sports pitches as 'site infrastructure' (with no clear indication what was envisaged in this location) but recent agreed layouts for the Country Park show an appropriate scheme for this area including amenity grassland, meadow grassland, tree planting including a small orchard, responding to the topography, landscape structure and sensitivity of the location.

E. Conclusion

The following need to be addressed:

- Deletion of sports pitches and accompanying screen planting to the south (see para D.8 and D.9);
- Lack of detail for the two road bridges across part of the Country Park (see C.1 and D.4);
- Review of phasing of north part of Phase 3 of the Country Park (see para C.3);
- More information on proposed car park north of the NEAP (see para C.4);
- Inclusion of viewpoint east of viewpoint 2 from the footpath at the edge of the site (particularly important in order to assess the effect of the proposed central square);
- A full revised Strategic Planting Plan including advanced planting (see C.5);
- Inclusion of a green corridor to the road link from Phase 1 to Newtown Road (see para D.2);
- Review of the design and location of the Phase 3 central square (see para D.6);
- Minor amendments to baseline in LVIA (para B.1 and B.2).



Appendix 3 Historic England response dated 15th May 2018

From: [REDACTED]
To: Planapps
Subject: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 18/00764/OUTMAJ
Attachments: 1800764OUTMAJ_HERef_P00870290_L315881.doc

This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. STOP. THINK before you CLICK links or OPEN attachments.

Dear Mr [REDACTED],

Please find attached our advice on the following site -

Sandleford Park Newtown Road Newtown Newbury Berkshire
Application No(s):18/00764/OUTMAJ

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

We help people understand, enjoy and value the historic environment, and protect it for the future. Historic England is a public body, and we champion everyone's heritage, across England.

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. Please read our full privacy policy (<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/terms/privacy-cookies/>) for more information.



Historic England


SOUTH EAST OFFICE



Direct Dial: 020 7973 3707

Our ref: **W:** P00870290

15 May 2018

Dear Mr 

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**SANDLEFORD PARK NEWTOWN ROAD NEWTOWN NEWBURY BERKSHIRE
Application No. 18/00764/OUTMAJ**

Thank you for your letter of 11 April 2018 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Yours sincerely



Business Officer

E-mail: 



EASTGATE COURT 195-205 HIGH STREET GUILDFORD SURREY GU1 3EH

Telephone 01483 252020
HistoricEngland.org.uk





Appendix 4 WBC Archaeologist response dated 7th June 2018

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07/06/2018 19:18:09
To: Planapps; [REDACTED]
Subject: 18/00764/OUTMAJ - Sandleford Park, Newtown Road, Newtown
Attachments: CWB8606 - Sandleford Park, Newtown Road, Newtown.pdf

Dear Planapps

Thank you for your consultation – the response from the archaeology service is attached.

Best wishes

[REDACTED]
Senior Archaeologist (Planning & Management Advice)

[REDACTED]
www.westberks.gov.uk/archaeology

Internal Consultation Response

To: [REDACTED], Planning Officer

Our Ref: CWB8606

From: [REDACTED]

Your Ref: 18/00764/OUTMAJ

Extn: 2805

Date: 07/06/2018

18/00764/OUTMAJ: Outline planning permission for up to 1,000 new homes; an 80 bed extra care facility as part of the affordable housing provision; a new 2 form entry primary school (D1); expansion land for Park House Academy School; a local centre to comprise flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5 up to 2,150sq m, B1a up to 200sq m) and D1 use; the formation of new means of access onto Monks Lane; new open space including the laying out of a new country park; drainage infrastructure; walking and cycling infrastructure and other associated infrastructure works. Matters to be considered: Access.

Sandleford Park, Newtown Road, Newtown, Newbury

Thank you for your consultation of 11/04/2018 on the above planning application which follows some previous applications. The submitted documents acknowledge that the site has some archaeological interest, with further potential for as yet unknown buried remains to survive. Some fieldwork has already taken place, although the fieldwalking survey and trial trench evaluation were over 20 years ago; a geophysical survey has been carried out more recently on land to the west, in 2013. Taken together they demonstrate archaeological evidence from the Roman, medieval and post-medieval periods.

Further investigation will be required where the development footprint will have an impact, and I request that the applicants be asked to commission a programme of archaeological investigation prior to and during the excavation of the foundations and any related groundworks, in particular for areas of development to the west and north of the site. These investigations should take a phased approach, with a combination of geophysical survey for areas not already covered by previous work, with subsequent archaeological investigation where appropriate. Mitigation may be required where there is a high level of significance and substantial negative impact. Provision should be made for the recording, analysis, publication and archiving of heritage assets of archaeological interest.

This should be secured by applying the following condition to any approval granted:

No development/site works/development shall take place within the application area until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved statement.

Reason: To ensure that any significant archaeological remains that are found are adequately recorded.

Such an approach follows the guidance set out in paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

If you would like to discuss this site further please do not hesitate to contact me.

[REDACTED]
Senior Archaeologist (Planning and Management Advice)



Appendix 5 WBC Conservation Officer response dated 25th July 2018

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 July 2018 12:38
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Conservation comments: 18/00764/OUTMAJ - Sandleford Park. Newtown Road, Newtown Road, Newbury

Dear [REDACTED],

This has belatedly crossed my path (following my extended leave of absence).

I have not had too much to say on previous applications for "Sandleford Park", and note that this is an outline application with access to be considered. Accordingly, unless otherwise advised, no building conservation comments are offered for this application.

Regards,

[REDACTED], **Principal Conservation & Design Officer**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Please note: My normal working days are Wednesday, Thursday & Friday



Appendix 6 WBC drainage comments dated 11th May 2018

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11/05/2018 13:54:35
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 18-00764 Sandleford Park, Newtown Road, Newtown, Newbury

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for consulting on the above application.

We have reviewed the proposals for the management and surface water runoff and consider the proposals to be **acceptable** in principle subject to further design as the layout develops.

We are pleased to note the indicative inclusion of bio-retention features within the development parcels and would wish to see this followed through to the final layout. Opportunities should be considered to implement further on-parcel SuDS to improve water quality. As suggested in the Flood Risk Assessment, this may include permeable paving, tree pits or swales. This approach accords with discussions at the meeting between the applicant and my colleagues, Jon Bowden and Stuart Clark, on 10 June 2016. Please note that the requirements of the Highways Authority should be taken on board for any SuDS within the adoptable highway.

We note that the proposals involve swales/conveyance greenways running parallel to the watercourse to feed the attenuation basins. It is important that the watercourse and swales are kept separate and not 'rationalised' as the layout develops. We would request that a minimum buffer of 3.5 metres is retained between the two conveyance features to allow access for maintenance. Furthermore, evidence should be submitted with any future applications that the swales are capable of conveying the 1 in 100 year, including climate change, event. It may be beneficial to design these swales as two stage channel to maximise water quality treatment and habitat improvement whilst maintaining the required flow capacity.

If the council is minded to approve the application we request that the following conditions are attached to the permission to ensure that flood risk is appropriately managed for the lifetime of the proposed development.

1. *No development shall take place until details of sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall be in accordance with the principles of the Brookbanks Flood Risk Assessment (dated February 2018). These details shall:*
 - a) *Incorporate the implementation of Sustainable Drainage methods (SuDS) in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (March 2015), the SuDS Manual C753 (2015) and West Berkshire Council local standards;*
 - b) *Include and be informed by a ground investigation survey which confirms the soil characteristics, infiltration rate and groundwater levels;*
 - c) *Include attenuation measures to retain rainfall run-off within the site and allow discharge from the site to an existing watercourse at no greater than the existing Qbar rate;*
 - d) *Include construction drawings, cross-sections and specifications of all proposed SuDS measures within the site;*
 - e) *Include run-off calculations, discharge rates, infiltration and storage capacity calculations for the proposed SuDS measures based on a 1 in 100 year storm + 40% for climate change;*
 - f) *Attenuation storage measures must have a 300mm freeboard above maximum design water level. Surface conveyance features must have a 150mm freeboard above maximum design water level;*
 - g) *Include pre-treatment methods to prevent any pollution or silt entering SuDS features or causing any contamination to the soil or groundwater;*
 - h) *Include details of how the SuDS measures will be maintained and managed after completion. These details shall be provided as part of a handover pack for subsequent purchasers and owners of the property/premises; and*

- i) *Include a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development. This plan shall incorporate arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a residents' management company or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.*

The above sustainable drainage measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the dwellings are first occupied or in accordance with a timetable to be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority as part of the details submitted for this condition. The sustainable drainage measures shall be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: *To ensure that surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner; to prevent the increased risk of flooding; to improve and protect water quality, habitat and amenity and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system can be, and is carried out in an appropriate and efficient manner. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Part 4 of Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006). A pre-condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.*

We would welcome continued discussions with the applicant as the drainage strategy develops and can be contacted directly for pre-application advice.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Senior Engineer (Land Drainage)

[Redacted]

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail



Appendix 7 WBC email correspondence regarding playing field provision 16th January 2019

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sandford Park
Date: 16 January 2019 16:42:43

Dear [REDACTED]

Following our meeting regarding education provision on Monday, I have spoken with Sport England and they would not be concerned if booking is required together with a (reasonable) charge to the public for the use of the sports pitches at Park House School outside of school hours. Should you wish to seek further views from Sport England regarding this I would suggest that you contact Vicky Aston whose contact details are within their consultation response to the application.

As promised at the meeting, the contact details for the Chief Executive of the Achievement for All Education Trust who now manage Park House School are:

[REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Tel: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Principal Planning Officer
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

www.westberks.gov.uk

This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed may not necessarily represent those of West Berkshire Council. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must neither take any action based upon its contents, nor copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this e-mail in error. All communication sent to or from West Berkshire Council may be subject to recording and or monitoring in accordance with UK legislation, are subject to the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and may therefore be disclosed to a third party on request.



**Appendix 8 WBC Highway Officer email correspondence regarding junction improvements
(July 2019)**

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, July 19, 2019 7:12 AM

To: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Sandleford Park

Hi [REDACTED], thank you for your email.

I can confirm that I am flexible over all of this. I have no strong views on who funds what, as long as it is all funded. As you know with the attached I made an attempt to apportion the mitigation should one developer proceed and not the other. However that can evolve and be subject to further discussions with myself and all parties.

I hope this helps

Kind Regards

[REDACTED] | Highways Development Control Team Leader
West Berkshire District Council

[REDACTED]

Tel [REDACTED]

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Sandleford Park

This is an **EXTERNAL EMAIL. STOP. THINK** before you **CLICK** links or **OPEN** attachments.

Hi [REDACTED]

Further to [REDACTED] email last week regarding the proposed highways mitigation, we note that the financial contribution towards the proposed improvements at the A339/Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane junctions is to be sought solely from Bloor Homes. This is a change in position from that previously communicated in two previous versions of the schedule. Whilst it is acknowledged that simply by the scale of the proposed Bloor

Homes development will result in more traffic generated at these junctions when compared to DNH, the DNH development will still generate traffic at these junctions.

Interrogation of the proposed developments traffic flows inputted into the VISSIM model indicates that the DNH development would generate circa 30% of the total traffic generated by the allocated site i.e. 1,500 homes compared to Bloor Homes, which would generate circa 70%.

We would be pleased to discuss this with you as soon as possible. Please feel free to call me if you wish to discuss or we would be keen to meet with you next week if this is convenient.

Thanks

From: [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Sandleford Park

Dear all,

Following a query from Andrew below regarding the highway mitigation list provided earlier, Paul has updated the attached list. I would be grateful for your thoughts on the mitigation required to be provided by each application and how it can be secured against each application whilst ensuring that any planning obligations are in accordance with the CIL regulations/NPPF.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Principal Planning Officer

[REDACTED]
www.westberks.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Sandleford Park

This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. STOP. THINK before you CLICK links or OPEN attachments.

Hi [REDACTED],

Thanks for getting back to me.

I have been forwarded on the updated highway mitigation table, which you have broken down by each application. With regard to the proposed improvements at Pinchington Lane/A339, these are allocated to Bloor Homes in your table; however, the trigger states "*Occupation 400 dwellings any part of development*".

Based on the trigger, I assume this is a joint contribution between Bloor and DNH. Could you confirm this is the case please?

Thanks

[REDACTED]

This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed may not necessarily represent those of West Berkshire Council. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must neither take any action based upon its contents, nor copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this e-mail in error. All communication sent to or from West Berkshire Council may be subject to recording and or monitoring in accordance with UK legislation, are subject to the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and may therefore be disclosed to a third party on request.

Sandleford Park – Proposed mitigation – DRAFT
 Planning applications 18/00764/OUTMAJ and 18/00828/OUTMAJ

Scheme	Drawing Number	Procured by:	Date
A339/B4640 Swan Roundabout improvements with VMS and A339 PROW Greenham 9 crossing	81311-041-108 (West Berks drawing)	S 278 highway works	Occupation 100 dwellings Bloor Homes
A339 – A343 to Pinchington Lane speed reduction signage	Drawing to be provided	S278 highway works	Occupation 100 dwellings Bloor Homes
Rupert Road, Chandos Road and Wendan Road pedestrian improvement's	Drawing to be provided	S278 highway works	Occupation 200 dwellings Bloor Homes
A343 Andover Road – Warren Road to Monks Lane Cycle Route	172985_A_05.2 (Vectos drawing)	S278 highway works	Occupation 100 dwellings Donnington New Homes
A343 Andover Road – Monks Lane to Buckingham Road pedestrian / cycle improvements	Under further consideration	S278 highway works	Occupation 100 dwellings Donnington New Homes
A343 Andover Road/Monks Lane Junction	81311-59-001 (West Berks drawing)	S278 highway works	Occupation 100 dwellings Donnington New Homes
Monks Lane Eastern Site Access	172985_A_07.1 (Vectos drawing)	S278 highway works	Refer to Bloor Homes phasing
Monks Lane Western Site Access	172985_A_08 (Vectos drawing)	S278 highway works	Refer to Bloor Homes phasing
A339 access	4768-SK-100 (WSP drawing)	S106 £1,500,000	Upon commencement
A343 access – 4.8 metres wide with 1.5 metre wide footway one side	A090455-SK23 (WYG drawing)	S278 highway works	Occupation 1 dwelling Donnington New Homes
A343 access – 6.0 metres wide with 2.0 metre wide footway both sides	A090455-SK13 (WYG drawing)		Occupation 100 dwellings Donnington New Homes
Kendrick Road emergency access	A090455-SK24 (WYG drawing)	S278 highway works	Refer to Donnington New Homes phasing
Provision of bus services into development from Monks Lane to Andover Road		S106	Occupation 100 dwellings Bloor Homes DPC
Travel Plan measures		S106	tba
Newtown Road / Pound Street and Bartholomew Street / Market Street traffic signals upgrade		S106 cost tba	Occupation 100 dwellings any part of development

A339/A343 St Johns Road Roundabout	172985_A_11 (Vectos drawing)	S106 cost	Occupation 500 dwellings any part of development
A339/Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane/Newtown Road	172985_A_01 Rev C	S106 £6,600,000 tbc	Occupation 400 dwellings Bloor Homes

All items in red should be implemented by Bloor Homes
All items in blue should be implemented by Donnington New Homes
In addition, all items in green should be implemented by whichever developer proceeds, should the other not proceed.
I am assuming that should both developments proceed any financial contributions would be funded proportionately.


Highways Development Control Team Leader

June 11th 2018
Updated July 12th 2019