

Vale of White Horse Local Plan EiP Stage 2 Matter 7 Statement Thursday 18 February

In respect of: Land at North Shrivenham (Site 21)

> On behalf of: Welbeck Strategic Land (737200)



## **1.0 Response to Question 7**

- 1.1. McLoughlin Planning is instructed by Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP to make further written representations to the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 1 Examination, in respect of its land and development interests at north Shrivenham (which is allocated for development in Core Policy 20 of the Local Plan).
- 1.2. This document sets out Welbeck's position in respect of Matter 7, Core Policy 21.
- 1.3. The starting point is to consider how the policy is worded and what it is seeking to achieve. To this end, CP21 is a policy, which simply looks to safeguard land for development associated with the junction enhancements on the A420. In terms of the soundness of Policy 21, there is a need for the policy to be justified, which is based on it have a robust evidence base.
- 1.4. As explained in paragraph 5.124 of the Plan, capacity issues on the A420 are likely to occur later in the plan period and this impact is partly as a result of the development proposed in the sub-area and will particularly affect junctions accessing, for the purpose of this representation, Shrivenham. The evidence based which underpins the Local Plan, in particular the Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study (TRA02) supports the need for a junction enhancement at Shrivenham to provide the necessary capacity to accommodate future traffic flows and movements.
- 1.5. Such works would potentially be needed irrespective of whether or not the full north Shrivenham allocation come forward for development because of the general background increase in traffic flows along the A420. Indeed, section 7 of the TRA02, paragraph 7.7.4 highlights capacity issues on limited stretches to the A420 at locations unrelated to Site 21. In dealing with highways issues, it also states that issues will be investigated and that:

"Direct mitigation by relevant developers should also form part of the mitigation of these problems and those identified as part of the planning application process."

- 1.6. For this reason, there is a wider planning purpose for CP21 identifying safeguarded land along the A420 to ensure these necessary junction enhancements. At Shrivenham the Local Plan specifically identifies safeguarded land at the existing junction of Townsend Lane A420 junction. The general extent of the safeguarded land is indicated at Appendix E of the Local Plan.
- 1.7. At this time, the precise extent of the land required for the junction improvement cannot fully be defined because detailed design work has yet to be undertaken. It may well be that the precise extent of the safeguarded land will need refinement, possibly when Part 2 of the Local Plan is prepared.



- 1.8. There is, however, nothing in CP21, which would prevent additional land from being included into the junction design as the policy is not worded in such a manner. This point is openly recognised in the footnote to the Policy that requires detailed design work carried out in consultation with the County Council. In the case of CP20 and Site 21 (Shrivenham North) Welbeck and its team are in discussions with the District Council and the County Council regarding the delivery of the junction enhancement. Such discussions are clearly accord with the approach set out in CP21 and the evidence based which underpins this policy.
- 1.9. The attached PBA plan shows how the area could be extended to accommodate the latest discussions with the County. Other applications in Table 1 have also assessed the potential for enhancements of the A420/Townsend Road junction.
- 1.10. However, for the purposes of this examination and the soundness of CP21, there is a robust evidence based and a clear planning purpose, beyond facilitating specific allocations for development, for including at least the principle of safeguarded land in Local Plan Part 1. The benefit of this policy is that it ensures that land is effectively safeguarded form development, which would otherwise prejudice the delivery of the junction upgrades.
- 1.11. Welbeck note that the drafting of CP21 is not concerned with how any junction enhancements would be funded. This is the correct approach to adopt because the funding of such enhancements is not of direct relevance as to whether or not land should be safeguarded. The level of contribution sought from any potential development at, in this case, Shrivenham is a development management issue to be determined through the consideration of individual planning applications such as those listed in Table 1. There is not a requirement for a specific site to solely be responsible for the delivery of the junction upgrade.
- 1.12. Overall, as drafted, CP 21 seeks to safeguard land at the A420, Townsend Road Junction on the western edge of Shrivenham and meet the tests in paragraph 204 of the Framework.





## Table 1 -table showing list of applications

Name	No. of dwellings	Status	Application No.
Townsend Road	31	Granted	P12/V00324/FUL
Land at Highworth Road	36	Granted	P12/V2582/FUL
Land off Highworth Road, Shrivenham	35	Resolution to Grant (S106)	P13/V2490/FUL
Land at Longcot Road, Shrivenham	59 or 45	Refused (59) – At Appeal and Refused (45)	P13/V1514/O (Appeal) P15/V2222/O (Refused)
Land to the East of Highworth Road	240	Resolution to Grant (S106) Local Plan Strategic Site	P13/V1810/0
Land off Colton Road (Replacement of P13/V0399/O)	68	Granted	P14/V2757/FUL
Land off Townsend Road	116	Refused	P15/V0663/O
3 Recreation Ground	11	Granted	P15/V0790/FUL
Land at Faringdon Road, Shrivenham	136	Under Consideration	P15/V1091/O





## McLoughlin Planning North Warehouse

North Warehouse Gloucester Docks Gloucester GL1 2FB 01452 835 614 www.mplanning.co.uk

