

Correspondence with Adrian Duffield - Head of SODC Planning and TFAG's Greg Stone 12-28 March 2021

From: Greg Stone

Sent: 28 March 2021 16:08

To: 'Duffield, Adrian' <Adrian.Duffield@southandvale.gov.uk>;

Subject: RE: FAO Adrian Duffield. Stage Two Complaint; Thames Farm, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake Planning application references: P20/S2808/DIS and P20/S1303/NM

Dear Mr Duffield,

Thank you for your mail of the 26th March.

You are indeed correct that I do not agree with the information in your response. I also understand the complex history of Thames Farm and the need for developers to build houses. But, not at any cost!

Given that planning permission for Thames Farm was only granted on Appeal, it is blindingly obvious that when 16m deep sink holes were discovered on the site requiring massive engineering works and that an off site drainage solution was required, that, what was a borderline decision to grant planning permission became even more marginal. Why then did you retrospectively grant permission for Taylor Wimpey to start building BEFORE the drainage condition as stipulated by the Inspector was discharged?

This decision was also taken AFTER you knew that sink holes existed on the site, that a grouting solution would be necessary and that off-site drainage would be required for the proposed development. This is crossing the line between your duty to the residents and the environment and the need to develop houses.

Your view on "materiality" is also somewhat blinkered. If, grouting a huge site to a depth of 16m and changing an on-site drainage solution to an off- site solution with potential flooding consequences, digging up a mile or so of busy roads, potentially compromising a water table and public amenities are not material, then what on earth is? Some common sense and reality need's to be applied here.

Your Sincerely

Greg Stone.

From: Duffield, Adrian <Adrian.Duffield@southandvale.gov.uk>

Sent: 26 March 2021 18:12

To: Greg Stone <greg@shiplakestones.com>

Subject: Re: FAO Adrian Duffield. Stage Two Complaint; Thames Farm, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake Planning application references: P20/S2808/DIS and P20/S1303/NM

Dear Mr Stone

Thank you for your email dated 12 March.

I note that you have seen my response to Peter Boros's Stage 2 complaint about our processing of applications at the above site. I'm sorry that you find information in my response to be disingenuous and incorrect.

I respect your view that what Taylor Wimpey has currently requested is materially different to the plans that were approved at appeal.

To assist your understanding of the current situation, I will clarify the council's position.

As you will know, we have a current application to consider drainage information in connection with the planning permission to develop 95 homes on the Thames Farm site.

To date and as part of the current planning application, a drainage strategy has been submitted and found unacceptable. Prior to formally submitting a revised drainage strategy for the council's assessment, Taylor Wimpey have chosen, on this occasion, to consult with the local community first. We are aware that there are strong views about the information circulated and Taylor Wimpey may choose to amend the scheme in the light of the feedback they receive.

As and when we receive a formal submission of revised drainage proposals from Taylor Wimpey we will consult with all the relevant bodies, such as the Environment Agency, Thames Water and Oxfordshire County Council and we will inform everyone who has commented on the drainage details to date. We will ensure that all interested parties will have a minimum of 14 days in which to submit their comments and we will take into consideration all the comments received before making a final decision.

I appreciate that you do not agree with information you have seen in my response but I can assure you I am not seeking to deflect issues to the local community. The planning history of Thames Farm is particularly long and complex. Over the last 10 years my officers have sought to work with the local community in many areas of the planning process and that was particularly the case in relation to the appeals on the site.

The council will respond to Mr Boros's latest letter which was addressed to the Chief Executive. I am sure Mr Boros will share that response in due course.

In regard to the 5 year housing land supply, not only do we need an up to date Local Plan, which we have (Dec 2020), but we need developers across the district to build houses, something we can only facilitate.

I hope my comments are helpful

Yours sincerely

Adrian Duffield

Head of Planning

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils

adrian.duffield@southandvale.gov.uk

From: Greg Stone <greg@shiplakestones.com>

Sent: 12 March 2021 18:34

To: Planning Registration <registration@southandvale.gov.uk>; adrian.duffield@sothandvale.gov.uk

<adrian.duffield@sothandvale.gov.uk>; Planning South <planning@southoxon.gov.uk>; Duffield, Adrian

<Adrian.Duffield@southandvale.gov.uk>

Subject: FAO Adrian Duffield. Stage Two Complaint; Thames Farm, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake Planning application references: P20/S2808/DIS and P20/S1303/NM

Dear Mr Duffield,

Your response to Peter Boros' Stage Two Complaint (Thames Farm, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake Planning application references: P20/S2808/DIS and P20/S1303/NM) dated 23rd February, particularly where you assert "Whilst I understand that many residents were opposed to the principle of development on the site, and would like the current condition details to be rejected as a way of preventing the development," is both disingenuous and incorrect.

The Thames Farm development was granted under appeal with a number of reserved matter conditions. It was also initially granted anticipating a normal SUDS drainage scheme and the documentation clearly shows the boundary of the development.

Whilst most residents were opposed to the development, they accepted the decision following the Appeal and were resigned to the development continuing as set out in the conditions precedent. They were not expecting a revised application to dig up the heart of Shiplake and discharge surface water into the flood prone Lashbrook. They were also not expecting the aquifer upon which the village and surrounding area relies for its drinking water to be put at risk with industrial scale grouting and with the ensuing noise, inconvenience and pollution. They were also not expecting the tree replanting to be delayed.

What residents are being asked to accept is **materially** different to the original plan. So, to dismiss the resident's concerns as you did in your response to Peter Boros is both misguided and frankly offensive.

If we look back as to why the Appeal was successful,(after the Application had been rejected by SODC), the primary reason given by the Inspector was because SODC had failed to discharge it's requirement to show that it had a 5 year land supply. It is your department's inability to fulfil its obligations which has directly lead to this unedifying mess for which I believe you owe the community an apology. Do not attempt to deflect these inadequacies on to the residents.

Yours Sincerely

Greg Stone.