

Shrivenham Parish Council – Formal Objection to Planning Application P26/V2692/O

To: Planning Department, Vale of White Horse District Council

Application: P26/V2692/O – Outline application for up to 100 dwellings (40% affordable) Site: Land east of the A420, north of Buckland Drive and Cozens Grove, west of Sywell Road, Trajan Road & Friars Court, Shrivenham

1. Council Resolution

At its meeting on [20th August, 2026], **Shrivenham Parish Council RESOLVED to OBJECT** to planning application **P26/V2692/O**. The Council considers the proposal to be contrary to the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, the Shrivenham Neighbourhood Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The development represents an unsustainable and unplanned expansion of the village that would cause significant harm to settlement character, landscape, infrastructure capacity, and the strategic A420 corridor.

The Council notes that this site has been refused THREE times already in 2018, 2021, and most recently in 2023 when 90 dwellings were refused. There have been NO material changes in facts, yet now an application for 100 dwellings is being considered and the Council and the local community feel strongly that it should be refused again.

2. Conflict with the Development Plan

2.1 Settlement Boundary and Spatial Strategy

The proposed site lies **outside the defined settlement boundary** for Shrivenham. The Local Plan's spatial strategy (Core Policies **CP3, CP4, CP15**) directs housing to allocated sites and within settlement envelopes. This proposal is **not allocated** and would extend the village northwards into open countryside.

2.2 Shrivenham Neighbourhood Plan

The proposal conflicts with several SNP policies, including:

- **Policy H1 – Settlement Boundary**
- **Policy D1 – Character and Design**
- **Policy CF1 – Community Facilities**

The Parish Council considers the proposal to be **in direct conflict with both tiers of the development plan**.

3. Highways and Transport – A420 Corridor

The A420 is a strategic route with known congestion and safety issues. The Council is not satisfied that the plan adequately addresses:

- Cumulative traffic growth in Shrivenham, Watchfield and the wider A420 corridor
- Increased vehicle movements through Buckland Drive and surrounding residential streets
- The absence of credible or deliverable mitigation

The proposal conflicts with **Local Plan CP33** and **NPPF para. 111?**.

4. Infrastructure Capacity – Healthcare, Utilities

Shrivenham is already experiencing significant pressure on local infrastructure.

4.1 Healthcare

Local GP services face capacity issues, long waiting times and NHS dental provision is effectively unavailable. The application if approved will add more unplanned strain to an already over-stretched healthcare provision in the village.

4.3 Utilities

Residents report issues about electricity reliability and water delivery in recent years following recent expansion.

The greatest issue is the inability of the present sewage system to deal with the existing demand evidenced by multiple discharges into the local stream and a constant flow of tankers at the Shrivenham sewage treatment works to remove waste.

It would appear that the system is in total failure now and Thames Water have forecast that it is unlikely that the Shrivenham Sewage Treatment Centre will be repaired until sometime between 2045 to 2050.

Adding another 100 dwellings onto an already failing system is totally unacceptable.

5. Landscape and Rural Character

The site comprises open farmland forming part of Shrivenham's rural northern setting. Development would:

- Erode the rural buffer between the village and the A420
- Harm landscape character (Local Plan **CP44**)
- Fail to respect the established form of the village (Local Plan **CP37**)

6. Biodiversity and Environmental Impact

The application does not provide a clear or deliverable strategy for achieving the statutory **10% Biodiversity Net Gain**, contrary to **Local Plan CP46** and **NPPF para. 180?**.

The building of dwellings so close to the A420 strategic corridor will not present a pleasant location with significant noise and pollution for any potential residents of the site.

7. Absence of Secured S106 Contributions

The Parish Council notes that the application does not include a binding S106 package covering:

- Education
- Healthcare
- Transport mitigation
- Open space
- Waste and recycling
- Community facilities

Without secured obligations, the development would place unacceptable pressure on local services, contrary to **Local Plan CP7**.

8. Housing Supply

It is our understanding that the Vale of White Horse meets the 5-Year Housing land supply requirement including 5% buffer as part of the Local Plan.

Additionally there are several significant housing developments already in the process of build out as part of the Local Plan, more than meeting the local need for the area.

Thus, there is no basis for a further unplanned development in open countryside.

9. Planning Balance

The Parish Council considers the harms identified—settlement expansion, landscape loss, infrastructure pressure, highways impact, and inadequate mitigation—to be **significant and demonstrable**. The claimed benefits do not outweigh these harms.

10. Conclusion

Shrivenham Parish Council formally **OBJECTS** to application **P26/V2692/O** and requests that Vale of White Horse District Council **REFUSE** the proposal.