

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee

held at the St John's Parish Church, Main Street, Grove, Oxfordshire, OX12 7LQ on Wednesday, 4 December 2013 at 6.30pm



**Open to the public, including the press**

### Present:

Members: Councillors Robert Sharp (Chairman), Sandy Lovatt (Vice-Chairman), Eric Batts, Roger Cox, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Bill Jones, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Helen Pighills, Catherine Webber, John Woodford.

Substitute Members: Councillor Mike Badcock.

Other Members: Councillors John Amys and Kate Precious.

Officers: Sandra Fryer and Susan Harbour. Geraldine LeCointe, planning consultant for Vale of White Horse District Council

Number of members of the public: 120

### **PI.465 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

### **PI.466 URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **PI.467 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Margaret Turner sent her apologies, Councillor Mike Badcock was her substitute.

### **PI.468 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER DECLARATIONS**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **PI.469 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The speakers' list was tabled at the meeting.

## **PI.470 STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON OTHER MATTERS**

None.

## **PI.471 FORMER AIRFIELD, GROVE. P12/V0299/O**

Sandra Fryer, Development Management Manager introduced the proposal for the development of the former Grove Airfield site. The application would contribute to addressing the five year housing land supply shortfall; was in the adopted local plan and saved local plan; it is fully compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Geraldine LeCointe, the planning consultant responsible for the case management of this application presented it to the meeting. The application is in outline with all matters reserved, except for details of the Southern Access Road/ Denchworth Road.

The site is 141 hectares; the proposed development will include the following:

- 64 hectares of built development;
- A community park;
- Two primary schools;
- Playing fields;
- A secondary school;
- An ecology park.

Although the application is in outline, the following parameters are fixed:

- the built site;
- density of the housing;
- scale – height of the buildings;
- green infrastructure.

The development would have three main character areas:

- The “urban core” – this would be built at a higher density and contain many of the facilities;
- The “rural edge” – this would have lower density buildings, with housing being arranged in an informal village style and would also contain an ecology park;
- “Park Place” – this would have lower density buildings but would be more formal in layout.

The following development phases are indicated:

- Phase 1. This would include a primary school and the local centre and also 500 houses;
- Phase 2. 1000 houses;
- Phase 3. 1000 houses.

The Northern Link Road is not included as part of the development as the applicant does not control the land over which it would have to pass. There is an intention to use a

Grampian condition to secure the Northern Link Road, and it should be put in place before building the 1500<sup>th</sup> house.

Sports facilities and pitches.

Sport England had previously been objecting the application. Following further work it has indicated that its strong objections have been set aside as the issues it raised are being addressed.

The Environment Agency has no objections subject to conditions.

The Highways Authority is happy to recommend consent, subject to the infrastructure.

There is an outstanding objection from Network Rail due to the bridleway and are recommending a package to deter people from using it.

Further to the original report, the recommendations have been updated and can be found at the end of this minute.

Frank Parnell, Chairman of Grove Parish Council spoke about this application; his comments are included in full below, and are in Parish Councillor Parnell's own words:

"Good evening. I'm Frank Parnell chairman of Grove Parish Council and I pleased to welcome the committee and officers of the Vale to Grove for this important meeting. Thank you for arranging it and I will now proceed to present our concerns with this outline plan, as submitted for approval.

Grove Parish Council notes that the Vale of White Horse District Council has a shortage of housing against government targets, but requests that you either reject this application, or, what we see as the failings of the current outline plan, are addressed **before** permission is granted. Alternatively we ask that you include rectification of the failings as planning conditions that have to be addressed before any detailed plans are approved.

We would also stress that policy H5 in the existing local plan (and listed in Para 6.7 of the Committee Report) **must** be adhered to in its entirety and this should be fully agreed before this outline planning application is given approval, or included as a condition of any such approval. Failure to do this should result in the plan being rejected. Grove has long been promised that if this development took place we would benefit from the new facilities and infrastructure; **now** is the time to deliver on those promises and make them binding conditions of any approval.

### **Northern Link Road (NLR)**

We still believe strongly that this outline application should not be approved without the link road outline and surveys being completed for the whole route. According to the inspector and the current local plan, the link road has to be completed before the 1,501<sup>st</sup> house is started; therefore it should be part of the outline approval for the whole 2,500 houses as they couldn't be built without it. If you decide that it should be subject to a Grampian Condition, then this should be part of a legally binding section 106 agreement. Grove Parish Council is very concerned about the amount of traffic that will have to go through the village and Southern Access Route while there is no Northern Link Road, and we are also worried that only 1,500 houses will be built in total, with no Northern Link Road!

### **Southern access road (SAR)**

Because the line of the Southern access road reduces the existing pitch area alongside the road and also crosses the training pitch, provision must be made of a replacement area and training facility before the work starts on the SAR. No replacement provision is

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

shown on the outline application. New playing areas and the training pitch will take at least two years to be ready, based upon our experience with the new pitches off Mably Way. We therefore ask that a condition is applied, if the plan is approved, that ensures these are completed and ready for use prior to losing any existing playing areas. The playing field area shown on the plan is the required amount to serve the new development, so the whole community would lose facilities if those lost are not replaced. We also have concerns about the junction with Cane Lane and Newlands Drive; both these junctions could cause problems for all residents as they are shown. We believe that careful planning is needed by the highways authority including consideration of a roundabout or traffic lights to ease traffic flow and maintain pedestrian safety. We are also greatly concerned at the amount of construction traffic in addition to the normal traffic on this road, which with the children travelling to/from school in Wantage is an accident waiting to happen. We would ask that the new footpath & cycle way alongside the new Southern access road be built and in use prior to the construction traffic using the road. The Parish Council believes that the outline plan needs to explicitly show a pedestrian access crossing the Southern access road from Wasbrough Field to the location of the new clubhouse.

### **Construction traffic**

Although no construction traffic management plan has yet been agreed, we are concerned about construction traffic using Mably Way. Current traffic (vehicular/bicycle/foot) is heavy during school term times with Grove school children having to cross Mably Way at least twice a day to get to and from school in Wantage. This is further exacerbated by employment traffic travelling to Grove Technology Park, as well as traffic accessing the health centre throughout the working day. We therefore ask that the management plan takes this into account and lays down that there will be no construction traffic during the morning and evening school and business peak travelling times.

The Parish Council further requests that construction vehicles must go through a thorough 'wheel wash' before entering the public highway.

### **Village identity**

The Parish Council is adamant that it wants to achieve a whole-village identity. The current plans are drawn up on the basis of all roads running North/South. This means that the village is split on North/South lines between A338, Main Street, Brereton Drive, Newlands Drive and the new development, with no access along the East/West line. This will mean that many villagers, particularly in "Old Grove" will find it easier to access Wantage rather than the new Grove shopping centre, thus reducing the likelihood of ever realising a whole-village identity. We would ask that the plans are modified to include the reopening of Cane Lane as a through road connecting the village along its East/West axis as part of the planning conditions.

### **Drainage**

We welcome the latest response from the Environment Agency dated 5 November 2013 and ask that all these conditions are made an integral part of any consent. We also ask that condition 5, relating to the monitoring programme of the key ecological receptors, excludes the bracketed words 'unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority' from the consent. This is to ensure that any detrimental impact stops the development until the mitigation and correction actions are agreed and take place. This Council also notes the requirement for contamination and ecological monitoring and would like to receive details on how this is to be achieved. We would also ask to be involved in subsequent decisions and any monitoring body set up. Although it will take time

to appoint the officers needed to perform the tasks identified, Grove Parish Council is keen to cooperate so as to minimize any delay in meeting the conditions.

Oxfordshire County Council will become responsible for management of the installed SUDS system; we ask that the Parish Council be involved with them and the Developers on its design, particularly in regard to methods of control and monitoring of drainage discharges.

### **Access to the area**

We object strongly to the fact that there are only two access points to the area shown on the outline application. We believe that there should be a further three access points to/from Newlands Drive and that without this the planning application should be rejected. We also believe that the junction with Newlands Drive, Savile Way and the new centre should have traffic lights, or a roundabout and pedestrian lights, to aid the integration with existing areas. Similarly, traffic lights or a roundabout with pedestrian lights should be applied to any other access off Newlands Drive. The Parish Council has concerns about the number of access points the traffic calculations are based on, which we believe invalidates the calculations behind the submitted planning application. We would ask that the calculations and their underlying assumptions be reviewed with Grove Parish Council before outline approval is given.

### **Land ownership issues**

We understand that the developers still do not legally own the entire site covered by the outline plan e.g. along Newlands Drive. Legal ownership is key to access to/from the site and integration with the existing village, and we would want evidence based reassurance that the ownership issues are capable of being resolved, and indeed will be resolved before detailed planning permission is given.

### **Density**

We believe strongly that a lower density of housing needs to be placed adjacent to the existing housing along Newlands Drive. The density should be the same as, or less than, the current housing density along Newlands Drive, and certainly not greater. Whilst we acknowledge that this is an outline application rather than detailed, we note that this concern is included in the paper from the officers. The paper states that this can be addressed at reserved matters stage and we therefore ask that it is included as a condition of any approval.

### **Car parking**

The Parish Council is concerned about the apparent lack of provision for car parking spaces. Residents are to travel to employment sites elsewhere in the locality but have to park their vehicles somewhere. The roads in the village are already 'clogged' with cars and other vehicles parked on the roadside making smooth flow of traffic difficult at times. We anticipate that the development will suffer from the same issue of lack of parking provision in garages and driveways. Consequently provision within the development for both overnight and daily parking (not in one big car park and not subject to parking restrictions and clamping) is necessary to ensure a smooth flow of traffic. Therefore we ask that this is a condition of any approval. We would like to suggest that houses have a minimum of two parking spaces within the ownership of the property and for properties with four or more bedrooms, another space for each of these additional bedrooms.

### **Energy efficiency**

The outline application suggests that the dwellings are being built to level 3 Code for Sustainable Homes (CFSH). The Parish Council again stresses that we would like to see Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

the first homes built to CFSH level 4 in keeping with other proposed developments in the area. Moving forward, the Parish Council would like the later stages of the development to be compliant with one level above the then current standard levels of CFSH as the Part L Building regulations change.

Although a requirement for additional cemetery space is part of the s106 listed in paragraph 7.108 and along with allotment space listed in appendix 12 they are not mentioned specifically in the recommendation in section 9. Can we please have your assurances that these will be included as listed in Appendix 12 and that any approval given will include them.

### **Others**

The Parish Council also fully supports the need for an expanded or new Scout hut, as the existing facilities are at capacity for the current population. Therefore doubling the size of the village will require scout facilities that can accommodate the increased population, of young people, along with facilities as in policy H5.

We also fully support the Wilts and Berks canal group and their request that, the upgrades to Denchworth Road to provide the Southern Access Road will include the necessary crossing point for the realigned canal route. This should also be able to accommodate pedestrian and cyclists alongside the canal.

### **Control of communal facilities**

Finally the Parish Council reiterates its desire to control all communal facilities arising from the development, subject to adequate commuted sums to support them. We currently maintain the playing fields and other open spaces to a high standard and wish to ensure that the new facilities are maintained to those same standards. We would also like to be an active partner in any development control or monitoring group that is set up for the development.”

### **The following petition was read out on behalf of Dr Les Clyne:**

"In order to ensure that a good development takes place which provides the necessary infrastructure and facilities please could the planning committee instruct the Vale officers to:

1. Rapidly set up the Development Delivery Board and make sure that it has its first meeting no later than 31 January 2014 and includes representation from Grove Parish Council.
2. Only sign the Section 106 agreement when it has the UNANIMOUS agreement of the Development Delivery Board including the Grove Parish Council representation, and if such agreement is not possible (including if the Board does not exist) the Section 106 agreement must be referred back to the Planning committee for approval."

Zoé Patrick, Oxfordshire County Councillor spoke in opposition to the application as follows (in her own words):

"I would like to concentrate on the following areas of the report.

1. Two access routes onto this site are totally unacceptable and make the whole plan completely unsustainable. The issues regarding the Southern Access and the Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Northern Access routes remain unresolved as no changes are shown on the current plans, except the Denchworth Road re-alignment to take into account the electricity sub-station. This road is dangerous now and here was an opportunity to make it safe, but it will be sadly lost. The obvious route into the site is from the Mably Way roundabout, but this has been ignored.

2. Equally, without a Northern Link road, the funny triangle of a route bringing all the traffic onto a country lane by the cemetery is a road going to nowhere. Members who were on the site visit last week will see what a narrow, winding lane this is on the way towards Denchworth village by the side of the railway line. Why are we bringing all the traffic here to send it back through the village again or are we expecting it to turn left towards Denchworth?
3. What has now compounded the situation further is regarding public transport serving the site. If you look at the County Highways submission in Appendix 9 you will see that under Bus Service Provision there is reference to the Thames Travel routes 36 and 32. Can I inform the committee that both of these services do not now serve Grove? The 36 service was terminated in October this year, and the 32 service will only serve Wantage from 9<sup>th</sup> December next week. This now leaves Grove without ANY public transport to the key employment areas of Didcot/Milton Park and Harwell.
4. Although re-opening the Grove station could help ease the public transport problems for the area, this will not happen in time to serve this development, and indeed, there has been no S106 contribution sought from developers for this project, which I feel is a missed opportunity.
5. Thames Water's comments outlined at 4.15 quote "Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing wastewater infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application". After visiting the TW Treatment Plant at Cow Lane in Grove this year, I saw first-hand how despite an upgrade to the treatment facility, what has not changed is the capacity of the local pumping stations to deal with the sewerage and this has not been addressed.
6. The County Council has recently undertaken a consultation exercise on schooling in the area. The Cabinet Member has confirmed the County's commitment to the secondary school in Grove which is good news. However, the uncertainty regarding the delivery of this school is making planning extremely difficult as we have little capacity in our current schools. Schools need to be provided sooner rather than later. Good cycleway and footpath access to all schools have to be taken on board to encourage walking and cycling between the local communities.

I urge the committee to defer this application until they are content that all these matters are resolved, otherwise residents in Grove will be badly let down by these outline proposals currently on the table."

Don Summers, a local resident spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included the following:

Site drainage issues, including disappearing run off retention capacity due to the increased hard landscaping and the net retention capacity.

Julie Maberly from the Wantage and Grove Campaign Group spoke objecting to the application, she raised the following points:

- Development should be proportionate and sustainable
- Adequate infrastructure investment should be forthcoming when needed
- The public transport proposed was inadequate
- The support for cyclists proposed was inadequate.

Ken Oliver from the Berkshire and Wiltshire Canal Trust spoke objecting to this proposal.

Brian Stovold, also from the Berkshire and Wiltshire Canal Trust spoke objecting to this proposal.

Ken Dijksman, a planning consultant spoke objecting to the application on the following basis:

- The access road offered no pedestrian or cycle linkages to Grove Technology Park
- The application is dictated by land ownership issues rather than by good design
- There should be a Grampian condition requiring pedestrian and cycle links from the sports field to the sports pavilion and from the housing areas to Grove Technology Park
- The s106 agreement should include money for the Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal Trust.

*At this point, the speakers objecting to the application ran out of time. Speaking time was extended with the explicit agreement of the applicants.*

Geoff Neil, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Marita Collins, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. In particular she was concerned about the impact the development would have on the properties in Church Ward Close; she would like these properties given the same consideration as those on Newlands Drive.

John Firth, a local resident, spoke objecting the application. He believed that the village status of Grove should protect it against unfettered development. He was also concerned about integration with Wantage.

Paul Dunwoody, a Wantage resident, recited a poem of his own composition objecting to the application.

Paul John, a local pastor spoke in support of the application. He was sympathetic to the infrastructure issues which had been raised but wanted to make the most of the opportunities offered by the development. In particular he would like a plot of land on the former airfield site to be earmarked for a Christian centre.

Justin Greenhalgh from HarBUG (Harwell Bikers User Group) spoke in support of the application. He wanted additional money for the cycle infrastructure, and referred to DfT guidance.

Stephen Sensecall, the applicants' agent, spoke in favour of the application; his main points are summarised as follows:

- The applicants and their agents have been working with council officers over a seven year period on the preparation of this application;
- This site will make a significant contribution to meeting the five year housing land supply deficit in the Vale of White Horse;
- The developer, Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon are "in for the long haul" to provide a good place for people to live;
- It is in the developers' interests to bring forward the development of the schools as soon as is feasible as it assists with the marketability of the scheme;
- Nothing in the proposal precludes a link to the Grove Technology Park;



- The sports field is separated from the pavilion; it is part of the developers' plan to have a permanent solution where the pavilion is on the same side of the road as the sports field.

Paul Boileau, the developers' agent spoke in favour of the application; his main points are summarised as follows:

- A comprehensive transport assessment has been completed in collaboration with Oxfordshire County Council;
- The site access proposals have been carefully modelled in conjunction with the County Council;
- The proposed parking is in line with the Vale's standards;
- The development will prioritise sustainable transport, together with strong walking and cycling networks;
- £2.5 million is included to support new public transport services;
- seven improvements are being made to the existing local highway network – to junctions and the Wantage Eastern Relief Road, the Southern Access Road and traffic calming in Newlands Drive;
- Complete flood risk assessments have been undertaken by Oxfordshire County Council and the Environment Agency;
- The proposed site is in Flood Zone 1 (outside 1:1000 year risk);
- Key flood risk benefits are to be included in the plans, including the alleviation of the existing problems in Denchworth Road to the north of the site;
- Draining in properties will deliver a 44 percent reduction in flows in a 1:100 year flood event;
- The work has been reviewed by the Environment Agency and the County Council;
- Thames water have responded concerning the capacity of the existing sewers within Grove: the proposals for the site will bypass the Grove network and the sewage will go directly to the sewerage treatment works.

Councillor Kate Precious, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application, her concerns are summarised as follows:

- This application may be good for the Vale's five year housing land supply but it is poor for Grove;
- If the development is to go ahead then the council should aim to get the best possible outcomes from the development and this scheme is not good enough;
- The roads surrounding the development are all already at capacity;
- Newlands Drive has no pavement;
- The development will fundamentally change the nature of Grove: there will be an "urban centre" in the middle of a village.

Councillor John Amys, one of the local ward members, spoke about the application and said that he endorses the comments made by the chairman of the parish council.

Councillor Sue Marchant, one of the local ward members, spoke about this application, her points are summarised as follows:

- This site is part of the local plan, and has not simply come about in connexion with the five year housing land supply shortfall;
- This site was originally selected by the local plan working group as the most suitable site as it is a brown field site skirting an existing development
- She had been assured by Oxfordshire County Council that the first primary school would be built as the first houses were built

- She would like to see provision for scouting groups in the s106 agreements
- The Northern Link Road should be considered prior to the second stage of development
- The work on the canal needs to be undertaken;
- There should be more shared ownership properties on the development.
- Local members should be included in discussions on s106 agreements.

In response to points raised by the speakers, the officers gave the following points of clarification:

- A Grampian condition for the Northern Link Road cannot form part of the s106 agreement as the road does not fall within the application site;
- The training pitch will be replaced on the development at an early stage;
- The Highway Authority does not consider that an opening onto Cane Lane is appropriate on highway grounds;
- Access points are subject to land ownership issues
- Only two access points are onto Newlands Drive, additional access points are subject to land ownership issues;
- Car parking – the Vale’s design and access statement recommend two spaces per housing unit and less for one bedroom flats. The development includes properly designed on street car parking;
- The cemetery and allotment provision proposed are in line with the scale of the development and are part of the s106 agreements
- Thames Water has confirmed that the development will link directly to the treatment plant;
- Infrastructure: expensive items are difficult to provide up front, but will come on line as soon as possible;
- Some items are not included in the s106 agreements, eg the Canal Trust, as other items have been prioritised to ensure that the development goes ahead, and to ensure that the development is viable;
- Condition 57 refers to a buffer at Churchward Close
- A community forum will be established as part of the delivery board;
- Affordable housing: the report recommends a minimum of 30 percent affordable rented housing and the balance to be shared ownership: it may also be possible for people to buy properties with government help which are not part of the affordable provision.

The committee debated the application, during the discussion several points were raised including the following:

- The need for extra Police Community Support Officers;
- The issues of affordable housing;
- The s106 money amounted to £49 million;
- The need for a funded youth worker;
- Soil percolation;
- This site had been through a public enquiry and the inspector agreed that this was the most favourable site;
- The site would deliver 750 new homes for social rent, which is a significant proportion of the current housing register at Vale;
- The residents of Grove should be given a report on whether the conditions of the approval have been met by the developers;
- Grove Parish Council should have a significant role in the development delivery board and in the conditions;

- Conditions: funding for monitoring would be met by the development delivery board;
- Affordable housing: to ensure the viability of the whole scheme, some flexibility was required.
- The second of the recommendations had been advised by the Vale's solicitors;
- Access points needed to be revisited,
- There was no provision for "female sport": mostly just for rugby and football;
- Are the houses to be built to "secure by design" standards?
- Is the site secured to police standards? – The police were consulted but did not comment on this, but it can be revisited at the served matters stage;
- The officers advised that the access links are highly desirable, not completely essential for the development to go ahead.

### **Resolved (For: 12; Against: 0; Abstentions: 1)**

**1. To grant outline planning permission be granted subject to the provision of, in the order of, 35% affordable housing on the site (of which a minimum of 30% shall be affordable rented) and the completion and signing of a S106 agreement to secure the following infrastructure (as set out in appendix 12 of the report):**

- Outdoor sports and green infrastructure;
- Indoor sports and leisure hub;
- Community hub (incorporating the social, community, recreational and welfare requirements of the new community);
- Other community infrastructure;
- Education;
- Strategic highways and transport;
- Local labour and training scheme, and
- District and County Council monitoring costs.

### **And subject to conditions to include:**

1. Reserved matters submission to cover all aspects of development;
2. Reserved matters – time limit;
3. Approved plan numbers;
4. Environmental statement/mitigation;
5. Materials – samples;
6. Boundary treatments;
7. Slab levels;
8. Noise levels;
9. Construction traffic;
10. constructing environmental management plan CEMP;
11. Landscaping;
12. Environment Agency conditions;
13. Environmental health conditions;
14. Surface water drainage;
15. Ecology;
16. Archaeology;
17. Northern Link Road;
18. Treatment of orange land ;
19. Phasing;
20. Land budget;
21. Design and access statement (including design coding and monitoring as appropriate);
22. Allotment provision, specification and timing;

23. Works to ditch outside application site ;
24. Total amount of housing numbers;
25. Housing mix;
26. Lifetime homes;
27. Code of construction practice ;
28. Hours of construction;
29. Provision of replacement pitch;
30. Hours of operation for the non-residential development;
31. External lighting;
32. Thames Water condition(s);
33. Section 38 and/or 278 works to include all required specifications of infrastructure;
34. Access for construction vehicles;
35. Restriction of residential occupation until infrastructure provided;
36. Restriction on non-residential occupation until infrastructure provided;
37. Timing of bus service provision;
38. Code levels residential;
39. Code levels non-residential;
40. Rainwater harvesting;
41. Location of local recycling sites;
42. Recycled material for highways;
43. Bin stores;
44. Bicycle storage;
45. Ducting for broadband;
46. Fire hydrants;
47. Waste management plan;
48. Travel Plan;
49. Public art strategy;
50. Wilts and Berks canal condition;
51. Restricted access to ecology park;
52. Earthworks plan;
53. Details of service corridors;
54. Phasing of green infrastructure;
55. Landscape and ecological management plan;
56. Location of construction compounds;
57. Green buffer to Churchward Close;
58. Use of variety of Architects throughout scheme;
59. Network Rail level crossing signing;
60. Development briefs and/or specifications for all components of the development including local centre, schools, allotments, LEAPS, NEAPS and MUGAS, community hub and extra care housing;
61. Cycle parking;
62. Utilities infrastructure (routes and protection areas and new structures);
63. Sustainable construction;
64. Local labour and training;
65. Monitoring and review of development as part of the Development Delivery Board.

And informatives as required.

**2. To authorise the head of planning the decision to switch between the use of planning condition or clauses within the Section 106 Agreement to achieve the agreed infrastructure package and other outcomes in line with this decision;**

**3. To set up a Development Delivery Board to support the delivery of the development in the Grove area.**

**4. If the outcome of negotiations to finalise the details of the affordable housing, infrastructure or planning conditions varies significantly from those identified above, or if there is an unacceptable delay in progressing towards the issue of a decision, the application will be brought back to the planning committee for further consideration.**

Access points to be added to s106 or conditions

**The draft Section 106 list is as follows:**

**1. Outdoor sports and green infrastructure. Total £6.8m**

- Sports pitches;
- Pavilion;
- Floodlit training areas;
- Play areas;
- Multi use games areas;
- Allotments;
- Cemeteries;
- Landscape maintenance;
- Mitigation for farmland birds.

**2. Indoor sports and leisure hub. Total £2.4m**

- Swimming pool;
- Sports hall;
- Artificial grass pitch;
- Enhancement of existing skate park;
- Tennis courts.

**3. Community Hub. Total £5.3m**

- Community building;
- Commuted sum to run hub;
- Children's centre;
- Library;
- Adults learning;
- Youth facilities;
- Health and wellbeing;
- Parish Council offices;
- Community development officer.

**4. Other community infrastructure. Total £2.2m**

- Waste and recycling;
- Waste disposal;
- Street naming and numbering;
- Police;
- Public art;
- Social and health care;

- Museum.
5. **Education. Total £22.7m**
- Primary School, No.1 one form entry primary school and No 1 two form entry;
  - Secondary school;
  - Special education needs.
6. **Strategic Highways and Transport. Total £9.3m**
- Support to strategic bus services;
  - Wantage Eastern Relief Road;
  - Northern Link Road.
7. **Other. Total £0.3m**
- Monitoring costs (Vale);
  - Monitoring costs (County);
  - Local labour and training.

The meeting closed at 9.25 pm