

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations   | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)   |
|--|--|
| <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Many of the comments in the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance received from individuals and summarised in the schedule, relate to policy issues dealt with in the local plan and considered by the Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry. These matters include, the scale of development, affordable housing and transport infrastructure including the relief road scheme for Wantage. The draft SPG must be consistent with the local plan on these issues and cannot vary or change the local plan context.</p> <p>GENERAL</p> <p><b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements are supportive of the Council's commitment to the long term, comprehensive development of the land west of Grove and agreed on the purpose of the draft SPG and also the Council's approach on public participation.</b></p> <p><b>Martin Grant Homes Ltd</b> object in principle to the SPG on Grove and to the annexe which should be deleted and consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed scale of development is too great and in the wrong location</li> <li>The SPG does not have the same status as the development Plan so it is unsatisfactory to try to introduce principles for the development of any site through SPG without exposing them to the full scrutiny that would otherwise take place if dealt with through a Local Plan Inquiry.</li> <li>There is a conflict between 1.1 and 8.1 of SPG. 1.1 indicates that proposals will only be permitted where they are 'in accordance' with the SPG, while 8.1 indicates that SPG seeks to give more guidance on how Grove 'could' be developed. The SPG should be deleted and there should be a re-evaluation of the delivery of sites through the Local Plan and the role SPG can play in that delivery.</li> </ul> <p><b>K.C.Turberfield</b> considers 2500 dwellings inappropriate</p> | <p>The support is welcomed</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The local plan inspector endorsed the strategic choice of the former airfield west of Grove as a major allocation in the plan. It is not a matter for the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance but is a policy matter dealt with in the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The purpose of the Supplementary Planning Guidance is to provide additional detail on how the local plan policies will be applied and this is the approach adopted to the guidance for Grove Airfield. The guidance is consistent with the policies and proposals in the Local plan for which it provides further guidance and amplification.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Para 1.1 second sentence amend to read 'The local plan indicates that all planning applications for the former airfield west of Grove will be expected to comply with comprehensive ....'</b></p> <p>The purpose of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance is to provide additional detail on the how the Local plan policies will be applied to this particular site. It is considered that the draft guidance as now amended reflects the policy H5 revised in the local plan. However, the reference 'will only be permitted when they are in accordance' does not reflect the local plan advice.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The local plan inspector endorsed the strategic choice of the former airfield west of Grove as a major allocation in the plan for 2500 dwellings. It is not a matter for the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance but is a policy matter</p> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations  | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)   |
|---|--|
| <p><b>D.N. Cain</b> considers 40 dwellings per hectare is too many and will make buildings overwhelming and cut out a reasonable skyline.</p> <p><i>Design and layout</i></p> <p><b>H.K. Brew, Grove Parish Council, Mrs Harwood</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barge boards should be dark not white, similar to ones on older properties in Wantage so that they do not impinge on the skyline.</li> <li>• Houses should not be built in straight lines.</li> <li>• There should be big trees, open spaces and not just blocks of houses.</li> <li>• There should be scope for easy loft conversions.</li> <li>• Pavements should be included on all streets.</li> </ul> <p><b>D.N. Cain</b> objects to four storey buildings.</p> <p><b>Grove Parish Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communal parking is not popular choice as people want to park within sight of their property.</li> <li>• Provision for one car parking space per bedroom for each house and a minimum of two spaces per dwelling should be made.</li> </ul> <p><b>G.K. Belcher</b> considers that there should be enough space left for cars in the development.</p> <p><b>Mr and Mrs Taylor</b> consider that the mature hedgerow that extends the length of Newlands Drive is attractive and significant landscape feature, and hosts a wealth of wildlife and would like it to be kept intact.</p> <p><b>Persimmon Strategic Land</b> consider that para 5.5 should be deleted as the requirement for Ecohomes environmental rating is too prescriptive.</p> <p><i>Dwelling mix</i></p> <p><b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements</b> object to the prescriptive requirements in relation to</p> | <p>dealt with in the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The local plan inspector at paragraph 8.14.2 of his report considered that development would have to reflect policy H14 on density, deriving as it does from PPG3 and incorporate a range of densities across the site. Furthermore the Inspector considered that there is no justification for any overall reduction in average density on such a large greenfield site with few on site constraints. The density of development is a policy matter dealt with in the Local Plan and cannot be revisited in the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>It is not the purpose of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance to prepare a detailed design for the site, but to provide guidance for the developers to take into account during the design process. Detailed design matters such as these will be dealt with through the development control process, with further discussions and consultations taking place through the Grove Development Forum.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The draft Supplementary Planning Guidance makes it clear that some four storey buildings will be allowed where they can be shown to make a positive contribution to the streetscape, create focal points and landmarks and reinforce the legibility of the scheme.</p> <p>It is not the purpose of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance to prepare a detailed highway design and specify the amount, type and location of new parking, but to provide guidance for developers to take into account during the design process. The detailed highway design will need to meet the requirements of Oxfordshire County Council's Residential Road Design Guide and the car parking standards set out in the District Council's draft Supplementary Planning Guidance. Detailed design matters such as these will be dealt with through the development control process with further discussions and consultations taking place through the Grove Development Forum.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Para 1.10 third sentence and para 6.5 first sentence delete 50% and replace with 40%.</b></p> <p>Considerable evidence was put to the inquiry regarding dwelling mix and type and affordable housing. The</p> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations   | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)   |
|--|--|
| <p>dwelling mix are premature pending up-to-date clarification of housing need and negotiations with developers/landowners.</p> <p><b>Persimmon Strategic Land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the requirement that 10% of dwellings should be designed to lifetime home standards (too prescriptive) and to the requirement that 50% should be affordable.</li> <li>• Object to para 6.5. which should be replaced by 'The Council will seek by negotiation with developers an element of affordable housing. The size and type of dwellings provided shall reflect the needs of those households requiring affordable accommodation.'</li> </ul> <p><b>Roads in Grove and Wantage</b></p> <p><i>General transport Improvements</i></p> <p><b>The Highways Agency</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be premature to finalise transport strategy for Grove and Wantage in advance of resolution of issues associated with Didcot.</li> <li>• As work has not started on Wantage and Grove Transport and Land Use Study it is inappropriate to make reference to unidentified and speculative measures that may or may not be justified in long term.</li> <li>• The highway improvements set out in the SPG are primarily aimed at providing most direct access to A34 without considering consequences for A34.</li> </ul> <p><b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements</b> consider that the extensive range of off-site road improvements in the SPG does not appear to have been justified in terms of transportation implications of the Grove scheme. The list of improvements seems to change and expand but without the technical justification required to enforce such demands. The west of Grove scheme cannot be used as a means to pay for, subsidise or implement improvements not directly needed as result of scheme.</p> <p><b>R.C. Price, K.C. Turberfield, (Unknown), M. Monk, Mrs H Harwood</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council should provide Grove residents with their own access road to the A417 and A34 and be supporting the redevelopment of the railway station.</li> <li>• Road infrastructure should be put in now, ahead of demand and not left until phase 3. Heavy lorries already shake the homes of Grove and Wantage and mingles with school children.</li> <li>• Proposed rail station is very important</li> <li>• It would be good to have a ring road around Grove</li> </ul> | <p>Inspector concluded that a 40% target for affordable housing is more rational and that there is no justification for more than 10% of new housing to be designed to 'lifetime homes' standards as recommended for acceptance by the Strategic and Local Plan Advisory Group. The draft Supplementary Planning Guidance must be consistent with the local plan on this issue and accordingly the 50% figure will be amended to 40%.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraphs 1.12, 3.3 and 3.4 of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance be amended as set out in Appendix 15.</b></p> <p>Extensive evidence was put to the Inquiry on all aspects of Transport Strategy for Grove and Wantage. Subject to detailed wording changes the Inspector is satisfied that policy H5 and paras 8.29 and 8.29a of the local plan provide a robust and practical framework within which the detailed implementation of necessary highway improvements may be resolved on a phased basis (para 8.16.20 of the Inspector's report). The draft guidance in Appendix A has, therefore, been revised to take account of the Inspector's conclusions on the implementation and phasing of highway infrastructure.</p> <p>See response to the Highway Agency above</p> <p>See response to The Highways Agency above</p> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations   | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)  |
|--|---|
| <p>to avoid traffic congestion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uncertainty about the Grove Road Station should be reflected in the SPG.</li> </ul> <p><i>New Road to A338 north of Grove</i><br/> <b>Persimmon Strategic Land</b> concluded that there is no requirement for a new link to the A338 north of Grove early in the second phase as a result of this development. It is therefore inappropriate to refer to these measures in the SPG.</p> <p><b>Grove Parish Council</b> considers plans to include a new road north of Grove should be included in phase 1.</p> <p><b>M. Monk, D.N. Cain</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no evidence on phase 1 map of the road linking the site to the A338 south of Bellingers Garage which was shown in first deposit plan.</li> <li>A new road south of Bellingers Garage is too close to Oxford Lane and will mean a lot of traffic trying to get onto A338. Concern for volume of traffic using A338 at peak times and a new road north of Bellingers Garage would be better</li> </ul> <p><i>New road from Mably Way west to A417</i><br/> <b>Persimmon Strategic Land</b> concluded that there is no requirement for any extension to Mably Way westwards to join the A417 as a result of this development. It is therefore inappropriate to refer to these measures in the SPG.</p> <p><b>K.C. Turberfield, J. Marriott</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed road should be given greater implementation priority in late phase 2.</li> <li>Should be a priority. Construction traffic will be considerable and would have to pass through residential and school areas.</li> </ul> <p><i>New road from Mably Way east to A417</i><br/> <b>Mr and Mrs J.M.S. Manning, M.G. Nicholas, N. and A.M. Adams, D. and M. Rowland, Mr and Mrs Notman, B. and S. Austin, T. Jones, Mrs H Harwood</b><br/> The proposed eastwards route via Mably Way will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cross agricultural land already designated for no development and put a by-pass directly between two communities.</li> <li>Be an ugly scar on landscape and destroy some local footpaths.</li> <li>Lead to further development around Mably Way and Charlton Heights and so draw in more traffic into Grove and Wantage.</li> <li>Render the Charlton Heights area more liable to crime, offering a rapid escape route.</li> <li>Developers will not pay to have the route properly tunnelled in order to protect the character of the landscape and preserve the green belt.</li> <li>Degrade parts of Charlton, Charlton Heights and Charlton Village. It will threaten the green separation of Grove and Wantage.</li> <li>Cause undesirable visual and noise impacts to the</li> </ul> | <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraphs 1.12 and 3.3 of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance be amended as set out in Appendix 15.</b></p> <p>The inquiry heard considerable evidence regarding the new road to A338 north of Grove. The Inspector is satisfied Policy H5 and paras 8.29 and 8.29a provide a robust and practical framework within which the detailed implementation of necessary highway improvements and traffic management measures may be resolved on a phased basis (para 8.16.20 of the Inspector's report). However, he does not consider it necessary to refer to the road to the north of Grove joining the A338 south of Bellingers garage as it would restrict the highway design options to be considered in the light of the outcome of WAGASTS phase 2 (para 8.16.4 of the Inspector's report). To be consistent with the Local Plan 'south of Bellingers Garage' should be deleted from the reference to the new road from the site to the A338.</p> <p>See response to the Highway Agency above.</p> <p>See response to New road to A338 north of Grove</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraphs 1.12, 3.3 and 3.4 amended as set out in Appendix 15.</b></p> <p>Extensive evidence was put to the inquiry about the impact of the new road from Mably Way east to the A417. The draft guidance has been revised as set out in Appendix A to take account of the Inspector's recommendation regarding the construction of a new relief road scheme for Wantage, as recommended for acceptance by Strategic and Local plan advisory Group.</p> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations   | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)   |
|--|--|
| <p>north eastern part of Wantage. This impact could be reduced by: the road having a much wider northwards sweep; putting it in a cutting nearer the top of Crab Hill; have landscaping in wide belts of trees both sides of the road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be invasive on the landscape and to environment surrounding Charlton. Should be further north if serving new development in Grove. Road will cut through a Roman road and area of natural beauty.</li> <li>• Cross green belt land that a previous independent enquiry in 1998 recommended should never be developed. If allowed will allow other development to get permission in prime agricultural land and the green belt.</li> <li>• The identity, character and distinct position of the historic market town of Wantage will be put at risk.</li> <li>• If there is no specific division between Wantage and Grove the two will just become one.</li> <li>• There will be pollution problems from the proximity of local and commercial through traffic.</li> <li>• Because of the short notice given to residents no decision should be made before full consultation with detailed plans and policy, concerning in-fill housing, access and noise, have been heard in a public meeting</li> </ul> <p><b>P.A. Darlaston, R.C. Price, Mr and Mrs J.M.S. Manning, M.G. Nicholas, Mr and Mrs Notman, B.</b> and S. Austin put forward alternative suggestions to the New road from Mably Way east to A417</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For eastbound road network, Council should be developing route involving existing Grove Park Drive, to connect the A417 with the A338 at the Williams roundabout which would provide a better link to the new development</li> <li>• Using Grove Park Drive would mean smaller slices from edge of fields rather than cutting through agricultural land.</li> <li>• The proposed extension eastwards of Mably Way will be a long route for the development which is predominantly in the north of Grove. Would be better to have new road north of Grove that links to Grove Park Drive.</li> <li>• Grove Park Drive would be cheaper to develop than building new road.</li> <li>• Alternative access to Didcot via Steventon Road.</li> </ul> <p>Realignment of Denchworth Road</p> <p><b>Persimmon Strategic Land</b> have not seen any technical justification from the County Highway Authority to support the realignment of Denchworth Road though take view there is scope for an on-line improvement.</p> <p><b>M. Monk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing Denchworth Road from Mably Way to Grove needs to be retained for residents of south west part of Grove</li> </ul> | <p>See response above</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraphs 1.12 and 3.3 of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance be amended as set out in Appendix 15.</b></p> <p>The local plan Inspector concluded that the realignment of Denchworth Road or the provision of an alternative road south of Grove to Mably Way, to facilitate a safe and satisfactory main vehicle access into the site from Mably Way would be an essential component of the first phase of development, rather than any increased use of</p> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations  | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)  |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Traffic calming measures</i><br/><b>C. Jones, R.C. Price, M. Monk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic calming measures should be put in along Denchworth Road as it feeds into Oxford Lane at the start of development to slow traffic down.</li> <li>Traffic calming measures are needed in Charlton Village Road now and before any development starts to prevent rat-running. Sort the roads out first not last.</li> <li>Current traffic calming measures in Oxford Lane are poor.</li> </ul> <p>SERVICES</p> <p><i>General</i><br/><b>Mrs H Harwood</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilities such as schools and shops should be put in small groups so they are easy to access.</li> <li>It would be better to have a leisure centre in Grove as there are more people there than Wantage.</li> </ul> <p><i>Schools</i><br/><b>Oxfordshire County Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Oxfordshire County Council school brief standard' should read 'Oxfordshire County Council Primary School brief standard' in 6.6.</li> <li>'contributions to improve existing primary schools' be changed to 'contributions towards the provision of temporary accommodation at existing primary schools may be required in the early stages of development until the new schools are able to accept pupils' in 6.6.</li> </ul> <p><b>Persimmon Strategic Land</b> has commissioned an Education Needs Assessment but this has not yet been completed. They reserve the right to comment further at later date, but do not take this as indication that they accept the requirements outlined.</p> <p><b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM</b></p> | <p>Newlands Drive or Cane Lane (para 8.16.9 of the Inspector's report). The draft guidance at Appendix 15 has been revised to take account of the Inspector's recommendation.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance</b></p> <p>The guidance reflects the measures set out in Policy H5 (xiva) of the local plan which the Inspector concluded are appropriate and provide a robust and practical framework within which the detailed implementation of necessary traffic management measures arising from the H5 allocation may be resolved on a phased basis. Accordingly there is no need to amend the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The Inspector noted the criticisms made at the inquiry regarding present deficiencies in the range and scale of amongst other matters leisure facilities. However, he considers that the policy is comprehensive and entirely appropriate regarding the level of facilities to be provided and did not recommend the inclusion of a leisure centre at Grove. Accordingly there is no need to revise the draft guidance as requested.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Page 48 paragraph 6.6 of the draft SPG amend 'Oxfordshire County Council school brief standard' to read 'Oxfordshire County Council Primary School brief standard'</b><br/>This change will correct the guidance.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Page 48 paragraph 6.6 of the draft SPG amend 'contributions to improve existing primary schools' to read 'contributions towards the provision of temporary accommodation at existing primary schools may be required in the early stages of development until the new schools are able to accept pupils'.</b></p> <p>The suggested amendment will give the County Council flexibility when considering the provision of primary schools in Grove.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The draft SPG sets out the Council's position regarding the provision of primary and secondary education. Nothing that was raised at the inquiry would lead the District Council to conclude that the draft Supplementary</p> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations   | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)  |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question the appropriateness of upgrading existing schools as well as requiring two new schools. More consultation required with Education Authority to determine best means to meet needs of primary pupils from the new development.</li> <li>• Consider there is still no clear way forward in relation to secondary school provision. Consider it preferable for SPG to set out options and implications/requirements of each and not assume one particular option.</li> <li>• In 4.10, replace 'council will require school...' with 'council will seek to ensure that the school...'</li> </ul> <p><b>H.K. Brew, Churches in Grove</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the opinion poll referred to in 6.7, 73% were in favour of two schools and this should be added to underline this strong public opinion.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the proposed school locations and endorse the location of a secondary school next to local centre.</li> </ul> <p><i>Churches</i></p> <p><b>Churches in Grove, Grove Free Evangelical Church, C. Jones, G.K. Belcher, Su Lockley, R. Lucas, G. Lucas, E. Redford, E. Harford, J. Dyer, M. Glover, B.E. White,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no provision mentioned in 1.8 for a church building/Christian centre, which should be part of the new development.</li> <li>• Land should be made available so that a multipurpose Christian centre could be built which would also serve the community.</li> <li>• Present churches are well attended but their present facilities will not be sufficient for the influx from the new development.</li> <li>• Welcome the joint use of buildings and, in the absence of specifically designated places, that some be reserved for Sunday worship.</li> </ul> <p><i>Local Centre facilities</i></p> <p><b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question the need for specific community worker and information centre to assist the integration of new and existing developments. The planning process combined with the use of existing</li> </ul> | <p>Planning Guidance should be revised at this stage, especially in the absence of any definitive advice from OCC.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>It is agreed that further discussion is required with the education authority regarding school provision in Grove. The District Council conclude that the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance should not be revised at this stage, especially in the absence of any definitive advice from OCC. It would be appropriate for further discussion and consultation to take place through the Grove Development Forum in addition to any consultation Oxfordshire County Council carry out as Education Authority.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Para 4.10 third sentence delete 'Wherever possible the Council will require' and replace with 'The Council will seek to ensure'. Also delete 'to be' and replace with 'are'.</b></p> <p>It is agreed that it would be appropriate to amend the guidance so as not to be so prescriptive.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: no change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>This is referred to in the local plan at para 8.27 and also in the draft SPG, but it is not considered necessary to change the draft SPG to include the precise percentages.</p> <p>This support is welcomed.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The Local plan Inspector (at 8.15.3 of his report) concluded that he saw no real risk that the new housing would take place without the appropriate infrastructure, services and facilities to accompany it, as to do so would be clearly contrary to the Local Plan, once adopted, and to SPG. In the absence of any specific requirement for the provision of land or 'buildings' in Policy H5 this requirement could not be introduced into the draft guidance.</p> <p>At para 6.10 of the guidance the reference to the community centre makes it clear that the precise recommendations will need to be discussed in fuller detail. The joint use of the community centre as a place for worship could be one of the issues for discussion and consultation through the Grove Development Forum.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations  | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)   |
|---|--|
| <p>agencies will be adequate for this purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider that the size and purpose of the community centre has not been adequately thought through. Text suggests unusually large building, used for a wide range of purposes. Should look into scope for shared use with schools.</li> <li>Consider the description of retail uses appears highly prescriptive and may lack credibility in relation to existing local retailing and market realities. Para 6.13 should be changed to read 'Convenience shopping such as a supermarket..'</li> <li>In 6.14, there is no attempt to consider joint use of facilities in order to rationalise the amount of community buildings to be provided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Grove Parish Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The possibility of expanding the present library into Grove centre and moving the centre to the new site be explored. If the library is moved it could affect the current centre.</li> </ul> <p><b>Persimmon Strategic Land consider that</b> reference to specific hectarage for open spaces in 6.17 is unwarranted and unduly prescriptive.</p> <p><b>Churches in Grove;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the local centre of the kind envisaged as the most appropriate response to that infrastructural requirement.</li> <li>Retain an option over the possible resiting of the Cornerstone café on the new centre.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need for the development to be integrated into the community strategy currently being produced by the Vale Strategic Partnership</li> </ul> <p><b>Mrs H Harwood</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A traditional street would be better than a pedestrian area as pedestrian areas are poorly used when the shops close, uninviting, and can become a no-go area.</li> </ul> | <p>The local plan Inspector (at para 8.15.4 of his report) did not see it necessary to recommend a change to the plan to delete the requirement for a community worker.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The local plan Inspector concluded that policy H5 lists all the necessary elements of the local centres and does not see a need to add anything further or delete any element. He concludes (at para 8.15.9 of his report) that there is no justification for a lower figure for the size of the community centre nor to remove it entirely. He concludes the same applies in respect of shopping premises to be expanded.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Page 50 para 6.14 of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance add new sentence 'It may be possible for these to be provided in association with the secondary school or community centre'.</b></p> <p>With regard to joint use it should be noted that paragraph 6.8 stresses that the decision on the extent of any shared facilities in the secondary school will have implications for the provision of facilities elsewhere within the development. A reference could be included in para 6.14 to refer to possibilities of joint use.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The Inspector concluded (paragraph 8.15.10 of his report) that the overall nature and extent of infrastructure provision sought is reasonable, practical and likely to be realistic in general terms. More specifically the Inspector did not recommend any changes to the amount of open space in Policy H5. Accordingly, the draft Supplementary Guidance should remain unchanged to be consistent with the local plan which refers to specific hectarages.</p> <p>The support is welcomed</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>Further discussions and consultation on the Cornerstone Café could take place through the Development Forum.</p> <p>The Council will work to ensure that the development at Grove links with the community strategy as highlighted in the Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>It is not the purpose of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance to prepare a detailed design for the site but provide guidance for the developers to take into account during the development. The precise layout and design of the local centre will be a matter dealt with through the development control process with further discussions and</p> |



**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations   | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)  |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Wilts and Berks Canal</i><br/><b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements</b> consider there is a limit to the extent to which restoration works to the Wilts and Berks Canal can be justified as direct consequence of development.</p> <p><b>British Waterways,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome references to Wilts and Berks Canal in 5.10.</li> <li>• Discharge of surface water to the canal will be dependent on the quality of the water and a full environmental impact assessment.</li> </ul><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach outlined in 6.21 provides major opportunity to restore this section of canal, and have been used on several other canal restoration schemes.</li> </ul> <p><i>Contributions</i><br/><b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements</b> consider that while it is not unreasonable to seek maintenance funding from developers for open space provision but question 25 year period. 10 year period for other developments is referred to in 4.20 of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Persimmon Strategic Land consider</b> that the obligation for open space covering 25 years is unreasonable and out of kilter with standard approach. Ongoing maintenance costs should be a matter for negotiation with the developer.</p> <p><b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements</b> consider that restoration works to Wilts and Berks Canal are not a justifiable planning benefit associated with Grove extension. Clarification is needed on what contributions are legitimately required towards the fire services. Appropriateness of contributions towards Grove Road Station have not been proven and the rail industry's role needs clarification.</p> <p><b>Oxfordshire County Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be reference to the provision for additional book stock in the free serviced site and pro-rata contribution towards the new library in 6.12.</li> <li>• Will require provision of water hydrants at nil cost for fire fighting purposes</li> </ul><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider that the cost of fire hydrants and</li> </ul> | <p>consultation taking place through the Grove Development Forum.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: no change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance</b></p> <p>The extent of any contribution will be determined through the development control process.</p> <p>The support is welcomed</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Page 46 paragraph 5.10 of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance add new sentence to read 'Discharge of surface water to the canal will be dependent on the quality of the water and a full environmental impact assessment'.</b></p> <p>This point is noted and the text of the draft SPG could be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS: para 2.7, last sentence delete 'usually for a minimum of 25 years' and replace with 'for a period of at least 10 years'</b></p> <p>The Inspector recommends that the local plan retains the reference in the first deposit local plan 4.20 to commuted payments, but that it should refer to 'a period of at least ten years'. To be consistent with this recommendation the draft Supplementary Planning guidance should be amended accordingly.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The advice on the Wilts &amp; Berks canal reflects the requirements of Policy H5 xv)c and the advice on Grove Station reflects the requirements of policy H5 xv)b and should therefore be retained in the draft guidance.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Para 6.21 third bullet point add to end 'There will be a requirement for fire hydrants to be provided throughout all phases of the development to the requirements of the Fire and Rescue Service'.</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council have now indicated that the requirement to provide fire hydrants is a standard requirement. Accordingly the guidance should be updated.</p> <p>See response to WM Wasbrough above.</p> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations   | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)  |
|--|---|
| <p>installation needs to be met in full by the developer. Installation needs to be in the initial stages of construction and continue throughout phases 1 to 3.</p> <p><b>The South West Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust</b> comment that no mention is made of additional healthcare provision. PCT request that it is included in the planning for Grove.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT<br/><b>Persimmon Strategic Land</b> consider that provision should be made in phase 2 for new employment-generating development. Council previously acknowledged provision should be made and would improve the site's sustainable credentials.</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT FORUM<br/><b>Churches in Grove</b> strongly support the formation of Development Forum.<br/><b>Grove Parish Council</b> fully supports the formulation of the Development Forum but wants those most affected by a decision to be in the majority<br/><b>Oxfordshire County Council</b> want to be represented on the Development Forum in its capacity as Strategic planning Authority, Highway Authority and Service Provider</p> <p>COMMUNITY WORKER<br/><b>Grove Parish Council</b> would provide positive support for a community worker.<br/><b>Churches in Grove</b> welcome the commitment to a community worker and information centre.</p> <p>OPEN SPACE<br/><b>Grove Parish Council</b> believe some of the land allocated for community park should include sports pitches and related facilities</p> <p>Annexe A<br/><b>Persimmon Strategic Land</b> consider that in Annexe A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• references to percentage and mix of affordable housing should be deleted.</li> <li>• references to new road south of Bellingers Garage and to promotion of new road westwards of Mably Way should be deleted.</li> <li>• 'realignment' should be replaced with 'improvements to' Denchworth Road.</li> </ul> | <p>No specific requirements have been made by the PCT for additional health care provision. Further discussions and consultation on health care will take place as part of the development control process and through the Grove Development Forum.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The Inspector concluded that on the basis of current evidence the currently available land at Grove Technology Park should be sufficient to meet locally generated needs for employment land to 2011 and did not merit an additional employment allocation at Grove. Accordingly it is not considered necessary to amend the draft Guidance.</p> <p>The support is welcomed</p> <p>The support is welcomed</p> <p>Oxfordshire County council is represented on the Development Forum</p> <p>The support is welcomed</p> <p>The support is welcomed.</p> <p>The draft guidance as set out in Annexe 15 has been amended to take account of the Inspector's recommendations on all these issues.</p> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE  
FORMER AIRFIELD WEST OF GROVE – DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES & GUIDELINES**

| Summary of Representations   | Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)   |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements</b> have reservations about the detail contained in Annexe A. Would welcome meeting with officers to discuss phasing of development.</li> <li>• Oxfordshire County Council consider it would be helpful to include in Annexe A the provision of fire hydrants in the phasing programme.</li> </ul> <p><b>K.C. Turberfield</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace 'realignment of Denchworth Road south of Mably Way' to 'realignment of Denchworth Road to Mably Way' in Annexe A.</li> </ul> <p>Annexe B</p> <p><b>Persimmon Strategic Land</b> consider that in Annexe B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The diagrammatic interpretation of re-aligned Denchworth Split 750 homes to be provided in phase 1 between the northern and southern parts of the site. Would be scope for access for say, 200 dwellings off Oxford Road.</li> <li>• Road from phase 1 plan and through route from phase 2 and 3 plans should be deleted.</li> <li>• <b>WM Wasbrough and the Trustees of WM Wasbrough's 1984 &amp; 1992 Children's Settlements</b> have reservations about the detail contained in Annexe B. Would welcome meeting with officers to discuss phasing of development.</li> </ul> | <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: No change to draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The phasing in the draft Guidance has been amended in Appendix 15 to take account of the Inspector's recommendations. Through its Development Team meetings officers have been discussing with the developers key issues relating to the development, including phasing.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Annexe A of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance Transport replace 'realignment of Denchworth road south of Mably Way' with 'realignment of Denchworth Road or the provision of an alternative road south of Grove to Mably Way'.</b></p> <p>Noted. The reference will need to be changed to take account of the Inspector's recommendation made at paragraphs 8.16.7-8.16.9 of his report.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION: Delete Annexe B from the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance.</b></p> <p>The officers note the concerns raised. In addition the Inspector's recommendations delete specific references to a new Road from Mably Way east of the A417 and west of the A417 and makes reference to realignment of Denchworth Road. In these circumstances your officers consider that it would not be appropriate to include Annexe B, particularly as it would not be able to include any specific routes.</p> |