

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO. | P21/V2546/RM |
| SITE | Land at Crab Hill Land east of A3388 and North of A417, Wantage, OX12 8HT |
| PARISH | WANTAGE |
| PROPOSAL | Construction of new road carriageways (Grove Road Loop Road and Major Access Road), footways, cycleways; Reprofiting of land for development, Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) swales and associated earthworks, and Hard and soft landscaping throughout the site, particularly within the Country Park (northern area of the site) and the park within the Grove Road Loop Road (as amended by plans received 30 November 2021, 17 December 2021 and amended by plans and information received 17 March 2022 and 25 April 2022). |
| WARD MEMBER(S) | Discharge of conditions 8 & 17 (CEMP), 8 & 31 (LEMP), 21 (Landscape Details), 23 (Tree Protection), 24 (Landscape Maintenance), 37 (Surface Water Drainage) and 45 & 48 (Highway Design) on planning permission P21/V2544/FUL. Amos Duveen Jenny Hannaby Andy Crawford Patrick O'Leary |
| APPLICANT | St Modwen Developments & Bare Trustees of the Crab Hill |
| OFFICER | Stuart Walker |

RECOMMENDATION

To approve the Reserved Matters, subject to the following:

Condition:

1. Approved plans

Informative:

1. Details pursuant to conditions 8, 17, 21, 23, 24, 31, 37, 45 and 48 of outline planning permission P21/V2544/FUL are agreed for this phase through the approval of the Reserved Matters application.
2. The applicant is reminded of the obligation of compliance with the relevant conditions on the outline application that apply to this phase (e.g., CEMP & LEMP implementation).

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This application comes to Planning Committee as Wantage Town Council object to the proposal.
- 1.2 The application seeks Reserved Matters approval of layout, scale, appearance, access, and landscaping for further infrastructure works on the Crab Hill strategic site. Known as Advanced Infrastructure Works Phase 6 (AIW6), the application seeks detailed consent for:
 - The Grove Road Loop Road and Major Access Road, footways, cycleways
 - Reprofilng of land for development
 - Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS), swales and associated earthworks
 - Hard and soft landscaping
- 1.3 A location plan is **attached** at Appendix 1. The application also seeks to partially discharge numerous outline conditions (where relevant to the proposal).
- 1.4 The proposed development has been designed and developed to accord with the approved masterplan, site wide strategy and design guidance documents. The proposal has also been amended to take account of comments received from OCC highways, the drainage engineer, and the landscape officer.
- 1.5 The application originally included the provision of the new allotments and a pedestrian / cycle link to the A338, but following discussions with officers and consultee feedback, these have been omitted to allow further design work to be undertaken and will be submitted for consideration under a separate Reserved Matters application in the future.
- 1.6 All plans and supporting documents accompanying the application are available to view online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk. The latest layout and section plans are **attached** at Appendix 2.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.1 A summary of the responses received is set out below. Comments made can be viewed in full online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Wantage Town Council | Mar / April 2022 Amendment – Objection: |
|----------------------|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would like to see a planning condition implemented that the landscape buffer is not incorporated into gardens.• Would like to see suitable tree planting that will provide screening and that will alleviate water issues.• Support the comments from residents about the use of filter drains across the area. <p>March 2022 Amendment – Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regarding levels, there is confusion about the proposed levels the cross sections supplied do not appear to match the latest version of the contour plots.• The height now appears to be increased to make the developer’s existing drainage plans work. Are there other drainage plans that can be explored that do not result in such a sharp increase in height close to the boundary of the development and treat the existing landscape more sympathetically? From the drawings it is difficult to determine the distance between the proposed development housing and the existing homes. If the back-to-back distance is 21 meters or close to this value as specified in the Design Guidance, this would have a detrimental effect to the amenity and privacy of existing homes given the height increase. While the priority would be to ensure the natural land levels are maintained, potentially increasing the back-to-back distances between the different estates, and introducing a buffer zone of vegetation and trees may also help lessen any impact.• Wantage Town Council’s concerns over drainage from the land, and evidence from existing residents, that recent work in the vicinity has disrupted flow of water flowing off and or draining from the fields is having an impact on residents. A condition should be considered to ensure the developer takes reasonable care during the construction to limit the risk to local existing residents as well as ensure the final scheme is acceptable. Wantage Town Council supports the District Council’s Drainage Team’s previous objection regarding demonstrating calculations to confirm the drainage plan will work.• Wantage Town Council is concerned that separating the application will mean that future applications will have predetermined results due to the lack of scope, and some solutions precluded to the treatment of footpaths, cycle paths, vehicle access and allotments for example the siting of the paths. It makes no sense to keep the dog-leg parcel of land in the application if |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>the intent is to properly review how this area works and is used. There is no explanation what the dogleg is for, for example a footpath? It raised concerns that it is by default a footpath and vehicle access. It would be helpful to have a discussion to agree if a portion of land is to be removed from the application that the boundary is drawn in a sensible location to ensure that any potential practical solutions are still open.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wantage Town Council feel that it could be useful to hold discussions over siting of footpaths and cycle paths and ensure that vehicle routes are as best segregated as possible. Existing allotment holders should be included in proposed discussions over their siting and may help propose acceptable solutions. <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Landscaping - the letter and new cross sections provided some relief to the Town Council that there was a mistake with the application regarding the landscaping drawings. The cross sections raise more questions rather than answering the concerns raised. The new cross sections show that the ground levels are altered and that they do not marry up with the ground levels at the boundary of the development - for example in some cases the step change is approximately 1 metre - this could lead to land slippage and potentially damage to properties adjoining the development site. We are certain that this is either a mistake in the drawings or a misunderstanding. To ensure that everything is clear we feel it is important to resubmit all the landscaping drawings once they have been corrected rather than just example sections (although some of these would be helpful too).• Cycle Route - National cycling design standards LTN 1/20 state that a balance will need to be struck to best meet the various design objectives when designing a cycle path. It will not always be able to meet all the objectives for example directness, amenity, and gradient. If gradient guidelines had to always be met many parts of the UK would not have cycling infrastructure. If zig zags cannot be introduced to reduce the gradient, then maybe creating segregated pedestrian footpaths and cycle routes would solve the issues. Potentially a route through the allotment site could be made use of to segregate cyclists and pedestrians and give better connectivity to the allotments from the new development site. We would be concerned that the |
|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <p>path, designed only for the use of pedestrians, would cause a greater safety concern. We are almost certain that cyclists would use this path to reduce the length of their journey, as the path submitted would be a shorter route. This would mean that an accident would be waiting to happen when cyclists and pedestrians use the same narrow path.</p> <p>Original Plans – Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the comments from Harbug. Would have liked the developer to have kept to the original vision. Would like to see widening of the path to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. The path needs to link up with the road and appropriately link to the cycle path. There are concerns about the change of profile of the land and the detrimental effect to the amenity of residents whose properties adjoin the new development - for example overlooking from buildings and gardens that will be raised above the natural landscape. There are concerns that the runoff from the hills will cause flooding to properties in the vicinity. |
| <p>Grove Parish Council</p> | <p>No objection.</p> |
| <p>Councillor Andy Crawford</p> | <p>Original Plans – comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was under the (mis?) apprehension that the new link path by the allotments was to comply with the description in the original outline plans which refer to paths for walking AND cycling. However, this path is only 2 metres wide, and is described as for pedestrians only. If this proceeds, it appears people wishing to go into town from the western part of Crab Hill will have to cycle around a significant detour around the route of new link road. Alternatively, they may use the pedestrian path which will give rise to safety concerns. Both the Vale and County Councils have policies seeking to promote cycling and this will be a tremendous lost opportunity if the pedestrian footpath is not upgraded to cater for cyclists in accordance with the aims of the original outline consent. If you are minded to approve, without amending this aspect, please advise as I should like to consider calling the application in. • As a separate point the Town Council met (successfully in a very constructive meeting) with the developers regarding the allotment provision and part of this discussion included the footpath/cycle way. From memory we did stress the need for this to be available for cyclists and whilst discussion was had |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>around what we were told were some challenging engineering issues regarding elevation/inclines etc we were not left with the impression that these were unsurmountable to deliver a cycle route.</p> |
| <p>Residents</p> | <p>April 2022 Amendment – one letter of objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing dwellings will still be overlooked and there is no explanation about landscaping relating to existing trees. • The new filter ditch alongside existing property should be changed to a ditch to minimise flood risk. Filter ditches tend to have a short lifespan and will cause flooding in the future as they are poor at preventing flash flooding. <p>March 2022 Amendment – Two letters of objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised levels near existing property will cause flooding and waterlogging of gardens, lack of privacy and potential loss of light. • It is unclear why ground levels need to change – the existing field is flat. <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – Two letters of objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised bank near existing property will cause flooding and lack of privacy. • Better drainage needs to be done to stop flooding on Elm Road. <p>Original plans – Four letters of objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase / change in levels leading to loss of privacy. • Increase / change in levels resulting in potential flooding of existing property. • See no reason to change levels. <p>In addition, five letters of objection have been received from residents in Rowstock.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over traffic impact at Rowstock Roundabout from the Grove loop road. |
| <p>Wantage and Grove Campaign Group</p> | <p>April 2022 Amendment – Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the new plans showing heights and distances between Truelocks Way, Elm Road, Aldworth Avenue and Westfield Way. They clearly show the importance of the "possible" landscape buffer between the new homes and existing dwellings. Can a condition be included in the approval of any application ensuring that this landscape buffer exists and is maintained outside the boundaries of individual properties? |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We note that the promised buffer between homes in Parsonage Close and new dwelling in parcel 1b are now the gardens of the new dwellings and the 'buffer' no longer exists. We would hope that this doesn't happen with future phases.• We still can see no evidence of the two footpath / cycleways through to Charlton heights shown in the original outline design and access statement (page 79) approved in application reference P17/V0652/FUL. We object to this lack of linkage between the new development and existing developments. <p>March 2022 Amendment – Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We note that the issues associated with the levels has not been addressed - specifically with reference to 5145720-ATK-AIW6-ZZ-DR-C-0618 sheet 8 – can we see cross sections both north/south and east / west abutting the boundaries with the existing homes on Charlton Heights please?• The new development seems to be at least a metre higher than the boundary and we can see little evidence of drainage infrastructure. Without clarity as to how runoff from the development can be stopped from running straight into the gardens and homes of existing residents we have to object to this application.• As noted in our previous objection we have already seen the impact on houses in Charlton Village of the raised homes and gardens in phase one of Kingsgrove and believe that this could be repeated north of Charlton Heights. In particular the impact on the existing homes of the increased water runoff caused by the higher ground and the extra elevation allowing residents of the new houses to look more directly into the gardens and homes of existing residents, resulting in a loss of privacy.• Also we still can see no evidence of the two footpath/cycleways through to Charlton heights shown in the original outline design and access statement (page 79) approved in application reference P17/V0652/FUL, seem to have disappeared altogether. We object to this lack of linkage between the new development and existing developments. <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – no response.</p> <p>Original plans – Objection.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We object to this application on the grounds that the planned changes in elevation to the north of Charlton Heights will have a detrimental impact on these existing dwellings. We have already seen the impact on houses in Charlton Village of the raised homes and gardens in phase one of Kingsgrove and believe that this could be repeated north of Charlton Heights. In particular the impact on the existing homes of the increased water runoff caused by the higher ground and the extra elevation allowing residents of the new houses to look more directly into the gardens and homes of existing residents, resulting in a loss of privacy. • We also object to this application because the new link path to the allotments in the original outline design and access statement (page 79) approved in application reference P17/V0652/FUL which refer to paths for walking AND cycling. However this path is only 2 metres wide, and is described as being for pedestrians only. This reduction in access to the allotments from the development will be detrimental to cyclists (and residents with trolleys/wheelbarrows) from the development. • Also the footpath/cycleway from the part of the development further south (nearer to Charlton Heights) across the open space to the allotments, and the two footpath/cycleways through to Charlton heights shown in the original outline design and access statement (page 79) approved in application reference P17/V0652/FUL, seem to have disappeared altogether. We object to this lack of linkage between the new development and existing developments. • We note that the pages from the original Design and Access Statement have not been updated making it difficult to compare these plans with previously approved plans. |
| <p>HARBUG</p> | <p>April 2022 Amendment – not consulted.</p> <p>March 2022 Amendment – no response.</p> <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The steep gradient is not a sufficient reason to abandon cycle provision. <p>Original plans – Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a serious problem with the proposed cycling provision down to the A338 in terms of its width and gradient. This will be off-putting to users. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Rowstock Residents Association</p> | <p>Original plans – Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We oppose the application for the Grove Road Loop Road as this will funnel more traffic via Rowstock Roundabout. Alternative plans to alleviate traffic congestion at Rowstock need to be in place before the loop road is approved. |
| <p>Oxfordshire County Council - Transport</p> | <p>April 2022 Amendment – no response.</p> <p>March 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest conditions on vision splays, roads to be constructed before occupation and construction traffic management. <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further information required regarding vision splays, trees, street lighting and cycle / footway link. <p>Original plans – no response.</p> |
| <p>Oxfordshire County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority</p> | <p>April 2022 Amendment – no response.</p> <p>March 2022 Amendment – Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sight of the overall scheme for this area and an explanation of how this part fits in would help to understand the scheme. <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further information required on how variable runoff rates are achieved. <p>Original Plans – no response.</p> |
| <p>Oxfordshire County Council – Archaeology</p> | <p>April 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has instructed Oxford Archaeology to implement archaeological recording works within the area specified in our December comments in line with the previously agreed WSI for the archaeological investigations. These works have therefore now been implemented, monitored, and will form part of the archive and as such our previous recommendations for conditions on the RM application are no longer required. <p>March 2022 Amendment – no response.</p> <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest conditions for Written Scheme of Investigation and mitigation. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| | Original plans – no response. |
| Drainage Engineer | <p>April 2022 Amendment – No comment.</p> <p>March 2022 Amendment – No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals have been amended to reflect previous comments and are considered acceptable. No objection to part discharge of condition 37 for this infrastructure package. <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many of the previous comments have been addressed but further information is required on boundary ditch, modelling and calculations. <p>Original plans – Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further information required. |
| Thames Water | No comment. |
| Environmental Health – Contamination | No observations to make. |
| Environmental Health – Protection | No comment. |
| Environmental Health – Air Quality | No comment. |
| Countryside Officer | <p>April 2022 Amendment – not consulted.</p> <p>March 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amended plans have not materially changed – see previous comments. <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – No objection, but</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor corrections to plans and LEMP required. <p>Original plans – Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments to the LEMP are required. |
| Landscape Architect | <p>April 2022 Amendment – not consulted.</p> <p>March 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans have been updated to take account of previous comments. <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – Holding objection.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of previous comments have been addressed but a couple of issues remain to be resolved with regards to the play area and tree species. <p>Original plans – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are required to hard and soft landscape works, the play area and LEMP. |
| Forestry Officer | <p>April 2022 Amendment – not consulted.</p> <p>March 2022 Amendment – No further comment.</p> <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amended plans have removed poplars. Landscape officer to comment on nature of overall scheme. <p>Original plans – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest revising species either side of roundabout from Poplar to Koster Oak, Turkish Hazel or Dawyck Beech. |
| SGN Networks | <p>Draw attention to existing utility infrastructure in vicinity of application site.</p> |
| Infrastructure and Development Team | <p>April 2022 Amended – not consulted.</p> <p>March 2022 Amendment - Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have reviewed the amendment and agree that the LEAP play area provision is in accordance with the S106 Agreement. <p>Nov / Dec 2021 Amendment – no response.</p> <p>Original Plans – Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have reviewed the allotment and LEAP play area plans and agree that the provision is in accordance with the S106 Agreement. |

3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 [P19/V3181/RM](#) - Approved (03/07/2020)

Erection of sub-station south of community building and associated access road, landscaping around WELR roundabout on A417 and balancing pond on western and northern boundary and partial discharge of conditions 8 and 17 (CEMP), 8 and 31 (LEMP), 21 (Landscape details), 23 (Tree Protection), 24 (Landscape Maintenance), 33 (contamination in respect of the western balancing pond only), 37 (Surface water drainage), 38 (Surface water drainage) and 45 and 48 (highway design) of permission ref. P19/V1269/FUL in relation to these works.

[P19/V1269/FUL](#) - Approved (22/08/2019)

Variation of conditions 1 (approved plans), 7 (Housing Delivery Document), and 17 (phasing plan) of planning permission P17/V0652/FUL

[P18/V2787/RM](#) - Approved (28/02/2019)

Reserved Matters application for infrastructure works including internal roads, car parking, landscaping of open spaces and the civic square. As amended by plans received 28 January 2019. As amended by plans received 6 February 2019.

[P17/V3248/RM](#) - Approved (02/05/2018)

Reserved Matters application for infrastructure works including ground levelling, internal access road, service diversions and landscaping (as amended by plans and information received 20 March 2018).

[P17/V0652/FUL](#) - Approved (27/11/2017)

Variation of Conditions 1 (amended parameter plans), 33 (additional land to be included within the Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation) and 52 (vehicle access) of Planning Permission P13/V1764/O (as amended by letter received 23 March 2017).

[P13/V1764/O](#) - Approved (13/07/2015)

Outline application for residential development of up to 1500 dwellings including new employment space (use class B1), a neighbourhood centre/community hub (use classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1, C2, D1 and D2), new primary school, central park, ancillary areas (including allotments and sports pitches) with access off the A338 Grove Road and three accesses off the A417 Reading Road. Provision of a strategic link road between the A417 and the A338 Road to be known as the Wantage Eastern Link Road (WELR). All matters reserved except means of access to the development and the WELR. Additional information received as amplified by agent's covering letter dated 30th October 2013 and agent's e-mail dated 10th December 2013.

4.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- 4.1 A Reserved Matters application is considered a new application for planning permission under the 2017 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. The outline application was EIA development and was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) and an addendum update statement, and the following areas of potential impact were addressed: landscape and visual impact; transport; historic environment; ecology and nature conservation; water resources and flood risk; noise; air quality; socio-economic impacts; cumulative effects and residual effects and mitigation.
- 4.2 It is considered this Reserved Matters application falls within the ambit of the approved ES, and a further addendum is not required for this application.

5.0 **MAIN ISSUES**

5.1 The main issues in this case are:

1. The principle of development
2. Layout
 - Residential amenity
3. Appearance and Scale
4. Landscaping
5. Access
6. Technical matters
 - Flood risk and drainage
 - Biodiversity
 - Conditions

5.2 **The principle of development**

The site is allocated for development in the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1 and outline permission for a housing led mixed use development, was granted in July 2015 with variations to parameter plans permitted in November 2017, August 2019, and January 2022. There are no material changes in planning policy and the established principle of the proposal remains acceptable.

5.3 **Layout**

The layout of the proposed advanced works is acceptable. They have been designed to accord with the approved masterplan, development brief and site wide strategies for delivery of the development. The proposal is compliant with local plan policy CP37.

5.4 *Residential amenity*

Concern has been raised on the impact to existing neighbours from reprofiling land and changing levels. The change in levels is in part to facilitate gravity surface water drainage and to ensure cut and fill across the site avoids the need to dispose of material off site. Some levels remain close to existing, but others vary from 0.5m to 1m in height. The largest level change is near 44 Aldworth Avenue at 1.22m.

5.5 The increase in levels is not considered harmful to existing neighbours and this is demonstrated on the section drawings attached at Appendix 2. These show possible locations of new dwellings within the site, the boundary, a landscape buffer, and drainage. Where levels are increased, officers are confident design guide standards can be achieved in future residential Reserved Matter applications to ensure privacy and amenity of existing property is maintained to an acceptable level. The proposal therefore accords with policy DP23.

5.6 The Town Council has requested a planning condition to ensure that landscape buffers are not incorporated into gardens and would like to see suitable tree planting that will provide screening and alleviate water issues. These are ultimately matters for future Reserved Matters applications, but officers advise there will be limitations on how much new planting can be undertaken due to

the existing watermain. The management of landscape buffers will be explored in more detail with future residential Reserved Matter applications.

5.7 Overall, the advanced infrastructure works proposal is considered compliant with the site wide design strategy, adopted design guide principles and policy CP37.

5.8 **Appearance and Scale**

The proposed development is acceptable in terms of its appearance and scale. Roads and play areas accord with the site wide design strategy and the design of all the external elements of the proposal is considered to make a positive contribution to their surroundings in this context.

5.9 **Landscaping**

A detailed landscaping scheme is submitted with the planning application which includes the country park (northern area of the site) and the play park within the Grove Road Loop Road. The content of the scheme is acceptable, and the Landscape Architect has no objection to the amended proposal, with changes made to both hard and soft landscaping to address their initial comments. The proposal accords with policy CP44.

5.10 **Access**

The proposed access connection points from the public highway were approved under the outline application. AIW6 seeks consent for access roads within the site. Concerns raised by residents of Rowstock are therefore not material to this Reserved Matters application as impacts of traffic on the wider network from the strategic site were considered as part of the outline submission. The principles for the street design and character of the loop road have been established through the approved Site-wide Strategy, Design Guidance and Development Briefs documents. The proposed roads are in accordance with these documents and the Highway Authority raise no objection. Their suggested conditions are already imposed on the outline consent or can be secured through the approved drawing condition for this application should approval be given.

5.11 Concern has been raised by the local campaign group that this application does not provide the two footpath/cycleways through to Charlton heights approved in application reference P17/V0652/FUL. It is intended that links to Charlton Village will be provided from the south of the site to Charlton Heights. The links are shown on the approved parameter plans to the southern boundary and the detail of these will come forward as part of future Reserved Matters applications for the detailed consent for the residential development.

5.12 The Highway Authority has assessed the amended proposal and raises no objection in respect of highway safety and vehicle ingress / egress or vehicle circulation within the site. The proposal accords with policy DP16.

5.13 **Technical Matters**

Flood Risk and drainage

A sustainable drainage scheme has been submitted which is acceptable. The Drainage Engineer and Lead Local Flood Authority raised an initial holding objection as insufficient detail had been provided. The applicant has since addressed these with amended plans and a supporting technical note, and the Drainage Engineer confirms no objection.

- 5.14 Concern has been raised over flood risk and the type of drainage ditch proposed along the southern side of the site, adjoining existing neighbours. Officers have sought further clarification from the drainage engineer who comments *Once the site is built out the majority of water will be directed towards the SUDS basin and through the outfall sewer to the Letcombe Brook, so this will cut off the main natural catchment. The ditch proposed on the boundary would therefore only cater for a small amount of runoff from green areas to the rear of the new development in the permanent situation and will be fed back into the basin. The main reason for requesting this ditch be incorporated was to protect off-site properties during the build phase.* Officers are satisfied the proposal therefore minimises flood risk of existing property to an acceptable degree and is thus compliant with policy CP42.

5.15 *Biodiversity*

The countryside officer has assessed the application and raises no objection. The proposal therefore would accord with local plan policy CP46.

5.16 *Conditions*

The application seeks to partially discharge numerous conditions on the outline permission that are directly related to this phase of development. The details submitted pursuant to conditions 8 (RM drawings), 17 (Construction Environmental Management Plan), 21 (landscaping), 23 (tree protection), 24 (landscape management), 31 (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan), 37 (sustainable drainage), 45 and 48 (highway design) are acceptable.

6.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 This application has been assessed against the development plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and all other material planning considerations. In considering the application, due regard has been given to the representations received from statutory and other consultees. These have been considered in assessing the overall scheme.
- 6.2 The site is allocated in the adopted local plan and there is an extant outline planning permission on the site for up to 1500 dwellings. Reserved Matters have also been previously approved for adjoining parcels of development and are under construction.
- 6.3 Reserved Matters details submitted in this application are acceptable. Subject to the recommended conditions, the application should be approved.

The following planning policies have been considered:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (LPP1) Policies:

- CP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- CP03 - Settlement Hierarchy
- CP04 - Meeting Our Housing Needs
- CP07 - Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services
- CP15 - Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area
- CP26 - Accommodating current and future needs of the ageing population
- CP33 - Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
- CP35 - Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking
- CP37 - Design and Local Distinctiveness
- CP38 - Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites
- CP39 - The Historic Environment
- CP40 - Sustainable Design and Construction
- CP42 - Flood Risk
- CP43 - Natural Resources
- CP44 - Landscape
- CP45 - Green Infrastructure
- CP46 - Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (LPP2) Policies:

- DP16 - Access
- DP17 – Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
- DP21 - External Lighting
- DP23 - Impact of Development on Amenity
- DP24 - Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments
- DP25 - Noise Pollution
- DP26 - Air Quality
- DP27 - Land Affected By Contamination
- DP28 - Waste Collection and Recycling
- DP36 - Heritage Assets
- DP39 - Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments

Neighbourhood Plan

In 2016, the independent examiner inspecting the Wantage Neighbourhood Plan recommended that the plan shouldn't proceed to a referendum. A revised neighbourhood plan has yet to be submitted. Accordingly, no weight can be given to this plan.

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Vale of White Horse Design Guide SPD

Vale of White Horse Developer Contributions SPD

National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance

Other Relevant Legislation

Human Rights Act 1998

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken in account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

Equality Act 2010

In determining this planning application, the Council has regard to its equality obligations including its obligations under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010

Author: Stuart Walker
Contact No: 01235 422600
Email: planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk