

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
GROVE AIRFIELD

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
GENERAL	
<p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) have suggested that the 'local centre' be amended to read 'centre' throughout the guidance.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) have raised the point that requirements for improvements in infrastructure and services should be in accordance with Circular 05/2005.</p>	<p>The name was changed from district centre in the first deposit plan to local centre at the request of Grove Parish Council. The Local Plan Inspector saw no reason to change this. It would not therefore be appropriate to change the description as suggested. RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p> <p>Agreed. An amendment to paragraph 6.3 would be the most appropriate point in the document to add text. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 6.3 add to end of paragraph the following: "Policy DC8 of the Local Plan states that the provision of essential infrastructure and services will be secured through legal agreements in accordance with Circular 05/2005." Paragraph 6.5 delete third sentence and add "The lower case text states that the Council may seek commuted payments to cover the new facilities and services provided for a period of at least 10 years. This circular also advises that the provision of subsequent maintenance of facilities may be required in perpetuity where the facilities are predominately for the users of the development".</p>
SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the SPG will not be used as a stand alone document by developers in drawing up detailed proposals for the site. It will be read in conjunction with the design statement that will be submitted with the outline planning application. The design statement will provide much of the detail missing from the SPG. Consequently, the SPG will need to be updated to reflect the changing position.</p> <p>Grove Parish Council comment that the timescale and life of the Development Forum is not clearly identified within this paragraph. It should state 'for the life of the development and beyond if necessary'</p> <p>Grove Parish Council consider that a more accurate description of the slopes to the south and north should be included.</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Mathews object because the site is described as sloping south when in fact it slopes in the opposite direction.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the SPG is not a stand alone document and that over time more detailed proposals will be developed in line with the guidance. The SPG does not need to be changed to reflect the increased level of detail. However, some clarification could be made.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 1.2 second bullet point delete and replace with 'The document provides guidance to the developers preparing the master plan, design statement and other technical documents which will support the planning applications for the site'. After the last bullet point add 'As the preparation of the master plan and associated technical documents proceeds, taking account of public and technical consultations, more detailed proposals for the site will be developed in the context of the framework provided by this guidance'.</p> <p>This point is covered in paragraph 4.7 of the SPG but a small amendment to paragraph 1.5 would cover this point. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 1.5, last sentence, after 'proposals for the site' add 'throughout its life'.</p> <p>It is agreed that the text should be amended to describe the topography of the site more accurately. The site is actually gently domed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 1.7 sentence 3, amend to read 'The land, which is generally flat has its highest section in the southern part of the site and consists of rough grazing and arable farmland.'</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Para 1.9</p> <p>Grove Parish Council comment that the second sentence should replace the words ‘At the heart of the ‘ with ‘ close to the existing edge of Grove. This pinpoints the new local centre to a specific location/area</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that integration of the proposed development with Grove is key to the success of the development. This needs to be reflected more clearly in the document.</p> <p>If the centre at the Airfield is to be seen as the new centre for Grove, rather than a third centre in Grove, this needs to be reflected in the SPG, and referred to as the centre in the SPG.</p> <p>All commercial facilities such as shops, public house / wine bar will be provided subject to market considerations.</p>	<p>Agreed. The suggested wording would give a more specific location closer to the existing village without being too prescriptive. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 1.9, second sentence, delete ‘at the heart of the development.’ and replace with ‘Close to the existing edge of Grove.’</p> <p>Agreed. Integration is one of the main themes of the SPG. The developers suggest adding ‘and which is integrated with existing Grove’. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 1.9, first sentence, after ‘on the site’ add ‘which is integrated with existing Grove,’</p> <p>The guidance does not preclude it being the main centre in the village. RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p> <p>The guidance states that these commercial facilities would be a valuable focus for the community and complies with policy H5 in the local plan. The SPG should not therefore be amended to include market considerations. These and other material considerations will be considered through the development control process. RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p>
<p>Para 1.10</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the County Council has agreed that there may not be a need for the second primary school, and if it is needed it will be in the third phase. The need for a second primary school will be assessed at a later stage. The SPG should reflect this position.</p> <p>Grove Parish Council comment that the wording of the first sentence be changed to read ‘two primary school complexes’.</p> <p>The second sentence should be reworded as follows: ‘If a separate secondary school is proposed for Grove the Council would like it to be part of the new development with the location to be determined after consultation with the Parish Council & Development Forum because of the concerns of traffic etc’</p>	<p>The text could be amended to take account of these comments, but reference should still be to two primary schools which is the specific requirement of the local plan.</p> <p>It is considered that the description ‘primary school’ should be retained as this is the specific requirement in the local plan.</p> <p>The text could be amended to take account of this comment. However, the Forum cannot determine its location but can offer advice on its location. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 1.10 delete and replace with ‘Two primary schools will be provided on the site one of which should be located at the local centre. If the site reserved for the second primary school is ultimately not required the District Council will consider an alternative use to be determined in the light of the material considerations at the time. The local plan provides for a secondary school to be built on the site. If a separate secondary school is proposed for Grove the District Council would like to see it located on the edge of the local centre to help improve the centre’s vitality and diversity. Its precise location will be discussed in the Development Forum. In the context of the education authority’s decision on the form of secondary education in the Grove and Wantage area.</p>
<p>Para 1.12</p>	

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Support</p> <p>The Environment Agency support the intention to create a network of green corridors and wildlife habitats to help improve the biodiversity of the site. This is particularly necessary along watercourses on the site, and is in accordance with principles set out in PPS1 – Delivering sustainable development.</p> <p>The Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust strongly support the stated intention of this document to ensure that within the site there is a network of green corridors and wildlife habitats to help improve the biodiversity of the site (paragraph 1.12). This is in-line with the new Government policies set out in PPS9.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that following recent consultation feedback and discussions with the Council regarding the use of the community park for some formal play space, it is appropriate for the SPG to provide flexibility as to how the space is used. It would not be appropriate for the first phase of development to meet accepted standards.</p> <p>Grove Parish Council considers the deletion of the words ‘playing fields’ and insertion of ‘amenity areas’ This should make it clear that the playing fields are all in one place and not scattered through the development, however open spaces will be.</p>	<p>The support is welcomed.</p> <p>The support is welcomed.</p> <p>The Local Plan requires 23 ha of community park and 11 ha of playing fields. The wording proposed by the developer implies a reduction in the area of community park. However, the text could be amended for clarity. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 1.12, first sentence, delete ‘as well as’ and insert ‘It may be necessary to provide’. Last sentence, delete ‘to be provided on the southern edge of the development’, and add “The Local Plan proposals map shows the southern part of the development area to be retained as open space. The Council envisages this to be predominantly community park and playing fields”.</p> <p>At this stage it would not be appropriate to specify that the playing field provision will be all in one place, and the local plan policy H5 never prescribed this. RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p>
<p>Para 1.13</p>	
<p>Grove Rugby Football Club consider that the provision of an alternative road south of Grove to Mably Way is in contradiction to policies DC8, DC9, NE10, NE11, H5, H9, CF1, L1, L3 and L13. Grove RFC consider that the SPG should require any proposals for an alternative road south of Grove to Mably Way to be made in compliance with the existing policies and principles of the Local Plan, and without impacting upon the existing green corridor between Wantage and Grove; the original path of the Wilts and Berks Canal; the Parish Council and Wasbrough playing fields; with increased road traffic, noise and pollution in close proximity to existing residential properties.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that there are no benefits in specifying an early start if completion is not required until 1500 dwellings. Practically, this means the road would be built in phases. The benefits of the road are only realised when it is built in its entirety. Building it in phases will only add to disruption during construction. For practical purposes the road is likely to be built in one phase, which will be determined by the planning and construction</p>	<p>This objection was also made in response to the proposed modifications to the Local Plan. The local plan Inspector considered that the first phase of new housing at least ought to be served principally from the south to Mably Way. He concluded that the realignment of Denchworth Road south or a suitable alternative road, as suggested in the Council’s pre-inquiry change to para 8.29, to facilitate a safe and satisfactory main vehicular access into the site from Mably Way would be an essential component of the first phase of development, rather than any increased use of Newlands Drive or Cane Lane. The Inspector did not recommend the specific line that has been proposed by the developers and other options can be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change</p> <p>In considering an objection to Proposed Modification 8.29 from Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) it was noted that the Local Plan Inspector felt that in the interests of clarity and certainly for all concerned for the policy and text to also refer to a specific number of new units being built before the new road link from the site to the A338 is completed. He was essentially content that revision to the revised deposit version of part xiv a) should ensure that the provision of the new road to the north of Grove would come at a time before the development</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>programme, which is more properly dealt with in the Environmental Statement. This might determine that the road should be built early for other reasons but the only policy requirement should be to determine by when the road is to be completed.</p> <p>They suggest amended the third sentence by deleting 'will be' and substituting 'may be'.</p> <p>Fourth sentence to read 'contributions will also be necessary to introduce measures that reduce the amount of traffic accessing to the A34'.</p> <p>Final sentence to read: 'The Council will require a contribution to and where possible the provision'.</p> <p>They question the need for paragraphs 1.10-1.13, which appear to duplicate matters that are covered elsewhere in the document.</p>	<p>of the new housing to the west creates significant highway safety or congestion issues within the existing built up area of the settlement or at the A338 junction to the east. He considered for a number of reasons that no more than 1,500 dwellings should be built before the new road is completed. This he concluded would place start of construction squarely within the (amended) second phase of development from 2011 to 2016. The start date 'early in the second phase' is not specific and is flexible. Given the land ownership issues, and particularly the Common Land, it is important that these issues are addressed as early as possible. There is therefore no reason to disagree with the Inspector's recommendation which gives some flexibility to the start date but clearly sets out the timing for the completion of the road. RECOMMENDATION: No change</p> <p>These specific changes proposed by the objectors do not represent policy H5 accurately and should not be made. RECOMMENDATION: No change</p> <p>This section is intended to reflect the local plan context and give the reader a clear understanding of that context. It is therefore considered that it should be retained. RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>
<p>Para 1.15</p> <p>Support</p> <p>The Environment Agency support this paragraph especially in connection with the Environmental Impact Assessment dealing with drainage issues. However, all drainage issues will have to be submitted in the form of a flood risk assessment relating to surface water change.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council considers the EIA should indicate how any archaeological constraints could be identified and managed. As such the current wording is sufficient.</p> <p>Grove Parish Council considers that in the sentence 'Given the scale of the proposal it must be accompanied...' insert a full stop after the words 'Impact Assessment'. Delete the remainder of the sentence including the bullet points. Or expand this to encompass the full range of factors to be assessed.</p>	<p>The support is welcomed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The Parish Council's concern is noted. The wording will be amended to make it clear that these are not the only issues to be dealt with in the EIA and the list of factors to be assessed could be expanded.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 1.15, last sentence, amend to read '... by a full Environmental Impact Assessment that will deal with 'a range of issues including:' And add further bullet point to read</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contamination
<p>Para 1.16</p>	
<p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the focus of paragraph 1.16 is misplaced. Different developers should not determine</p>	<p>It is agreed that the features of the character areas should be established through the design statement that accompanies the outline planning</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
	<p>resource efficiency. This site is of such a scale that there is the possibility of establishing a number of character areas and local identities within the overall identity of Grove.</p>
<p>Para 2.3</p>	
<p>Objections</p> <p>Grove Parish Council considers that the reference to 3–4 storey buildings should be removed from the first bullet point. They do not think that 3–4 storey buildings are in keeping with this relatively flat area of land. They also suggest deleting the words ‘and Newlands Drive’ from the 5th bullet point.</p> <p>They suggest inserting a new sub para: The existing Newlands Drive requires removing as a barrier and its hard edged appearance to be softened.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the design quality, including style, should not be prescribed in SPG. It should be set out in the detailed design guide and design codes as part of the Design Statement and outline planning process. The detailed references to design should be deleted.</p> <p>There are a number of options as to how Newlands Drive might be incorporated in the new development; it might not be retained in its current form. This was confirmed in the recent consultation exercise. Therefore no reference should be made to it in this context.</p>	<p>The revised SPG makes it clear that some 3-4 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. The Parish Council concerns could be addressed by adding ‘A limited number’ to the sentence. Because of the uncertainty about the treatment of Newlands Drive reference to it could be deleted.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 2.3 first bullet point 3rd sentence delete ‘some’ and add ‘A limited amount of.’. Fifth bullet point delete ‘Newlands Drive’ and add ‘add the existing village’.</p> <p>See response to Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) below.</p> <p>The Council consider it entirely appropriate to include the design principles and this should remain. It is agreed as suggested by Persimmon that bullet point 3 could benefit from amendment to refer to public transport routes.</p> <p>As Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) point out there are a number of approaches as to how Newlands Drive might be incorporated into the new development and indeed it may not be retained in its current form. Deleting the reference to Newlands Drive in bullet point 5 would help overcome this. However a new bullet could be added to take account of the Parish Council’s views on Newlands Drive.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 2.3 add new bullet point to read ‘Newlands Drive will need to be taken account of in the design of the new development. There are a number of approaches as to how it might be incorporated in to the new development and could include removing it in whole or in part and landscaping it to soften the edge of the existing development’. Amend bullet point 3 to read ‘The highest densities should be in and around the local centre, the spine road and other high quality public transport routes,...’.</p>
<p>Paras 2.4 – 2.6</p>	
<p>Objections</p> <p>Grove Parish Council considers the second sentence of para 2.5 should be deleted.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that there needs to be reference to the type of centre, a centre for Grove or a new local centre for Grove.</p> <p>There should be more references to greater integration with existing Grove.</p>	<p>This sentence is included to make the point that it may be appropriate to include taller buildings of 3-4 storeys to help to give the centre a sense of place and identity. It is considered that the reference should be retained.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p> <p>The type of centre is covered in policy H5 of the local plan which refers to it as a local centre and sets out the extent of facilities and services to be located there. Paragraphs 4.2 – 4.4 already refer to the integration of the local centre with the existing village.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
Para 2.8	
<p>BBOWT note that paragraph 2.8 mentions the need to utilise open spaces as wildlife corridors. I would add to this by encouraging the Council to develop a ‘Green Infrastructure’ Strategy to give additional guidance to developers about the need to cater for biodiversity in open spaces and landscaping proposals.</p> <p>Green infrastructure is a term which is used to describe multi-functional green spaces which assist in achieving some of the facets identified as being important for creating sustainable communities. I have enclosed a copy of ‘Planning Sustainable Communities: A Green Infrastructure Guide for Milton Keynes and the South Midlands’ for your information.</p>	<p>The comments of BBOWT are noted. At this stage the Council is not in a position to produce a Green Infrastructure Strategy and reference should not be included in the guidance. The guidance does however at paragraph 2.8 refer to the use of some of the open space as corridors for wildlife.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p>
Para 2.9	
<p>Grove Parish Council considers that after the word ‘features’ the remainder of the sentence be deleted.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the guidance is overly prescriptive and implies that the hedgerow on Newlands Drive is important, which is misleading. The hedgerow is of poor quality. Historically it appears the hedgerow has been kept low, but in recent years allowed to grow taller and appears to be “leggy” and of thin form. The development should be integrated within Grove not screened from it. The retention of the poor quality hedgerow will potentially compromise the design of that area of the site and integration. They also suggest deleting references to this feature, but insert ‘reference to existing vegetation’.</p>	<p>Agreed. The hedgerow is of poor quality and is of no significant landscape or historical interest. Its retention would not assist in integrating the new dwellings with the existing village and would be inappropriate in the context of the response made to objections to para 2.3.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 2.9 second sentence delete. ‘such as the substantial hedgerow along the western edge of Newlands Drive which provides a valuable screen’. Insert ‘as well as existing vegetation where possible’ to end of second sentence.</p>
Para 2.10	
<p>Grove Parish Council asks for the deletion of third bullet point. We do not want to create small open spaces which are very difficult to maintain and would attract anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to change this reference as such spaces can add to the quality of the environment. The reference is not to include small spaces per se, but smaller functional spaces such as play areas, informal space and even civic spaces. Paragraph 2.3 sets out the need to ensure spaces are overlooked by properties and have a clearly established identity.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>
Para 2.12	
<p>Support</p> <p>The Environment Agency support this paragraph.</p>	<p>The support is welcomed.</p>
Para 2.13	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Grove Parish Council. Add to the start of third sentence ‘Further advice <u>must</u> be obtained from the police crime prevention.....’</p>	<p>While developers cannot be required to obtain such advice the reference could be strengthened.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 2.13 third sentence delete ‘can’</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
	and insert 'should'.
Para 2.15	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that it is not appropriate in a guidance document such as this to impose such specific, detailed restrictions. They should be dealt with in the generic design codes in the design statement that is submitted as part of the outline planning application.</p>	<p>These are not detailed restrictions but guidance for the developers to take into account during the design process. It is entirely appropriate that this level of guidance is contained in the SPG.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>
Para 2.16	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the guidance is overly prescriptive and should be changed to allow for more flexibility following the detailed assessment in the design.</p>	<p>It is agreed that this particular reference to the materials to be used for screening external apparatus is too prescriptive for the design principles.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 2.16, last bullet point, delete and replace with 'Any external apparatus will be designed to include a secure and visually acceptable perimeter to the apparatus and take into account the need for access by maintenance vehicles'.</p>
Para 2.19	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the guidance is overly prescriptive. The street hierarchy is a matter for discussion between the design team and the County Council highways department.</p>	<p>The basic street layout and road hierarchy influences the quality of the public realm, permeability and ease of movement and it is appropriate to retain the general principles in this guidance. It is agreed that reference should be made to the role of Oxfordshire County Council as highway authority in the development of the hierarchy.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 2.19 add new sentence at start of this paragraph to read: 'A road hierarchy and street design will be agreed with Oxfordshire County Council as highway authority and submitted as part of the outline planning application'.</p>
Para 2.20	
<p>Oxfordshire County Council considers this paragraph should be amended to read "The County Council and District Council also support the principle of Home Zones. Home Zone designs are for residential streets which are designed so that vehicle traffic speeds and car access is limited and the road space is shared between cars, cyclists and pedestrians. Different parts of the site may be particularly suitable for design along Home Zone principles. Developers should make earlier reference to Oxfordshire County Council's guidance for developers on 'Home Zone characteristics for New Housing Development' and to the Institute of Highway Incorporated Engineer's Home Zone Design Guidance, 2002."</p>	<p>This reflects the fact that the County Council do not currently formally adopt Home Zones.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 2.20 amend to read: "The County Council and District Council also support the principle of home zones for residential streets. These are designed so that vehicle traffic speeds and car access is limited and the road space is shared between cars, cyclists and pedestrians. Different parts of the site may be particularly suitable for design along home zone principles. Developers should make early reference to Oxfordshire County Council's guidance for developers on 'Home Zone Characteristics for New Housing Development' and to the Institute of Highway Incorporated Engineer's 'Home Zone Design Guidance, 2002'".</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
SECTION 3.0 ACCESSIBILITY AND PERMEABILITY	
Para 3.3	
<p>Objections</p> <p>Grove Parish Council In the first bullet point - add after Mably Way 'or Downsview Road', This option needs to be investigated'</p> <p>What is the attractiveness that requires improving? The context should be specified</p> <p>In the third bullet point change the words ' form a new spine road' to 'form several routes (or spines) through the development'.</p> <p>The sixth bullet point should have an additional sentence 'These measures will be such that they could be removed once the NLR is operational after 1500 houses and a review has taken place.</p> <p>A bus terminus or interchange should be located at the new centre, with adequate stops located throughout the new development.</p> <p>Communal parking should not be encouraged with all parking for housing being kept within the boundaries of properties. General parking areas at the local centre should be provided.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that Oxfordshire County Council does not support a link road through the development from the Northern Link Road to the southern access road, and as such the requirement should be deleted.</p> <p>They also suggest the first bullet point is amended to read 'Improvements to Denchworth Road...'</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the sixth</p>	<p>The rewording complies with that in the local plan. It is not considered that this should be changed at this stage as it does not preclude this option being investigated.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p> <p>The text could be expanded to make it clear that the attractiveness of the link to Mably Way to vehicular traffic will help to reduce the tendency for traffic to access the site through Grove village. The text already makes clear that it could help to create a visually attractive gateway to the development.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 3.3 add to end of second bullet point 'which will help reduce the tendency for traffic to access the site through Grove Village.'</p> <p>Although the site is proposed to be served primarily by a spine road linking from the new road to the A338 north of Grove to the southern access this does not preclude other north south routes being developed off the spine road to aid legibility and the overall design of the development.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p> <p>It would not be inappropriate at this stage to decide whether or not any such traffic management should be temporary or permanent and the suggested change should not be made.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p> <p>A sentence could be added to take note of this comment as it is unlikely that a bus terminus or interchange would be considered by the bus operators.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 3.5 add to end of paragraph 'Provision should be made for bus stopping facilities within the new development along the main distributor road and particularly at the local centre'.</p> <p>Parking provision will be provided in accordance with 'Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Parking Standards'. This will include parking for residential properties and the range of facilities provided at the local centre. The SPG makes clear that parking for residential properties should preferably be located within the curtilage of dwellings with communal parking to be kept off-street and in small groups, subject to surveillance from adjoining properties.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p> <p>The County Council have made no objection to the SPG in this respect. It is important for reference to the link road to be retained as it will allow permeability for vehicles between the north and south of the site.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p> <p>This would be at variance with policy H5 of the Local Plan and should not be amended as suggested. It is important to retain the requirement to realign the current Denchworth Road.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>bullet point is a duplication of the fifth point and is therefore not required.</p> <p>Persimmon does not own or control land between the airfield and Milton Park and the Harwell/Chilton Campus and as such the requirement should be for a contribution towards improved cycle links rather than for the improvement of cycle links.</p>	<p>This emphasises the need to have traffic management measures in place during the second phase to seriously deter traffic from using existing roads and should be retained. RECOMMENDATION: No change</p> <p>The point is noted and the wording suggested more closely reflects that in the local plan RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 3.3 amend 9th bullet point to read ‘Contributions towards improved cycle ...’</p>
<p>Para 3.5</p>	
<p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment on paragraph 3.5 that the requirement for contributions to improvements in public transport needs to be in accordance with Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations, including all of the tests set out therein. They also suggest the deletion of Wantage from paragraph 3.5.</p>	<p>Policy DC8 of the Local Plan clearly sets out that the provision of infrastructure and services will be secured through legal agreements in accordance with Circular 05/2005. This is a general point and it is suggested that amended wording to cover the provision of all infrastructure and services be included. See the General section at beginning of this schedule. The requirement to contribute to improvements to public transport in Wantage is specified in policy H5 and should not be deleted. RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>
<p>Para 3.6 – 3.7</p>	
<p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that on street parking maybe acceptable if it is designed correctly as part of an overall car parking strategy that will provide a range of options for parking provision and should not be prejudged at this stage.</p>	<p>The SPG is guidance and is not necessarily prescriptive. The type of parking provided will have to comply with the County Council’s Parking Standards set out in this Council’s SPG ‘Parking Standards’ and take account of County Council’s ‘Residential Road Design Guide’. However the guidance would benefit from being amended to take account of this comment. RECOMMENDATION: Amend paragraph 3.6 and 3.7 to read ‘Car parking standards are set out in the Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance – “Parking Standards”. The standards are intended as a guide to developers but in the interest of ensuring that the development is properly served with parking and to avoid unnecessary parking on residential streets which are not designed for on-street parking, the District Council will wish to ensure that a realistic level of par parking is provided throughout the development.</p> <p>A parking strategy will be prepared to accompany the planning application which will put forward a range of car parking proposals. In residential areas car parking preferably should be within the curtilage of dwellings. Where any type of communal parking is proposed, be it for residential areas or to serve the local centre, it should be designed to be kept off-street in small groups, well lit and secure, open to natural surveillance from surrounding properties or busy thoroughfares and form part of the overall urban design concept”.</p>
<p>Para 3.8</p>	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Grove Parish Council considers that the second sentence should be amended to read ‘The Local Centre will provide a natural focus for the</p>	<p>Agreed. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 3.8 second sentence delete ‘at</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
whole of community.....'	the heart of the development' and insert 'for the whole community'.
Para 3.9	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that public transport should be added to the second sentence.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 3.9 second sentence insert, 'public transport' after 'distributor road'.</p>
Para 3.10	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Grove Parish Council proposes an addition to the end of the last sentence to read 'and existing village'.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 3.10 add to end of last sentence 'and existing village.'</p>
SECTION 4.0 INTEGRATION AND INCLUSION	
Para 4.3	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Grove Parish Council considers that the words 'towards the eastern edge' should be changed to 'close to the existing edge of Grove.'</p>	<p>Agreed. See also response to objection to paragraph 1.9 from the Parish Council.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 4.3, first sentence, delete 'towards the eastern edge of the development' and replace with 'close to the existing edge of Grove'.</p>
Para 4.5	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Grove Parish Council considers that 'representatives of the general public' should be added.</p>	<p>There would be no objection to including reference to the general public in this paragraph.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 4.5, Delete second sentence and Insert 'People living in Grove and the surrounding communities, particularly those living near or on the site, local organisations and service providers will all be keenly interested in how the site develops.' Paragraph 4.6 add to the end paragraph 'The Forum includes the developers and representatives from the District Council, Oxfordshire County Council, Grove Parish Council, Wantage Town Council, East Challow and East Hanney Parish Councils.'</p>
Para 4.7	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Grove Parish Council proposes adding the words 'and beyond' to end of first sentence</p>	<p>Agreed. It has always been assumed that the Development Forum would continue during the implementation of the development and beyond. However additional wording could be better added to the second sentence.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 4.7 add to end of second sentence 'and the forum may therefore continue to have a role after the development is complete'.</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
SECTION 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION	
Para 5.1	
<p>Support</p> <p>The Environment Agency support this paragraph and the first two key principles.</p>	<p>The support is welcomed.</p>
Paras 5.2 – 5.10	
<p>Support</p> <p>The Environment Agency support paragraphs 5.3 – 5.10</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>Principal Energy Officer, Vale of White Horse District Council. Whilst the local plan refers to energy conservation and efficiency as well as general principles of sustainable construction enshrined in the Eco Homes Standards, additional guidance has been provided on sustainable energy by the District Council’s energy officer, which will be forwarded to the developers of the site in order to ensure energy sustainability matters referred to in the guidance are addressed by the developers it is suggested an energy strategy be submitted alongside the planning application.</p> <p>Grove Parish Council proposes deleting the sentence in para ‘The Environmental Impact Assessment should address many of the issues set out below’ and replacement with ‘The scope of the EIA should be agreed with the Parish Council based on stakeholder comments gathered by the GPC through meetings of the Development Forum. The scoping report should detail the baseline studies needed to be completed in advance of the environmental assessments and of any site works. The geographical boundaries of the EIA topics and baseline studies should also be agreed between the Vale and GPC, such that for example traffic studies are evaluated on a regional basis and flooding and water quality issues are evaluated an appropriate distance down stream of the project site.</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment should address many of the issues set out below’.</p> <p>Insert the following new paragraphs:</p> <p>‘The drainage system should be designed such that the ecological properties of the receiving waters are not negatively impacted.</p> <p>The drainage system should be designed such that day to day management of the system and annual maintenance are sustainable and that the costs of operation and maintenance are minimised. The design must be approved by the bodies responsible for the operation and maintenance of the system following the developer’s withdrawal. The design and assumptions of flood return periods should be agreed by the Environmental Agency.</p>	<p>The support is welcomed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Add to the end of para 5.3 “The Council will expect an energy strategy to be submitted with the planning application setting out what energy conservation measures have been incorporated into the detailed design of the development.”</p> <p>Since the Parish Council made its comments the scoping report has been published on the Grove Airfield web site and the Parish Council has the opportunity to comment on that report. The requirements for EIA’s are set out in Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations and the District Council has been requested to give a scoping opinion by the developers of the site.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to include this level of detail but the comment could be taken account of by an amendment to paragraph 5.8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.8 add to end of paragraph ‘Care will be taken to ensure that the ecological properties of the receiving watercourses are not negatively impacted’.</p> <p>The specific text recommended by the Parish Council would be too detailed and prescriptive. Reference currently in the SPG, to the use of natural and sustainable drainage systems is considered to meet the aspirations of the Parish Council. This is especially the case as the Environment Agency or the Council’s Land Drainage Engineer have not objected to this guidance nor required any more specific guidance at this stage.</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>The design should included control of discharge rates such that the combined flows of drainage from the site and discharges from the wastewater treatment plant treating sewage or storm water from the existing and fully developed new Grove communities do not negatively impact the ecology of the receiving watercourses’.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) make a number of suggestions about this section.</p> <p>They comment that the south is not the lower end of the site. The site slopes gently northwards and southwards from a saddle that runs east – west roughly across the middle of the site.</p> <p>They note there are five internal subcatchments draining the site, each of which would require a separate attenuation point.</p> <p>They recommend a number of specific changes:</p> <p>Para 5.1 should be amended to read ‘Include measures to ensure that surface water drainage is dealt with in a sustainable manner.’</p> <p>Para 5.2 delete second and third sentence and replace with ‘The issues to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment will be set out in the scoping opinion adopted by the LPA’.</p> <p>Para 5.4 amend to read ‘The provision of water butts and grey water schemes, the use of solar panels and photoltaic cells and the orientation of buildings to maximise solar gain and the availability of proven technology can all help energy conservation.</p> <p>Para 5.7 amend to read ‘The Environment Agency has advised that measures should be incorporated into the development to ensure that water run off is attenuated to the equivalent rate from the greenfield site.</p> <p>Para 5.8 amend to read ‘The use of natural and sustainable drainage systems will be required to help manage and control surface water run off from the site into any receiving watercourses to ensure...;</p> <p>Para 5.9 first sentence amend to read ‘A water feature at the lower point of the site could provide valuable...’</p> <p>Para 5.10 amend to include Timing of the Works in relation to the canal.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p> <p>See response to objection from Grove Parish Council made in response to paragraph 1.7.</p> <p>This is a matter of detail that does not need to be amended in the SPG. However the change to paragraph 5.8 made below recognises this.</p> <p>Agreed. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.1 second bullet point insert ‘that’ between ‘ensure surface’ and delete ‘from the site’.</p> <p>Agreed. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.2, delete second and third sentences. Add new sentence to read ‘The issues to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment will be set out in the scoping opinion by the Local Planning Authority.’</p> <p>It would perhaps help if the paragraph were redrafted to refer to developing technologies. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.4, first sentence, re word to read ‘The provision of water butts and grey water schemes, the use of solar panels and photovoltaic cells, the orientation of buildings to maximise solar gain and other developing technologies could all help to conserve resources and energy’.</p> <p>The suggested amendments have been discussed with the Council’s Land Drainage Engineer and are considered acceptable. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.7 amend to read ‘The Environment Agency has advised that measures should be incorporated into the development to ensure that surface water run off is attenuated to the equivalent rate from the greenfield site.’</p> <p>Paragraph 5.8 first sentence amend to read ‘... from the site into any receiving watercourses to ensure there is no increase...’</p> <p>It is considered that the text could be made less prescriptive and provide the opportunity to use water features creatively throughout the site. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.9 amend to read ‘Water features throughout the site including the Community Park could contribute to the sustainable drainage system at times of high rainfall and could provide valuable holding areas capable of receiving surface water run off. Such facilities’</p> <p>Agreed. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.10 second sentence amend to</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
	read ‘... on the timing of the canal works, quality of the water, a full environmental impact assessment and the agreement of the Environment Agency.’
<p>Para 5.11</p> <p>Support</p> <p>The Environment Agency support this paragraph.</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Grove Parish Council suggests adding a further point to the effect that ‘Space for recycling sorting and bin/box storage should be provided in all communal housing areas.’</p>	<p>The support is welcomed.</p> <p>The text could be amended to take account of this comment. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.11 second sentence amend to read ‘This could include making space available either within buildings or as part of communal facilities, for sorting and storing recyclable waste and facilities for the provision of home composting and for water butts and grey water schemes.’</p>
<p>Para 5.13</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Grove Parish Council suggests amending last bullet to read ‘providing covered and secure storage facilities for cycles...’</p> <p>Also add a point that states that ‘The provision of a dedicated cycle storage for at least 2 cycles should be included in the design for all housing’</p>	<p>Agreed RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.13 third bullet point amend to read</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘providing wherever possible secure’... <p>This idea is welcomed and a fuller bullet point could be added. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.13 add new bullet point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘wherever practicable dedicated cycle storage should be incorporated into the design of the new dwellings and in particular in flatted development.’
<p>Para 5.14</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>Grove Parish Council suggests adding after the last sentence ‘Construction traffic should not go through the existing village’. Also that there should be a weight limit on internal roads (both new and original). Also add in both paragraphs ‘After consultation with Grove Parish Council.’</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council consider it would be helpful to add a new paragraph after paragraph 5.14 on construction traffic to read as follows</p> <p>“The developer should plan the phasing/stages of the construction to minimise the long term disruption to new residents caused by construction traffic having to pass through previously built stages. This will allow the infrastructure to be completed to an appropriate level for new residents and to minimise road safety risks.”</p>	<p>Agreed. Amendments could be made to take account of this concern. The amendment should also recognise that traffic could have implications for other parishes. It will not be appropriate to specify specific measures such as weight limits which may not be appropriate or practical to enforce. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 5.14 add to end of last sentence ‘to prevent construction traffic going through the existing village’. This will follow discussion by the Development Forum and consultation with the local councils.</p> <p>Agreed RECOMMENDATION: After paragraph 5.14 add a new paragraph to read “The developer should plan the phasing of the development to minimise disruption to new residents caused by construction traffic having to pass through previously built phases. This will also minimise road safety risks.”</p> <p>The reference to infrastructure to be completed to an appropriate level for new residents is covered in the guidance at paragraph 7. RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
SECTION 6.0 PROVISION OF SERVICES AND FACILITIES	
<p>The Environment Agency comment that Section 6.0 ‘Provision of services and facilities’ should include the provision of water and sewage treatment. These are essential infrastructure requirements, which must be in place to meet the needs of the development prior to development occurring.</p>	<p>Agreed RECOMMENDATION: After paragraph 6.20 add new paragraph to read: ‘Essential infrastructure such as the provision of water and sewage treatment facilities will need to be in place to meet the needs of the development prior to the development occurring.’</p>
Para 6.4	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that paragraph 8.33 of the Local Plan has been amended to delete the time period for the commuted sum payments and refers back to policy DC.8. The SPG should follow the same approach. They also suggest the deletion of ‘require’ and substitution of ‘encourage’ into the last sentence.</p>	<p>It is agreed that a reference to policy DC8 is appropriate, but the reference to ‘at least ten years’ should remain as this is also set out in the lower case text of policy DC8. In addition reference should be made to the advice in Circular 05/2005 that provision for maintenance may be required in perpetuity RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 6.4 add to end of third sub para. ‘This will be in accordance with local plan policy DC8’. Delete from second sub para the third sentence and add ‘Circular 05/2005 advises that the provision for subsequent maintenance of facilities may be required in perpetuity’.</p> <p>The guidance could be amended to read ‘expect’ but should not use the vague term ‘encourage’ RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 6.4, third sentence, delete ‘require’ and insert ‘expect’.</p>
Para 6.5	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that there needs to be some flexibility in the proportions of shared ownership and social rented provision. These are matters that will ultimately be determined through s.106 negotiations.</p>	<p>This is covered in more detail in the affordable housing SPG which should be referred to here.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Para 6.5, add to the end of the paragraph “Further information is given in the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance”.</p>
Paras 6.6 – 6.7	
<p>Objections</p> <p>Grove Parish Council considers there is a contradiction here. Para 1.10 states ‘Two primary schools’. This para states ‘Two new primary schools’. Clarification is required.</p> <p>The location of the secondary school should be subject to the views of the local people through the Development Forum.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the County Council has agreed that there may not be a need for the second primary school, and that if it is needed it will be in the third phase. The need for a second primary school will be assessed at a later stage. The SPG should reflect this position</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the wording of</p>	<p>Agreed. This should be clarified by referring to the new buildings on the site.</p> <p>It is agreed that reference can be made to the Development Forum in the revised text.</p> <p>Changes to paragraph 1.10 were recommended earlier in the schedule and paragraphs 6.6 and 6.7 need amendment in the light of the current situation. However, they should not be amended to reduce or remove the requirement for the two primary schools and the secondary school as established. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraphs 6.6 and 6.7 in policy H5 amend to read:</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>paragraph 6.7 needs to be reviewed to take account of the current unresolved situation regarding the potential provision of a secondary school.</p>	<p>‘6.6 Two new buildings for primary schools will be provided, one of which should be located at the local centre. The primary schools will be provided through the provision of free serviced land totalling 2.2 hectares for each school and the building costs to Oxfordshire County Council Primary School Brief Standard and environmental requirements. Alternatively the schools will be provided by the developer on a 2.2 hectare site to at least the standards set out above. Contributions towards the provision of short term temporary accommodation at the existing primary schools may be required in the early stages of the development until the new school is able to accept pupils. The District Council will encourage the education authority/provider to maximise possibilities for community use of the primary school buildings. If the site reserved for a second primary is ultimately not required the Council will consider an alternative use to be developed in the light of material considerations in the future.</p> <p>6.7 Policy H5 of the local plan requires that a new secondary school is provided as part of the new development, however, Oxfordshire County Council as education authority will not</p> <p>make a decision on secondary school provision in the area until the end of 2006. The District Council would ideally like to see a secondary school located on edge of the the local centre to help improve the centres vitality and diversity. However, it might be that the secondary school is not required until the later stages of the development, which could have design implications on the site layout and as a result the school’s location may be affected. An opinion poll carried out for the County Council in 2003 showed that the majority of the community to be in favour of two secondary schools, one located in Grove and the other in Wantage. Despite the uncertainty of the situation, this Supplementary Planning Guidance has been prepared on the assumption that a secondary school for Grove pupils will be required on the site. Free serviced land totalling 9.1 hectares and a pro rata contribution towards building costs of a single school for Grove will be required. If only a single new school is to be provided jointly for Grove and Wantage it would be preferable to locate this further south to be closer to Wantage rather than on the edge of the local centre and this guidance will need to be reviewed to take account of this.</p> <p>6.8 The siting of the new secondary school for Grove on the edge of the local centre....’</p>
<p>Para 6.8</p>	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council request that a new paragraph is added under Education which reads:</p> <p>“Special Education Needs – Oxfordshire County Council will require financial contribution towards the provision of any identified additional Special Education Needs facilities which can be attributed to the new development. This will be calculated on the basis of a proportion of the overall pupil generation.”</p>	<p>Agreed. The insertion of this paragraph would be consistent with the County Council’s policy to seek contributions towards special educational needs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 6.8 add after the paragraph a new paragraph to read:</p> <p>“Special Education Needs – Oxfordshire County Council will require financial contributions towards the provision of any identified additional Special Education Needs facilities which can be attributed to the new development. This will be calculated on the basis of a proportion of the overall pupil generation.”</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
Para 6.9	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council ask that to allow flexibility could the wording at the start of the fourth sentence of paragraph 6.9, “In the longer term” be removed and an additional sentence be added to this paragraph: “These will include contributions towards transport.”</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) ask that ‘will’ be amended to ‘may’ after ‘the longer term’ in the fourth sentence.</p>	<p>Agreed. The removal of ‘in the longer term’ would allow flexibility and highlight that the fact that contributions may be sought towards public transport. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 6.9 fourth sentence delete ‘In the long term’ and add to end of paragraph a new sentence to read ‘These will include contributions towards public transport.’</p> <p>The use of ‘will’ complies with the wording of policy H5 and should not be changed. RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>
Para 6.10	
<p>Grove Parish Council want the Parish Council offices to be located in a new Community Centre and agree that the Community Centre could host a variety of functions including meeting rooms which must be easily accessible to everyone. (This would include lifts if multiple storeys).</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that it is inappropriate to specify the size of the community centre if the exact requirements are as yet unknown and further discussion with the Parish Council is required.</p>	<p>The support is noted. The requirement for lifts is not appropriate for this guidance or consideration as part of the development control process, but will be considered as part of any application for Building Regulations approval. Reference to the Parish Council office requirement could be made in the text. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 6.10 Amend third sentence to read ‘The accommodation could include meeting rooms, parish council offices ...’.</p> <p>The local plan Inspector concluded that there is no justification for a lower figure for the size of the community centre or a need to remove it entirely. Accordingly the SPG quite properly states the requirement of policy H5 of the Local Plan and should not be amended. RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>
Para 6.11	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that a proposed change is required to provide flexibility following consultation and opportunities for provision that might arise.</p>	<p>The SPG accurately represents policy H5 of the Local Plan which requires provision of a building at the local centre. The developer suggested amendments are not considered to be in accord with the Local Plan but wording could be included which would provide some additional flexibility. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 6.11, second sentence, amend to read ‘This could be a free standing facility or it could be provided in conjunction with the primary school, secondary school or the community centre.’</p>
Para 6.12	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that this change is required to reflect the current uncertain position regarding the future of library provision in Grove.</p>	<p>The wording proposed by the objector is considered appropriate. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 6.12 second sentence amend to read ‘Oxfordshire County Council has yet to make a decision on future library provision in Grove. However should it be decided that the new facility will replace the existing Grove library’</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
Para 6.13	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that in light of the recent consultation, the list should not be too prescriptive</p> <p>as it is not known at this stage what shops and what size of shops will be viable within the centre.</p>	<p>The SPG accurately represents policy H5 of the Local Plan and should therefore not be amended. The Inspector at the Local</p> <p>Plan Inquiry concluded there was no justification to lower the figures for shopping provision or remove them from the local plan. The specific details of such facilities will be resolved through ongoing public consultation in association with the Development Forum and taking account of other material considerations through the development control process.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>
Paras 6.15	
<p>Objections</p> <p>Grove Parish Council consider that after consultation with the Senior Youth Worker for the area, facilities for teenagers should be provided in a sole use facility and not shared with secondary school or community centre. A buffer zone around the facility should be incorporated. (This may be left for the Development Forum to discuss therefore no location or limits should be indicated). Delete the last sentence of this paragraph and insert new sentence 'If Youth Shelters are provided then consultation between the Youth Service and Parish Council must take place'</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that consultation responses to date have indicated a range of views as to the nature, form and location of a youth facility. The centre may not be the most appropriate location for facilities for teenagers. This issue should not be prejudged at this stage.</p>	<p>It is agreed that this would be appropriate matter for the Development Forum to discuss.</p> <p>In response to consultation on Youth Shelters it is suggested that the consideration should be widened to include the Thames Valley Police Architectural Liaison Officer who has considerable experience of the provision of these facilities.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Change paragraph 6.15 to read: "Facilities for teenagers, including a free standing, dedicated youth centre will be provided. The building design should meet needs as a performance venue and be located where activities and events for young people will not lead to any conflicts with residential properties. The centre should be autonomous of any school provision. It will be crucial that young people are heavily involved in the design of the building. If Youth Shelters are provided then consultation between the Youth Services should take place with amongst others the Grove Parish Council and the Thames Valley Police Architectural Liaison Officer".</p> <p>See response above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>
Para 6.17	
<p>Objections</p> <p>Grove Parish Council consider the SPG should swap the space required between playing fields for outdoor sport and a community park. (playing fields 23 hectares and community park 11.25 hectares) The existing sports clubs are growing in size and want to expand further with the influx of some 2500 homes, parents and children.</p>	<p>At this point in time, with the Inspector having only recently made recommendations on Local Plan it would be inappropriate to consider amending the SPG so that it was at variance with policy H5 of the plan. The precise disposition and mix of open space can be refined to take account of material considerations discussed in the development forum. However, the Council could not require the developers to provide 23 ha of playing fields as this is in excess of what is required to serve the development.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that initial master planning work and consultation has shown that at</p> <p>least some of the 11.25 ha of playing fields should be located within the Community Park rather than having a separate area for playing fields outside of the Community Park. Recognition should also be made of the potential reduction in the total amount of play space required if all weather pitches are provided and sharing takes place.</p> <p>Subject to the design of the site a Landscape buffer may not be the most appropriate way to deal with the boundary between the airfield and the Technology Park.</p>	
<p>Para 6.20</p>	
<p>Objection</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that this para duplicates paragraph 3.17</p>	<p>It is agreed that this is a duplication of paragraph 3.17 but should be retained in this section which sets out the services and infrastructure to be provided.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p>
<p>Para 6.21</p>	
<p>Oxfordshire County Council ask if a new sentence could be added to the second bullet point to read:</p> <p>“Financial contributions towards the improvement of existing rights of way may also be required”</p> <p>Could the following new bullet points be added to this paragraph:</p> <p>“i) Waste Management. Developer contributions will be sought to assist in the upgrading of Waste Management facilities to cater for their increased usage caused by the new development.</p> <p>ii) Museum Resource Storage. Developer contributions will be sought to reflect the need to contribute to the services provided by the Standlake Museum Resource Centre, associated with the educational, research and leisure activities of the County Council.</p> <p>iii) Social & Health Care. Major residential development in Grove will increase the demand for Day Care facilities in Wantage/Grove, and developer contributions towards a new Resource Centre will be required”.</p> <p>It would also be helpful if this section had an accompanying plan.</p> <p>Grove Parish Council ask for clarification as to why money from this development would be needed to improve the leisure facilities at Wantage Leisure centre. New Grove will be larger in population than Wantage when it is completed and therefore money should be used to enhance and</p> <p>incorporate new facilities in to Grove itself.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that the requirement</p>	<p>These are now becoming standard requirements of Oxfordshire County Council and should be added to the guidance.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 6.21, second bullet point, add new sentence to read “Financial contributions towards the improvement of existing rights of way may also be required” Paragraph 6.21 add new bullet points</p> <p>“</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste Management. Developer contributions will be sought to assist in the upgrading of waste management facilities to cater for their increased usage caused by the new development • Museum Resource Storage. Developer contributions will be sought to reflect the need to contribute to the services provided by the Standlake Museum Resource Centre, associated with the educational, research and leisure activities of the County Council. • Social and Health Care. Major residential development in Grove will increase the demand for day care facilities in Wantage/Grove, and developer contributions towards a new Resource Centre will be required”. <p>Policy H5 sets out a requirement for a number of leisure facilities in Grove including open space, an indoor community sports hall and hard surfaced ones for sport. The requirement to contribute towards enhancing existing infrastructure and services in Wantage including Wantage swimming pool is also</p> <p>included in policy H5 and the local plan inspector saw no reason to change this part of the policy. The rationale for the contribution to Wantage swimming pool is that the development at Grove, while not</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>for contributions to off site facilities needs to be in accordance with Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations, including all of the tests set out therein. Contributions will only be made towards facilities which are related directly to the proposed development and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and in kind to the proposed development.</p> <p>The development of the airfield is not related to the restoration of the Wilts and Berks Canal and as such a contribution will need to be assessed against the requirements of Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>Improvements to Wantage Leisure Centre may not be appropriate if leisure facilities are provided as part of the development.</p> <p>The contribution towards Grove Railway Station will be subject to a feasibility and safety studies and the ability of the train operating companies to stop trains at the new station.</p>	<p>justifying the provision of a new swimming pool in Grove, will increase usage of the Wantage facility.</p> <p>The lower case text makes it clear that the development will be expected to link to footpaths and cycleways in the surrounding area including the Wilts and Berks Canal where contributions will be sought to help with its restoration. The inspector saw no reason to remove it from policy H5. All contributions will be assessed in the light of Circular 05/2005 and Policy DC8 of the Local Plan. RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p>
SECTION 7 - TIMESCALES	
<p>Grove Parish Council consider that the following should be added to both bullet comments: ‘and before the development is commenced. A new bullet point ‘A guarantee should be received from the developers that the 106 agreement money should be spent on the items it was intended for within the time frame allocated. This should be overseen and enforced by a monitoring officer appointed by the Vale’. (or words to that effect)</p> <p>Annexe A Grove Parish Council seek clarification is sought from the Vale of White Horse District Council as to when the start of houses and road etc will commence.</p> <p>Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) comment that Annex A is too</p>	<p>These programmes and trigger points should be established before planning permission is granted. RECOMMENDATION: Paragraph 7.1 amend to read ‘Key Principles. The developers should, before planning permission is granted’.</p> <p>The Section 106 agreement is a legal agreement between the local planning authority, the highway authority and the lead developers which endures with the land. The SPG makes clear that a phased programme with firm trigger points will be established in legal agreements for the implementation of the development.</p> <p>The Council, in drawing up the legal agreements will ensure that the phased provision of services and facilities for new residents is guaranteed before it grants planning permission.</p> <p>The question of monitoring and enforcing any such agreement will be a matter that is dealt with through the development control process and is not appropriate for inclusion in the SPG. The District Council has established procedures for monitoring legal agreements to which it also is party. Oxfordshire County Council also has procedures for monitoring the legal agreements to which it is party. RECOMMENDATION: No change.</p> <p>The start time will depend on the dates for the submission and determination of the outline planning applications for the site and the new link road north of Grove to the A338, and the subsequent detailed applications for the first phase of development. In the light of these requirements the Council considers it unlikely that the development will commence until April 2008 as set out in the Annexe A of the SPG.</p> <p>Annex A sets out the Council’s guidance on the phasing of provision of services and infrastructure. The matters covered in the Annex will undoubtedly be refined over time, in the light of material considerations.</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>prescriptive. The matters covered therein should be dealt with at the application stage and as part of the s106 negotiations. Annexe A should be replaced by a requirement to submit a phasing plan with the outline planning application.</p> <p>Alternatively, it should be stated that specific requirements and their timings will be subject to a Section 106 and other negotiations, to reinforce the fact that this is guidance. The deletion of the plans is welcomed.</p>	<p>Para 7.1 already sets out the requirement for a phased programme of trigger points to be established in legal agreements and the timing for the implementation of the key highway improvements and other infrastructure. Accordingly there is no need to change the Annex.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change</p>