

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P14/V2873/O</a>
<b>SITE</b>	Land to the West of Great Western Park (Valley Park) Didcot (in the parishes of Harwell and Milton)
<b>PARISH</b>	HARWELL
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Outline planning application for a residential development of up to 4,254 dwellings, mixed-use local centres, primary schools, sports pitches, community and leisure facilities, special needs school, open space and extensive green infrastructure, hard and soft landscaping, attenuation areas, diversions to public rights of way, pedestrian and vehicular access and associated works (as amended by drawings and information accompanying letter from Agent dated 10 March 2016, 21 August 2019, 24 January 2020, 30 March 2020, 20 May 2020, 14 December 2020, 6 May 2021 and 15 June 2021).
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Hayleigh Gascoigne Sarah Medley Andy Cooke
<b>APPLICANT OFFICER</b>	Hallam Land Management Ltd Adrian Butler

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**It is recommended that authority to grant outline planning permission is delegated to the head of planning subject to:**

**1. Completion of S106 agreements between this council, Oxfordshire County Council, the applicants and land owners to secure affordable housing, housing for care, schools and public open space on site, on site infrastructure including roads, local centres, allotments, play areas, fitness facilities, sports pitches, sports pavilions and a community building, and financial contributions towards new and existing infrastructure improvements, including towards schools, public transport, off site road and road junctions provision and improvements, cycleway and footpath improvements, sports, and health centre provision;**

**2. Conditions as summarised below:**

- 1. Time limit for commencement – the later of 3-years from date of this permission and or 2 years from approval of the first reserved matters application**
- 2. Time limit for submission of first reserved matters – within 2-years of the date of this permission**
- 3. Time limit for submission of remaining reserved matters (14 years from date of the planning permission)**

4. **Approved plans and documents**
5. **Number of residential dwellings (up to 4,254) and market housing mix to accord with the 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment**

**Pre-Commencement Conditions** (note these conditions will allow access and associated infrastructure works to take place before required details are submitted and agreed)

6. **Agreement of a Housing Delivery Document for whole site**
7. **Submission of reserved matters before each phase – appearance, access (where not included as part of this application), landscaping, layout and scale)**
8. **Development briefs for the local centres, recreation and community buildings**
9. **Agreement of a site-wide Strategic Design Code which will follow the general principles of the submitted design and access statement and the parameter plans. The strategic design code shall:**
  - **Set out the principles of good design**
  - **Include site wide strategies and design principles for the built environment, landscaping, housing, local centre, permanent sport and recreation buildings, parking and the movement network, cross sections and perspectives of key streets, buildings and open spaces, building materials, boundary and public realm treatments, cycle and pedestrian movement and cycle parking;**
  - **Identify the Framework Plan Areas**
10. **Agreement of Framework Plans for each sub area of the development to include:**
  - a) **Permeability and road hierarchy (including location of key primary and secondary roads);**
  - b) **Public transport accessibility (including bus routes and bus stop locations);**
  - c) **Location of residential built development;**
  - d) **Location of community infrastructure (details of which are to be provided in Development Briefs in accordance with Condition 8);**
  - e) **Guidance on scale, building heights/lines/layout and features;**
  - f) **Integration of foul water pumping station(s), electricity sub stations and telecommunication cabinets.**
11. **Agreement of a site wide phasing plan**
12. **Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP) for each phase or sub-phase**
13. **Landscape management and maintenance plan submitted concurrently with details of landscape works under proposed condition 15**
14. **Tree protection scheme before each phase/sub-phase**

15. Hard and soft landscaping scheme before each phase/sub-phase and what it should contain

**Concurrent with Each Reserved Matters Application**

16. Submission of Noise Impact Assessment and mitigation measures for non-residential areas concurrent with Reserved Matters for each phase/sub-phase
17. Submission of noise mitigation for all dwellings sensitive to noise concurrent with Reserved Matters for each phase/sub-phase
18. Biodiversity Enhancement Plan
19. Submission of Landscape Ecology Management Plan (LEMP)
20. Archaeology – staged program of mitigation in accordance with approved Written Scheme of Investigation
21. Contaminated Land – intrusive investigation
22. Details of all lighting before each phase/sub-phase in the south of the site
23. Submission of a foul drainage strategy for on/off site works
24. Surface Water Drainage Scheme before each phase/sub-phase in line with Flood Risk Assessment
25. Biodiversity/watercourse buffer zones
26. Ecological Construction Management Plan
27. Watercourse crossing details required
28. Submission of a Community Employment Plan (CEP)

**Prior to occupation/ use conditions**

29. Hours of operation for non-residential development (excluding schools) to be agreed
30. No non-residential unit to be occupied until footpaths/roads linking to the existing highway have been constructed in accordance with approved details for that phase or sub-phase.
31. No residential unit to be occupied until footpaths/roads linking to the existing highway have been constructed in accordance with approved details for that phase or sub-phase.
32. Submission of Framework Travel Plan
33. Submission of non-residential travel plans
34. No occupation of last dwelling in phase until all connecting roads, footway and cycleways serving that phase to an adjoining phase are complete.

**Post Occupancy Monitoring, Management and Other Conditions**

35. Except for access and associated infrastructure no development in flood zones 2 or 3
36. Green buffer – no built development in areas north and south of B4493 as shown on submitted plan
37. Time periods for construction 0700 hours to 1800 hours Mondays to Fridays, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturdays. No working at all on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays

38. Replacement landscaping if damaged/destroyed within 5 years following its completion within phase/subphase
39. Dwelling space standards in accordance with policy DP2 of the LPP2

#### Informatives

1. Broadband provision
2. Land drainage consent needed for any works to watercourses or ditches
3. A separate agreement under s278 of the Highways Act is needed from OCC for vehicular access, new footway links, bus infrastructure, carriageway widening, right hand turn lane
4. It is an offence under S151 of the Highways Act 1980 for vehicles leaving the development site to carry mud onto the public highway
5. No vehicles associated with the building operations on the development site shall be parked on the public highway, so as to cause an obstruction. Any such obstruction is an offence under S137 of the Highways Act 1980
6. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx. 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
7. Interference with a water main may be an offence under s174 of the Water Industry Act 1991. Any work that may require diversion of a water main, works within 5m of a strategic water main or piling within 15m of a water main could need the approval of Thames Water.
8. Planning Obligation

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application was last reported to planning committee on 16 February 2021. The meeting minutes record that it was resolved to defer consideration for the following reasons:

1. *“The applicant to review the proposed 5-arm roundabout design to investigate options for:*
  - *Details of any pre-designs of the roundabout envisaged by the applicants*
  - *Providing either a bridge or an open underpass to provide direct cycle and pedestrian access across the roundabout*
2. *The applicants commit to providing the £200,000 biodiversity contribution prior to development commencing.*
3. *Planning officers to engage with the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (OCCG) to obtain their opinion on the impacts of*

*the proposal for healthcare provision. Should the OCCG justify a need for any financial contributions or land on site for providing improved healthcare facilities, then committee members wished to secure the requirements through the s106 agreement”.*

- 1.2 This report addresses these three matters only. All other material planning matters are outlined in the previous reports to planning committee on 16 February 2021 and 20 April 2016. These reports are at **attached** at appendices 1 and 2.
- 1.3 Since the 16 February 2021 the applicants have on two occasions submitted amended roundabout designs and technical reports explaining the roundabout design and addressing bridge and underpass potential. The second set of changes followed feedback from a stakeholders meeting in May 2021. The 5-arm roundabout has been amended, adding controlled crossings to the Harwell Link Road and west bound arm of the B4493. All proposed controlled crossings are set closer to the roundabout to reduce journey times. A widened facility is provided for pedestrians and cyclists on the west side of the northern arm. On the southern arms the segregated paths are moved to the roundabout edges. The points at which cycle paths meet roads are revised to allow cyclists to seamlessly merge between the on road and off-road provision at the crossings. To assist cycling journeys the applicants have offered to provide ‘green wave’ technology at controlled crossings. The latest 5-arm roundabout plan is **attached** at appendix 3. The applicant’s response to the first reason for deferral is **attached** at appendix 4 and their roundabout design rationale is **attached** as appendix 5.
- 1.4 Although not part of the reasons for deferral the report also considers the provision of a Dutch type roundabout design and a 4-arm roundabout design as alternatives In addition, the applicants have submitted a sustainability note which is **attached** at appendix 6.
- 1.5 The applicants have agreed to provide the £200,000 biodiversity contribution prior to development commencing. OCCG has responded to this council’s consultation and this is summarised in Section 2 below.

2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATION**

- 2.1 The revisions to the 5-arm roundabout and the associated reports have been subject to further public consultation. A summary of the responses received is below. All other comments previously made are summarised in the previous reports and all comments received can be viewed online at [www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk).

Harwell Parish Council	Objects. Reiterate previous objections and comments and asks that serious consideration is given to provision of land for a suitably sized medical centre. The Parish Council also has two main concerns regarding cyclist and equestrian access.
------------------------	--

	<p><u>Cycling</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severe disruption in commuter cyclist amenity due to the multiple stop/start actions and a large and busy roundabout will discourage children cycling to/from schools.</li> <li>• Removing traffic from the school run is an important aspect of reducing congestion and meeting emission targets and planning policy is clear that active travel should be greatly promoted</li> <li>• These concerns could be adequately addressed by provision of a high quality, sealed-surface alternative route via Cow Lane, across the applicant’s site and along the GWP perimeter track. This would lead almost directly to the Wantage Road stepped cycle lane being constructed at the moment and provide a continuous, safer, although longer, route into the centre of Didcot and the schools along the way. This should be a requirement of the planning permission.</li> <li>• Welcome the ‘green wave’ technological solution for cyclists and this should be a requirement of the planning permission.</li> </ul> <p><u>Pedestrian Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the provision of formal crossings close to each arm of the roundabout and this mainly addresses previous concerns regarding pedestrian amenity.</li> </ul> <p><u>Equestrian Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed equestrian route could be improved around the southern arm of the roundabout by including a new bridleway section on land just to the south west of the roundabout. This would run directly from crossing to crossing and cut the corner. This section is relatively flat.</li> </ul>
<p>Didcot Town Council</p>	<p><u>Objects.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal will have a significant impact on school places as there are no plans for a secondary or ‘through’ school.</li> <li>• Welcome the two primary schools and SEN school planned</li> <li>• Concerned that no school place provision is to be made until seven years or more into the development’s phase build plan. All school infrastructure should be in place before the first house occupation.</li> </ul>

Parks, Amenity, Leisure, Facilities and Environment

- Local schools would remove the need to drive children to school and lead to a reduction in car use.
- The development falls short of environmental targets, not meeting zero-carbon build targets or promoting alternative energy sources such as solar or ground-source or promoting the use of EVs by installing charging circuits.
- There should be non-vehicular connectivity between the proposed development and the existing developments and further to the town itself.
- Planting schemes should achieve a net increase in biodiversity sought by the District Council
- The development should provide:
  - A secondary school,
  - One sizeable, or two smaller, community meeting spaces/community centres,
  - Increased green space so that the Garden Town master plan target of 50% is met without counting footpaths and cycle tracks as 'green space'

Phasing

- Cycle and pedestrian connectivity should be in place prior to first occupation to discourage car use.

Connectivity and Roundabout

- There are no plans for a road or cycle path to Didcot centre or Great Western Park which does not promote good community links.
- A Dutch style roundabout that prioritises cyclists should be provided rather than the lozenge shape roundabout proposed
- A main selling points for HIF was connecting Valley Park to employment sites such as Culham and Milton Park and cycling was supposed to be incorporated into that plan. As the plans stand, cyclists will not be able to access these roads or cycle networks which suggests the roundabout plans need to be changed.

Number of dwellings

- Unclear how many dwellings are proposed.

Building Design: Zero carbon

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The developer should demonstrate how they plan to meet policy SO12 (Protecting the environment and responding to climate change): “Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution (such as water, air, noise and light)” across the development, as the need for zero carbon in building construction and in day to day running of the finished dwellings is paramount for this large development.</li> </ul>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) – Highways</p>	<p>No objection: <u>Summary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OCC’s overall transport / highway position for Valley Park remains unchanged from the previous comments provided on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2021 and at 16<sup>th</sup> February 2021 planning committee – no objection subject to appropriate planning conditions being imposed and legal agreements securing the necessary transport / highway mitigation package to accommodate the development site within the highway network. The latest submission for this application provides the rationale behind the proposed southern 5-arm roundabout arrangement to serve this Local Plan allocated housing site, which have been assessed on its merits and is considered acceptable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant’s latest transport submission for this application consists of two Technical Notes, (TN36 and 37) dated 26<sup>th</sup> April 2021 clarifying the design rationale for the previously approved southern 5-arm roundabout arrangement to address the queries that were raised by the district council’s planning committee on the 16<sup>th</sup> February 2021. Since TN37 was submitted an amended version of TN37 (dated 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2021) has been received from the applicant following constructive discussions with local stakeholders. OCC has the following comments:</li> </ul> <p><u>Technical Note 36 (TN36): Design Rationale – Southern Roundabout Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This TN has been prepared in response to the queries raised by the planning committee on the 16<sup>th</sup> February 2021. In particular, the approved design arrangement / layout of the Southern 5-arm roundabout arrangement on the B4493 and Harwell Link Road. Within this document, there</li> </ul>



	<p>is clarification on the design considerations and physical constraints that have been taken into account by the applicant's project team while working collaboratively with officers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposed alteration to the existing B4493 roundabout junction will provide two new arms on the roundabout to provide access to Valley Park (north and south) whilst retaining through flow for all public highway users of the B4493 and Harwell Link Road, and ensuring the site's impact on the local highway network is mitigated. The proposed access arrangement has been designed in accordance with national and local design guidance documents, such as Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), Manual for Streets 1 &amp; 2 (MfS) and Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20.</li><li>• Concerns have been raised by local residents and other stakeholders that the roundabout design proposed does not adequately provide satisfactory provisions for cyclists as well as other public highway users in the local area, nor accord with appropriate design standards / guidance. Throughout TN36 the rationale behind the roundabout's design is clearly provided and confirms the appropriate design standards / guidance documents have been utilised for the overall design. For example, the proposed roundabout junction is estimated to generate a high number of daily movements once the site (and other committed sites in the local area) are fully built out. Such a significant number of traffic movements trigger the need to use a DMRB design for the roundabout arrangement. LTN 1/20 has been considered for the overall design of the roundabout, however the guidance within this document confirms that an LTN 1/20 (radial style) roundabout has a design restriction of up to 8,000 daily movements on it. Traffic movements above this threshold means that off-road cycle provision must be provided instead of on-carriageway provisions to ensure the safety of cyclists. Hence the amplification of proposed off-carriageway cycle (and pedestrian) provision that have been proposed by Valley Park and have been accepted by OCC as the Local Highway Authority.</li><li>• With regard to the off-carriageway infrastructure and routes being provided at the roundabout junction these have been reviewed by the</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>applicant following comments received by the planning committee and local stakeholders. Concern has been raised with the alignment and directness of these routes, especially for cyclists. These routes have been adjusted accordingly (as confirmed in Paragraphs 3.1 to 3.7 of TN36). These amendments consist of adjusting crossing point locations and route alignments around the roundabout, making the routes as direct as possible while ensuring they continue to meet the required design guidance documents and accommodate all non-motorised users (NMUs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• While cyclists and pedestrians are fully catered for in the proposed design of the roundabout, it is important to note that equestrian users have been considered too. The provision of Pegasus crossings shown at three of the roundabout arms confirms this as does the width of the routes to them. It is noted that on the western arm of the roundabout that a controlled crossing is shown. The design of which is to be agreed with the County Council. The principle of a controlled crossing in this location is agreed and subject to available space it is considered that the design of this crossing should also be a Pegasus type to ensure equestrian users have suitable crossing facilities within the overall design of the roundabout junction. A Pegasus crossing has already been provided by the County Council on the eastern arm of the existing roundabout.</li><li>• Overall, the proposed adjustments to the 5-arm roundabout are considered acceptable, are in accordance with DMRB, LTN 1/20 and OCC cycle guidance.</li></ul> <p><u>Green Wave Proposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• TN36 confirms that while the alignments of the routes to cross the roundabout junction have been adjusted for all public highway users, it is recognised that cyclist commuter routeing has been raised as a concern by local stakeholders. To address this issue research has been undertaken by the developer's project team and a system known as 'Green Wave' is proposed to mitigate this concern. The Green Wave system consists of providing a wave of green lights for cyclists who will travel through the junction and is based on detection, speed and number of</li></ul>
--	--

cyclists i.e. providing a priority route for cyclists at the signal-controlled crossings. Such a design concept is new and has not been provided for in Oxfordshire before. However, this innovative proposal is considered acceptable to the County Council as it will further promote active and sustainable travel in the local area. The delivery of this new type of infrastructure will be provided by Valley Park via a S278 legal agreement for these roundabout works with an agreed financial contribution (commuted sum) to secure the future maintenance of this equipment.

Revised Technical Note 37 (TN37): Southern Access – Response to Planning Committee NMU Crossing Options

- Prior to the submission of TN37, comments on this subject have already been provided by County Council officers to the district council's planning committee and through previous statutory comments for this development proposal. The physical constraints that were identified that limit the design options available at this location, such as A34 overbridge, embankment of the A34 to the east, adjacent properties, existing retaining structures, Harwell Link Road and large differences between the finished road level and surrounding existing ground levels have not changed. However, to ensure each design option that has been identified by interested parties is considered, TN37 seeks to address these:

Underpass Option

- Paragraphs 2.9 to 2.22 confirm the design criteria that has been considered for an underpass proposal i.e. DMRB, Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 1995 and MfS. In addition, the physical land constraint in the area, such as topography has also been assessed. Having reviewed this information it is clear an underpass option would raise design concerns regarding DDA compliance for all highway users, as well as require significant engineering works to provide an underpass with indirect routes under the existing roundabout junction of B4493 and Harwell Link Road (as shown in Figure 2.4). Other design issues such as secure by design, appropriate lighting, drainage and physical measures at the entrances of the

underpass to deter misuse and slow down cyclists would be required. Maintaining such a significant structure would also place a high financial burden to the County Council. It is expected that an underpass arrangement will attract limited use and that users will find alternative, more direct and less confined routes across the junction. This without the infrastructure that has been currently proposed to accommodate all highway user movements. The introduction of the innovative Green Wave scheme would also not be considered appropriate for this option. For these reasons such a structure is not supported by OCC in this location nor are such facilities encouraged within MfS.

#### Overbridge Option

- Paragraphs 2.23 to 2.26 confirm the design criteria that has been considered for the overbridge option suggested by the planning committee on the 16<sup>th</sup> February 2021. From reviewing this section of the TN it is clear that while this option would be safer (than the underpass solution) in terms of secure by design requirements, its design and delivery would however be difficult to achieve due to the physical constraints involved (as identified above in this response) and would not meet the needs of all the highway users expected to use the proposed routes i.e. equestrian users and mobility impaired users. Figure 2.5 clearly shows that the likely route of an overbridge option would be indirect and encourage users to find other means to cross the existing roundabout without the infrastructure improvements that have been proposed to accommodate all highway user movements. Maintaining such a significant structure would also place a high financial burden to the County Council. The introduction of the innovative Green Wave scheme would also not be considered appropriate for this option. For these reasons such a structure is not supported by OCC in this location.

#### Dutch Style Roundabout Option

- Paragraphs 2.27 to 2.29 and Figure 2.6 confirm why a Dutch Style roundabout is not considered appropriate to serve the southern access

arrangement of Valley Park. Highway capacity is one major issue that would be affected by incorporating this design into the access arrangements for this strategic part of the highway network. This together with the fact that, as noted above, modelled daily trips through this junction exceed recommended maximum for a radial roundabout solution. However, it is clear the most prominent design issue identified with this option is the physical constraints that prevent such an arrangement being delivered i.e. requirement for third party land and proximity of A34 and adjacent properties. As a concept, OCC supports the design aspirations of Dutch Style / radial roundabouts where appropriate.

#### 4-arm Roundabout Option

- Paragraphs 2.30 to 2.32 confirm that amending the proposed 5-arm roundabout design to a 4-arm arrangement will have several detrimental impacts on the approved transport strategy for Valley Park such as Harwell Link's strategic route for local and commuter traffic will be impeded by adding additional turning movements on it (due to requirement to create access in Valley Park southern neighbourhood), making it less attractive and possibly encouraging traffic to find alternative routes through local areas. The approved public transport strategy for the site would become less attractive for future users as it would become detached from the main route being promoted. Such design issues were considered at the time when the 5-arm roundabout arrangement was approved by the County Council. It is also the case that creation of an additional access point into Southern Valley Park, remote from the roundabout, would introduce an additional, significant break in the cycle / pedestrian route along Harwell Link Road.
- The 5-arm roundabout arrangement, since it was secured at resolution for planning approval in April 2016, has evolved with input from local stakeholders, OCC and the district council and is considered to be a more desirable design, that caters for all users of the public highway in the local area and for future residents of Valley Park. As such the County Council has assessed the proposed 5-arm roundabout arrangement as

acceptable with the inclusion of the innovative Green Wave system which will test new active travel technology to promote sustainable journeys in the local area.

A4130 Eastern Access

- Since comments were provided for Drawing 10219-HL-90 Revision D in January 2021. OCC is now able to confirm that the type of crossing that is to be provided on the southern arm of the proposed roundabout is to be controlled by design i.e. a Toucan crossing. This is subject to appropriate road safety audits when the detailed design of these works come forward and are formalised. The same approach is to be taken for the on-site roundabout that provides the link to the proposed Science Bridge.

Local pedestrian and cycleway improvements

- Further to local stakeholder comments received regarding the condition of Cow Lane and it being used as an alternative cycle route for residents to travel to Harwell and Harwell campus, consideration is given to its improvement. Within the heads of terms for the S106 agreement for Valley Park it has been agreed that the development site will pay a financial contribution to OCC towards upgrading sections of Cow Lane to ensure future pedestrians and cyclists can use this leisure / green route through the development site as it is built out. Improving Cow Lane will also complement the formal pedestrian and cycle infrastructure already being provided by Valley Park as part of the site's overall master plan and its connectivity to adjacent local areas.
- In addition to Cow Lane it has been suggested by local stakeholders that a footpath through the green area between Great Western Park and Valley Park, providing a link to the University Technical College (UTC) is upgraded to a pedestrian / cycle route. Such a connection could then link to Cow Lane providing an alternative route to the schools located at Great Western Park. Such a design concept is supported by OCC. However, the route identified is outside the red-line boundary of the Valley Park site plan and may not be deliverable by the site promoters of this planning application.

<p>Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (OCCG)</p>	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a significant development and the three practices in the local PCN do not have the capacity to absorb this level of population increase as a direct result of this development going ahead.</li> <li>• Primary Care infrastructure contributions are therefore requested from this development to support plans to fund a surgery site on Great Western Park (GWP) in the first instance presuming such a development is deliverable.</li> <li>• The following financial contributions are requested with a potential land fall-back position: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ £2.841m is secured towards the proposed GWP healthcare centre; and,</li> <li>○ Should the GWP healthcare centre not proceed £3.261m is secured which will enable OCCG to secure land elsewhere and build a healthcare centre or extend an existing health centre; or,</li> <li>○ 0.25 ha land is provided at Valley Park for a new GP health centre at nil cost and £2.841m capital is provided towards its construction.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Patient Participation Groups in Didcot</p>	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the OCCG comments and requests.</li> <li>• Existing GP Practices are overloaded.</li> <li>• The GWP GP health care facility may not be sufficient to cope with Valley Park.</li> <li>• Healthcare provision in Valley Park is essential and request an area of 1.3ha should be made available for a medical/health centre to be constructed. This would include a building accommodating 2,600 sq m and provide 60 parking spaces.</li> </ul>
<p>Sustainable Harwell</p>	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of the roundabout and its landscape impact. If the proposed roundabout is accepted, it should be a condition of the approval that the centre of the roundabout is managed as a nature haven, making it a biodiversity and visual asset and softening its impact on the rural landscape.</li> <li>• The size of the roundabout appears to be due to a high number of predicted motor vehicle movements but there seems no credible justification of these.</li> <li>• The design is based on the National Design Manual for Roads and Bridges because of the volume of traffic. More realistic traffic projections</li> </ul>

	<p>may make such a large roundabout unnecessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not agree with the applicant that the roundabout forms part of the strategic network of roads around Didcot.</li> <li>• Moving to a lower carbon future, constraints improving the balance between motor vehicle traffic and other forms of mobility will be particularly important.</li> <li>• The speed limit of 50 mph on the Harwell Link appears to be used as an element of the justification for the size of the roundabout. The speed limit of the Link could be reduced by OCC to negate this issue.</li> <li>• Welcome the improvements to the roundabout design and 'green wave scheme and if the application is approved it should be made a requirement and written assurance from OCC provided that they will support the scheme technically and financially.</li> <li>• Support Harwell Parish Council's request to implement an alternative routing providing safer access for cyclists, especially school children, from Harwell to some of the Didcot Schools. This will require enhancing the surface of Townsend, a clear cycle route connecting Cow Lane with existing routes in GWP and the possible enhancement of the path round the back of the Aureus School to enable connection the B4493.</li> <li>• Cow Lane should retain priority over any road that is proposed to cross it.</li> <li>• A 4-arm roundabout remains a viable option.</li> <li>• If this new design is to go to the planning committee for approval it should be subject to:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clarity about the projected traffic volumes and the role of the roundabout within the wider Didcot network;</li> <li>○ Commitments to the implementation of a scheme such as the Green Wave; and,</li> <li>○ Commitments to provide an alternative cycle route though Valley Park.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>HARBUG</p>	<p>No objection, subject to conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roundabout is an inappropriate design and will encourage the use of motorised traffic, which is contrary to local and national Government policies.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept that the modifications to the design has made concessions to make crossing the junction by cycle and walking easier.</li> <li>• Welcome the ‘Green Wave’ to allow cyclists to cross the roundabout in a safe and convenient manner. HarBUG would welcome the opportunity to work with the developer consortium and County Council in the design, specification and testing of the ‘Green Wave’.</li> <li>• The ‘Green Wave’ proposal is a key component in making the roundabout a cycle friendly junction that follows District and County transport policies and needs to be a condition of the planning application with agreement from the County Council to support and maintain the ‘Green Wave’ during its lifecycle.</li> <li>• The following should be included as conditions of the planning application:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The design of the cycle path merges back onto the main carriageways - lengthen transitions to allow cyclists to merge into traffic flow safely and conveniently without having to stop or slow down. No 90° give way lane terminations.</li> <li>○ Ensure the masterplan provides good cycle access into Harwell village via Cow lane /Townsend bridge.</li> <li>○ There should be an alternative route via Great Western Park and Valley Park for cyclists avoiding the roundabout.</li> <li>○ A high-quality cycleway should be provided between the Science Bridge and Cow Lane / Townsend bridge in Valley Park. This link in conjunction with the Science Bridge cycleways will provide a strategic Science Vale cycle route from Culham Science Centre to Harwell Campus providing direct links to Didcot West housing, a link into Milton Park and the Power Station site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Providing the provisions listed are included as conditions of the planning application, we offer no objections to the application being approved.</li> </ul>
Residents	<p>15 letters of objection have been received raising the following issues:</p> <p><u>5-Arm Roundabout</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fundamental principle of this design is still through put of motor vehicles and not enticing people to walk and cycle.</li> <li>• OCC transport modelling seems to be based on planning and building for more traffic resulting in</li> </ul>

	<p>junctions being designed for more traffic whereas decision making on infrastructure should be based on delivering on net-zero targets set for 2045 (Vale) and 2050 (Oxfordshire and the UK).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not convinced by the applicant's case for the roundabout design being based on significant commercial traffic, to support additional traffic generated by the Science Bridge and other HIF works or traffic approaching at up to 50mph whereas 40mph is more likely. The original traffic modelling did not take into account the Science Bridge and the other HIF works north of the site. Hence the planning committee should be aware that if the traffic volumes used in the initial modelling were still appropriate, there might not be need for such a large roundabout.</li><li>• Applicant advises some 33,000 vehicles could move through the roundabout but this figure seems unsubstantiated as there seems to be no such suggestion in the transport assessment.</li><li>• A 4-arm roundabout design is still a viable option.</li><li>• An underpass is dismissed by the developer on the basis of one example scheme.</li><li>• There appears to be sufficient space and appropriate levels for a cycle and bridleway underpass south of the roundabout. Pedestrian traffic could monitor an underpass ensuring it is safe and under passes would not be as long here as that beneath the railway to Milton Park.</li><li>• Proposal ignores the Science Vale Cycle Network.</li><li>• Lack of detail for bridle path provision; is there segregation of paths and a soft surface?</li><li>• No detail as regards horses crossing the western arm of the roundabout. It currently shows a toucan crossing.</li><li>• What is the purpose of taking the bridle path around the south-eastern and eastern arms of the roundabout? It is surely safer for riders traversing between 243/12 and the northern arm to use the Link Road crossing if needed and then cross the western arm by the A34 bridge.</li><li>• Cyclists using the Link Road carriageway are unlikely to want to switch to the shared-use path at the roundabout.</li><li>• The applicant has not demonstrated:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ That other types of design discussed at the Committee are restricted either on safety</li></ul></li></ul>
--	--

	<p>grounds and not recommended in the guidance and/or are not able to be constructed due to existing physical constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ That the design now offers a quicker flatter and shorter route without serious gradient changes to the other options such as the underpass and bridge.</li><li>● A combination of at-grade pedestrian routes using the crossings and an underpass for SVCN 5 and the existing bridle-path between the Harwell and Link Road arms would seem to provide a more optimum solution.</li><li>● It is recognised that improvements have been made, within the parameters the developers have set themselves, which appear to exclude proper consideration of existing users.</li><li>● It is unclear whether the 'green wave' system has any meaning at a nonurban location where in general there will not be waves of cyclists coming through. This system is based on detection, speed and number of cyclists and making inner city cycling safer, where cyclists are travelling in straight lines, not turning right-angles at crossings to satisfy a developer's car-led plan.</li><li>● The 'green wave' is critical to the scheme and should be based on sensor technology rather than an app.</li></ul> <p><u>Connectivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● A bridge across the A34 at The Driftway would enhance active travel between Didcot and West Hagbourne and reduce need to use the 5-arm roundabout.</li><li>● Cow Lane and Townsend, Harwell should be upgraded to allow cycling.</li><li>● Enhancing a path in GWP to the UTC is encouraged.</li><li>● Provide a foot/cycle way along Reading Road into Harwell connecting Valley Park and Harwell.</li></ul> <p><u>Carbon Reductions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● There is no substance in the applicant's submission outlining the developer's actual targets/plans. The first phase of development should not miss out on the 75-80% reduction in carbon emissions standards simply by virtue of them being built a year before the deadline for the change.</li></ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Electric vehicle charging points should be provided.</li></ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inadequate dental provision.</li><li>• The GWP GP surgery should be built before Valley Park housing is commenced.</li><li>• Need supermarkets on this side of Didcot to prevent traffic through Didcot to access supermarkets on the east side of town.</li></ul> <p><u>Other Matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The developer should do its utmost to maintain the current groves of trees and waterways that cross through the area to protect wildlife.</li><li>• The site should not be developed as there is no need for the housing.</li><li>• Detrimental impact on the town centre with increased traffic and footfall which will be an untenable burden in combination with other developments in the Didcot area.</li></ul> <p>Two residents whilst raising other objections to the proposal, welcome the amendments to the 5-arm roundabout and 'green wave' traffic light system for cyclists.</p>
--	--

### 3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 Details are contained in the earlier planning committee reports.

### 4.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 This is EIA development and the application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) and addendums. The following areas of potential impact were assessed: ecology, landscape and visual impact, historic environment, hydrology and flood risk, traffic and transport, air quality and climate, noise and vibration, agriculture, community and socio-economics.

4.2 The amendments made to the proposal do not change the conclusions of the ES or the identified mitigation. No further assessment is therefore required.

### 5.0 **MAIN ISSUES**

5.1 The main issues addressed in this report are the reasons for deferring the application on 16 February 2021 which are :

1. **The 5-Arm Roundabout**
2. **The Biodiversity Contribution**
3. **Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group Response**

#### **The 5-Arm Roundabout**

The first reason for deferral is in two parts:

- i. Details of any pre-designs of the roundabout envisaged by the applicants
- ii. Providing either a bridge or an open underpass to provide direct cycle and pedestrian access across the roundabout.

#### Pre-Designs

- 5.2 No detail of any pre-designs of the roundabout have been submitted. Since 2015 a 5-arm roundabout has been proposed on the B4493 and in April 2016 this council resolved to approve the 5-arm roundabout.

#### Provision of a Bridge or Underpass

- 5.3 The applicants have shown potential routes for an underpass (page 5 of **appendix 4**) and bridge (page 7 of **appendix 4**). Neither provides direct access for cyclists or pedestrians. Both have been considered and discounted by the applicants and by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) as Highway Authority.

#### *A Bridge*

- 5.4 The applicant advises a bridge could be safe for users. Extensive ramping however would be required to provide 5m clearance above the roads and for the ramps to be Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant. Road crossings would still be required to allow equestrian access. A bridge would not be a direct route and would add distance to routes for cyclists and pedestrians compared to the roundabout proposal.
- 5.5 OCC advise that a bridge would be a safer option compared to an underpass but its design and delivery would be difficult to achieve due to the physical site constraints involved and would not meet the needs of all the highway users expected to use the proposed routes i.e. equestrian users and mobility impaired users. In addition, the bridge route would be indirect and encourage users to find other means to cross the existing roundabout without the infrastructure improvements that are currently proposed to accommodate all highway user movements. Maintaining such a significant structure would also place a high financial burden on OCC.
- 5.6 For the reasons outlined above and notwithstanding any potential landscape and visual impact, a bridge is not supported.

#### *An Underpass*

- 5.7 The applicants advise that for an underpass to be DDA compliant and with existing topography around the roundabout including changes of levels, extensive excavation and retaining structures would be required together with a zig zag approach/exit in the west. This would result in an enclosed space for users and would compromise the sense of safety due to the corners and enclosure. Furthermore, an underpass would add some 80m to a cycle or pedestrian journey compared to the proposed roundabout design.
- 5.8 OCC also doubt that an underpass would be secure by design to deter crime. Appropriate lighting, drainage and physical measures at the entrances of the underpass to deter misuse and slow down cyclists would be required.

Maintaining such a significant structure would also place a high financial burden on OCC. Moreover, it is expected that an underpass arrangement will attract limited use and that users will find alternative, more direct and less confined routes across the junction.

- 5.9 For the reasons mentioned above and notwithstanding any potential landscape and visual impact a bridge is not supported.

Amendments to the Roundabout Design

- 5.10 The roundabout design has been amended bringing proposed controlled crossing points on the southern arms (Harwell link road and access to the southern part of Valley Park), closer to the roundabout thereby providing a more direct route for cyclists, equestrians and pedestrians (non-motorised users (NMU's)). The controlled crossing points are Pegasus crossings being suited to NMU's. The location of the controlled crossing point on the northern arm has not been revised as the fall in levels discounts it being brought closer to the roundabout.

- 5.11 The 5-arm roundabout provides peripheral off road cycle and pedestrian paths that can be used as an alternative to using the road. Segregation of cyclists and cars at roundabouts accommodating in excess of 8,000 daily vehicle movements which will be the case here, is emphasised in OCC's cycling design guidance, LTN 1/20, Manual for Streets 1 & 2 (MfS) and TD16/07 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges which applies to the B4493. The roundabout design including off road paths in this case comply with local and national guidance.

*Green Wave' Technology*

- 5.12 To assist cycling journeys using the segregated cycle paths the applicants have offered to provide 'green wave' technology. This technology gives priority to cyclists over road traffic at the road crossings by providing a 'wave' of green lights for cyclists who will travel through the junction and is based on sensors detecting, speed and number of cyclists i.e. providing a priority route for cyclists at the signal-controlled crossings.
- 5.13 OCC is satisfied with this technology being introduced and a s106 legal agreement or s278 legal agreement can secure it together with financial contributions towards providing the technology and its maintenance.
- 5.14 To conclude on this topic neither a bridge nor an underpass is supported by your officers, the Highway Authority, and the applicants. They would not provide a direct route through the roundabout for NMU's and would extend journey times compared to the current proposal.
- 5.15 The roundabout design as proposed provides segregated, direct paths for NMU's and complies with local and national guidance. The roundabout design is considered safe by the Highway Authority and complies with policy DP16 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.

*Public Rights of Way (PRoW)*

- 5.16 Some interested parties including Harwell Parish Council suggest Cow Lane and a path to the UTC at GWP could be improved to provide an alternative route to the B4493 for cyclists and pedestrians accessing GWP facilities and schools.
- 5.17 Cow Lane through Valley Park is already agreed to be improved. In addition, the applicants have committed £50,000 for improvements to the surface of Cow Lane from Townsend in Harwell to the A34 overbridge. This is agreed by OCC, is acceptable and can be secured through the s106 agreement.
- 5.18 Cycle and pedestrian paths would link Cow Lane through the Valley Park development to a path in GWP that ultimately leads to the UTC and other facilities in GWP. This path exists at a width of 3m and with a self-binding gravel surface suitable for cycling and pedestrians. Where it is needed this path is already due to be upgraded to a cycle/pedestrian path as part of the Valley Park proposals and is to be secured through the s106 agreement.

#### Other Matters

- 5.19 In response to matters raised by interested parties the applicants have assessed and discounted the provision of a 'Dutch' type roundabout and a 4-arm roundabout design. A 'Dutch' type roundabout could not be accommodated due to its increased size compared to the current proposal, the topography in this location (including the fall in levels to the north) and the requirement of third party land outside the applicants' and OCC's control.
- 5.20 A 4-arm roundabout is not supported as it will detrimentally impact on the Harwell Link Road strategic route for local and commuter traffic being impeded by adding additional turning movements on it (due to requirement to create access in Valley Park southern neighbourhood), making it less attractive and possibly encouraging traffic to find alternative routes through local areas. The approved public transport strategy for the site would also become less attractive for future users as it would be detached from the main route being promoted directly through Valley Park and could leave significant parts of the Southern Valley Park site without a bus service traversing through it. It is also the case that creation of an additional access point into Southern Valley Park, remote from the roundabout, would introduce an additional and significant break in the NMU route along Harwell Link Road.

#### **The Biodiversity Contribution**

- 5.21 As requested by planning committee the applicant has agreed to pay the £200,000 biodiversity contribution prior to the development commencing. This can be secured in a s106 agreement.

#### **Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group Response**

- 5.22 Following the deferral, officers have again sought a response from the OCCG. They have responded and request:
- £2.841m towards the proposed GWP healthcare centre; and,
  - Should the GWP healthcare centre not proceed, that £3.261m is secured which will enable OCCG to secure land elsewhere to build a healthcare centre or extend an existing health centre; or,

- 0.25 Ha Land is provided at Valley Park for a new GP health centre at nil cost and £2.841m capital is provided towards its construction
- 5.23 The CIL Regulations and NPPF advise that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:
- i. Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  - ii. Directly related to the development; and
  - iii. Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 5.24 OCCG explain that this Primary Care Network (PCN) area is already under considerable pressure from surrounding planning applications for housing, this application directly impacts on the ability of this PCN to provide primary care services to the increasing population and an increase of around 10,865 people from the Valley Park development proposal is coming at a time when two of the practices within the PCN have no effective scope to increase registrations and one practice has been taking new patients but is at a tipping point in terms of capacity. It is therefore necessary for this development to make provision for health care facilities and OCCG requests are directly related to the development proposed.
- 5.25 The GWP planning permission requires provision of land (0.2ha), minimum floor space of 646 sq m (GIA) for a minimum 4 GP surgery and a financial contribution for a new healthcare centre on GWP. OCCG has confirmed in its consultation responses that Valley Park creates a need for a minimum floor space of 643 sq m (GIA). A planning application has been submitted on behalf of OCCG for a healthcare centre on GWP comprising some 1,419 sq m of internal floor space on a 0.2ha site to provide 10 consulting rooms, training and meeting rooms, utility rooms, changing rooms, waiting rooms and offices. This healthcare centre is aimed at meeting the needs of residents of both GWP and Valley Park developments
- 5.26 In its consultation responses OCCG has clearly set out its calculations for the amounts requested which accords with the OCCG Estates Strategy formulation for all developments, and is calculated based on the number of beds per house at a basic rate of £360 per head. This has then been applied directly to the number of residents expected for this development. This sum was tested by OCCG in 2020 locally to ensure it aligns to current market rates. The amounts requested are fairly and directly related to the development.
- 5.27 The Patient Participation Groups (PPG) in Didcot suggest a 1.3ha site should be made available which is considerably more than recommended by OCCG and significantly greater than the existing three healthcare centre sites in Didcot which are at most some 0.26ha according to planning applications submitted at these sites. They also suggest floor space should be a minimum of 2,600 sq m (which is significantly larger than that the 643 sq m required by OCCG and the floor spaces at the three existing health centres in Didcot (which range from 723.5 sqm to 1,607 sq m according to planning applications submitted at these sites) and 60 parking spaces be provided. As mentioned above the planning application for a proposed healthcare centre site at GWP is



0.2ha with a 1,419 sq m building containing facilities intended to serve both GWP and Valley Park. The PPG request is excessive and without justification.

- 5.28 As a fall-back position in case the GWP healthcare centre does not proceed, OCCG seek a 0.25ha site on Valley Park. This could comprise part of the northern district centre which is to be approximately 0.85ha and could include associated parking. A minimum sized building of 643 sq m GIA would be needed should a fall-back scenario arise.
- 5.29 In conclusion on this matter the OCCG requests are acceptable and considered to meet the three CIL tests set out above. They can be secured through a s106 agreement.

**Financial contribution requests**

- 5.30 As explained in this report and in the 16 February 2021 report to planning committee the following developer contributions are considered fair and proportionate and should be secured through a section 106 agreement:

Oxfordshire County Council	Proposed Contributions (all index linked)	Trigger	Towards
Biodiversity off setting	£200,000	Payment – prior to commencement.	Biodiversity improvements
Bus stop infrastructure	£198,000	Payment 1 - Prior to first occupation Payment 2 – by 500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 3 – by 1,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation	Towards the provision of bus shelters and bus stop infrastructure serving the Site
Public transport serving the site	£3,600,000	Payment 1 – by first occupation Payment 2 - on or before the date which is 12 months after payment 1 Payment 3 on or before the date which is 24 months after payment 1 Payment 4 on or before 500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 5 on or before the date	For the provision and/or improvement of public transport services serving the Site

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee - 28 July 2021

		<p>which is 12 months after payment 4</p> <p>Payment 6 on or before the date which is 24 months after payment 4</p> <p>Payment 7 on or before the date which is 36 months after payment 4</p> <p>Payment 8 on or before 1,000<sup>th</sup> occupation</p> <p>Payment 9 on or before the date which is 12 months after payment 8</p>	
Education infrastructure serving the site.	£2,500,000	<p>Payment 1 – by 1,500<sup>th</sup> occupation</p> <p>Payment 2 – by 2,000<sup>th</sup> occupation</p> <p>Payment 3 – by 2,500<sup>th</sup> occupation</p>	For education infrastructure serving the site
Two on site primary schools as below:			To meet primary school education needs for future occupants of the dwellings
Primary Education Contribution Direct Delivery (PS1)	£1,717,080	<p>Payment 1 -prior to commencement</p> <p>Payment 2 - on or before the first Working Day in School Opening Year</p>	
Primary Education Contribution Land (PS1)	£12,600,000	<p>Payment 1 – prior to commencement</p> <p>Payment 2 - on or before the Offer Date in respect of</p>	

		<p>Primary School 1 Site Payment 3 - on or before the date which is six months after the date of letting of the contract for the construction of a Primary School Payment 4 - on or before the date which is twelve months after the date of letting of the contract for the construction of a Primary School</p>	
<p>Primary Education Contribution Land (PS2)</p>	<p>£6,350,000</p>	<p>Payment 1 – by 2,000 dwelling occupations Payment 2 - on or before the Offer Date in respect of the Primary School 2 Site Payment 3 - on or before the date which is six months after the date of letting of the contract for the construction of a Primary School at Primary School 2 Site Payment 4 - on or before the date which is twelve months after the date of letting of the contract for the construction of a Primary School</p>	

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee - 28 July 2021

		at Primary School 2 Site	
Primary Education Contribution Direct Delivery (PS2)	£685,620	Payment 1 – by 1,850 dwelling occupations Payment 2 - on or before the first Working Day in School Opening Year	
Secondary school and sixth form infrastructure at GWP	£9,000,000	Payment 1 – by 1,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 2 – by 2,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 3 – by 2,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 4 – by 3,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation	Provision and/or improvement of secondary and/or sixth form infrastructure at the secondary school at GWP
Special needs education serving the site	£1,232,500	Payment 1 – by 1,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 2 – by 1,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 3 – by 2,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation	Provision of a new special education needs facility on site
Health and well-being	£158,483	Payment 1 – by 1,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 2 – by 2,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation	To facilitate adult care provision at Didcot and serving the Site
Didcot library	£949,130	Payment 1- by 1,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 2 – by 2,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 3 – by 3,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation	Provision of library facilities (including book stock etc) in Didcot

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee - 28 July 2021

Central (Oxford) library		Payment 1 – by 1,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 2 – by 2,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation	Provision of library facilities at the Central Library in Oxford
Road improvements towards providing the Science Bridge, A4130 widening and the Harwell link road	£12,277,044	Payment 1 – by 1,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 2 – by 1,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 3 – by 2,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 4 – by 2,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 5 – by 3,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 6 – by 3,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation	Towards providing the Science Bridge, A4130 widening and the Harwell link road
Cow Lane improvements	£150,000	Payment by 500 <sup>th</sup> occupation unless OCC request the additional Cow Lane contribution	Improvements to Cow Lane at the site
Additional Cow Lane contribution	£260,000	Payment to be requested one month after 300 <sup>th</sup> occupation (if needed)	Surfacing and improvements to Cow Lane at the site
Further Cow Lane Contribution	£50,000	Payment by 500 <sup>th</sup> occupation unless OCC request the additional Cow Lane contribution	Improvements to Cow lane between the A34 overbridge and Townsend, Harwell
Rights of Way	£250,000	Payment 1 – by 500 occupations	Improvement of the public rights of way network

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee - 28 July 2021

		Payment 2 – by 1,500 occupations	in the vicinity of the Site
'UTC' path (green route)	£213 per linear metre for reconstruction; £41.27 per linear metre for maintenance	No later than the completion of construction of the parts of Cycle Route 3 (which is part of phase 4 of the development.	Improvements to a path on GWP making it suitable for pedestrian and cyclist use
Green wave - B4493 5-arm roundabout	£TBC	By first use of the 5-arm roundabout	Provision of 'green wave' technology using on site sensors and not an app. and its management and maintenance.
Milton Interchange design revisions and construction	£1,999,858	Payment 1 – by 1,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 2 – by 2,250 <sup>th</sup> occupation (unless the developer undertakes these works)	Seeking to alleviate congestion.(This sum is only secured should OCC decide to undertake this work otherwise the developer is expected to undertake the work)
Rights of way	£250,000	Payment 1 – by 500 <sup>th</sup> occupation Payment 2 – by 1,500 <sup>th</sup> occupation	Improvements in the vicinity of the site
Rowstock roundabout improvements	£378,803	Payment – by 2,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation	Highway improvements between the A4130 and the A417 at Rowstock Junction
Collett Road roundabout improvements	£170,000	Payment by 3,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation (unless the developer	Improvements to the roundabout

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee - 28 July 2021

		undertakes these works)	
Travel plan monitoring	£7,800	Payment 1 – before first occupation. Payment 2 – by 1,000th occupation Payment 3 – by 2,000 <sup>th</sup> occupation	To encourage more sustainable modes of travel
S106 monitoring fees	£21,700		
<b>Vale of White Horse District Council</b>	<b>Proposed Contributions</b> (all index linked)	<b>Trigger</b>	<b>Towards</b>
Healthcare provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £2.841m towards the proposed GWP healthcare centre; and,</li> <li>• £3.261m should the GWP healthcare centre not proceed allowing OCCG to secure land elsewhere and build a healthcare centre or extend an existing health centre; or,</li> <li>• 0.25 ha of land with a minimum building size of 643 sq m GIA is provided</li> </ul>	TBC	The proposed healthcare centre at GWP or acquiring land for a new healthcare centre or extending an existing facility or providing a new healthcare centre at Valley Park.

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee - 28 July 2021

	at Valley Park for a new GP health centre at nil cost and £2.841m capital is provided towards its construction		
Rugby pitches	£76,923	Payment by 200 occupations	Towards rugby provision in the Didcot Leisure Sub Area as described in the Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire Councils Leisure and Sports Facilities Joint Statement for the Didcot Leisure Sub Area 2013 to 2029 dated August 2014 or other such identified provision in the Vale of White Horse Leisure and Sports Facilities Study 2013-2031 dated November 2014 or any replacement leisure and sports strategy.
Indoor Bowls	£258,678	By 3,000 occupations	Towards the improvement of indoor bowls facilities and infrastructure in the parishes of



Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee - 28 July 2021

			Harwell and/or Milton
Swimming Pool	£1,881,831	Payment 1 – by 500 occupations Payment 2 – by 1,000 occupations Payment 3 – by 1,500 occupations Payment 4 – by 2,000 occupations Payment 5 – by 2,500 occupations Payment 6 – by 3,000 occupations Payment 7 – by 3,500 occupations Payment 8 – by 4,000 occupations	Towards swimming pool provision in the Didcot Leisure Sub Area as described in the Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire Councils Leisure and Sports Facilities Joint Statement for the Didcot Leisure Sub Area 2013 to 2029 dated August 2014 or other such identified provision in the Vale of White Horse Leisure and Sports Facilities Study 2013-2031 dated November 2014 or any replacement leisure and sports strategy
Leisure provision	£3,186,000	Payment 1 – by 1,750 occupations Payment 2 – by 2,000 occupations	Towards sports hall and health and fitness provision in the Didcot Leisure Sub Area as described in the Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire Councils Leisure and Sports Facilities Joint Statement

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee - 28 July 2021

			for the Didcot Leisure Sub Area 2013 to 2029 dated August 2014 or other such identified provision in the Vale of White Horse Leisure and Sports Facilities Study 2013-2031 dated November 2014 or any replacement leisure and sports strategy
Waste and recycling bin provision (£170 per dwelling)	£723,180	Payment 1- commencement of development Payment 2 – by 750 occupations Payment 3 – by 1,425 occupations Payment 4 – by 2,000 occupations Payment 5 – by 3,000 occupations Payment 6 – by 3,500 occupations	Towards the purposes of the provision of waste and recycling facilities and collections within the Development
Public Art	£1,281,200	Payment 1- commencement of development Payment 2 – by 200 occupations Payment 3 – by 500 occupations Payment 4 – by 1,000 occupations Payment 5 – by 1,500 occupations	Towards public art on the Site

		Payment 6 – by 2,000 occupations Payment 7 – by 2,500 occupations Payment 8 – by 3,000 occupations Payment 9 – by 3,500 occupations Payment 10 – by 4,000 occupations	
Street Naming	£48,671	Payment 1- commencement of development Payment 2 – by 500 occupations Payment 3 – by 1,000 occupations Payment 4 – by 2,000 occupations Payment 5 – by 3,000 occupations Payment 6 – by 3,500 occupations	For the purposes of street naming and numbering within the Development
S106 monitoring fees	£23,138		

6.0 **CONCLUSION**

6.1 This application has been determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise as required by Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

6.2 In April 2016 this authority resolved to grant outline planning permission for up to 4,254 dwellings on this site subject to a legal agreement being entered into to secure affordable housing and infrastructure improvements and the agreement of planning conditions. This resolution included the design of the 5-arm roundabout which has now been amended to improve its design. As requested by the council the applicants have investigated the provision of a bridge or underpass across/beneath the 5-arm roundabout but neither would provide a more direct route for non-motorised users and for the reasons explained in this

report and by OCC as Highway Authority, these options are not supported. The 5-arm roundabout is a reasonably safe design using segregated cycle, equestrian and pedestrian paths that accords with national and local standards and is compliant with policy DP16 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 2.

- 6.3 The applicant has committed to paying the biodiversity contribution prior to development commencing.
- 6.4 OCCG has responded to consultation. Its expectations are considered reasonable and can be secured through the s106 agreement.
- 6.5 Subject to the imposition of planning conditions and completion of a s106 agreement the application is development plan compliant and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged. In accordance with paragraph 11(c) of the NPPF permission should be granted without delay. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

The following planning policies have been considered:

**Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 1 – core policies:**

- CP1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- CP2 - Cooperation on unmet housing need for Oxfordshire
- CP3 - Settlement hierarchy
- CP4 - Meeting our housing needs
- CP5 – Housing supply ring-fence
- CP7 – Providing supporting infrastructure and services
- CP15 - Spatial Strategy for the South East Vale Sub-Area
- CP17 - Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area
- CP18 - Safeguarding of Land for Transport Schemes in the South East Vale Sub-Area
- CP22 – Housing mix
- CP23 – Housing density
- CP24 – Affordable housing
- CP33 – Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility
- CP35 – Promoting public transport, cycling and walking
- CP36 – Electronic communications
- 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
- CP47 – Delivery and contingency

**Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 2**

- CP4a – Meeting our housing needs

CP16b - Didcot Garden Town  
DP2 – Space standards  
DP11 – Community Employment Plans  
DP16 – Access  
DP17 - Transport assessments and travel plans  
DP20 – Public art  
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  
DP30 - Watercourses  
DP33 – Open space  
DP36 – Heritage assets  
DP39 – Archaeology and scheduled monuments  
DP47a - Delivery and contingency

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

The site is within both Harwell and Milton Parishes. Neither Parish (nor Didcot Town which adjoins the site) are currently preparing Neighbourhood Plans.

### **Adopted Guidance**

Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015  
Developer Contributions – Delivering Infrastructure to Support Development  
SPD – June 2017

### **Other Relevant Legislation and Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)  
Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan October 2017  
Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards 2017  
Community & Infrastructure Levy Legislation  
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990  
Human Rights Act 1998  
Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010  
Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998  
Section 85 of CROW Act 2000

**Case Officer:** Adrian Butler

**Email:** [adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk)

**Tel:** 01235 422600