

APPLICATION NO.	P21/V3516/RM
SITE	Monks Farm Grove, OX12 0AH
PARISH	GROVE
PROPOSAL	Reserved matters approval for 83 dwellings (Phase 1B), including appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, and approval of details in relation to Phase 1B for conditions 1, 16, 19, 20 pursuant to planning permission P16/V0981/O.(As amended by plans and documentation received 19 April 2022, and as amended and amplified by new information received 1 and 13 June, 13 July, and 18 August 2022.)
WARD MEMBER(S)	Ron Batstone Ben Mabbett
APPLICANT OFFICER	David Wilson Homes Stuart Walker

RECOMMENDATION

To approve Reserved Matters, subject to the following:

Conditions:

1. Approved plans
2. Roads, parking and turning and footways to be provided prior to first occupation of each dwelling to which it relates.
3. Boundaries to be provided in accordance with approved drawings prior to first occupation of each dwelling to which it relates.
4. Restriction on occupancy to no more than 55 dwellings until bridge is complete.
5. Restriction on occupancy to no more than 75 dwellings until the landscaping approved within this application is complete

Informatives:

1. Details pursuant to conditions 1, 16, 19 and 20 of outline planning permission P16/V0981/O are agreed for this phase through the approval of the Reserved Matters application.
2. The applicant is reminded of the obligation of compliance with the relevant conditions on the outline application that apply to this phase (e.g., CEMP and LEMP implementation).
3. Highway informatives

1.0 **INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL**

1.1 This application comes to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Ron Batstone.

1.2 The application seeks Reserved Matters approval of layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping for 83 dwellings, pursuant to outline permission P16/V0981/O for up to 400 dwellings on the Monks Farm strategic housing site. The outline permission approved access from the A338 and Denchworth Road and therefore, this is not a matter for consideration as part of this application. The application, known as phase 1b, is the first Reserved Matters to come forward. Phases 1a and 1c for infrastructure, including the bridge over the Letcombe Brook, the spine road and land for the primary school expansion have been submitted separately (applications P22/V1031/RM and P22/V1020/RM) and these Reserved Matters applications remain under consideration. Future phases (2 and 3) for the remaining housing will come forward later.

1.3 A location plan is **attached** at Appendix 1. The application also seeks to partially discharge numerous outline conditions (where relevant to the proposal).

1.4 Phase 1b seeks detailed consent for 83 dwellings (one to five bed properties in a mix of apartments and dwellings, including some affordable units), open space, including an orchard and informal areas, new tree planting, with vehicular and pedestrian access from Denchworth Road, and the provision of vehicle, cycle and pedestrian access to the Grove Northern Link Road and the Cow Lane crossing, as approved in the outline permission. The proposal has also been amended several times to take account of comments received from the Highway Authority, drainage engineer, countryside, and landscape officers.

1.5 The latest layout and tenure plans are **attached** at Appendix 2. All plans and supporting documents accompanying the application are available to view online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

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

Grove Parish Council	No objection.
Residents	25 letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to The Maples junction are unsafe. • Highway works are outside the application boundary. • New road will bring traffic from the new development and A338 onto Denchworth Road, which is not suitable for any increase in traffic. • Proposal will result in construction traffic coming through Grove to the detriment of residents.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road should only be built if the alternative through to the Airfield is not achievable and applicant has not demonstrated why Grove Northern Link Road (GNLR) cannot be delivered as intended. • This access will become the GNLR and the rest of the GNLR will not be delivered. • New road will be a rat run. • This proposal will lead to loss of informal parking at Denchworth Road entrance to Cow Lane. • Cow Lane will become inaccessible to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders who will have to navigate the new junction. • New link road makes no provision for cycle lanes. • New road junction should be a mini roundabout. • There is a lack of parking for new dwellings accessed off the link road. • Dwellings lack any sustainable measures such as heat pumps and solar panels. • Cycle infrastructure is inadequate. • Loss of hedgerow and habitat. • Impact on infrastructure, sewers, schools, and doctors. • Risk of flooding. • Loss of green space / agricultural land. • Housing is not needed. • Impact on Letcombe Brook.
<p>Wantage and Grove Campaign Group</p>	<p>Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Policy 15c in LPP2 states all development will be guided by a comprehensive development framework for the settlement. This framework does not exist. • Core Policy 15a refers to delivering the North Grove Link Road (NGLR) that will form an important connection between Grove Airfield and the A338 and planning for the Monks Farm and Grove Airfield sites, ensuring they are fully integrated. • Local Plan Part 1, Appendix A - Monks Farm, Grove states that delivery of the Grove Northern Link Road (GNLR) is required for access to the Grove Airfield development. • This application ensures a complete separation between the Monks Farm and Grove Airfield development by diverting the planned route of the Grove Northern Link Road so that it no longer joins up with the planned route across the Airfield. This will push all traffic from the west of Wantage and Grove onto the Denchworth Road from the northern access of the Airfield Development to the end of the Maples

	<p>ensuring that much traffic will then continue through the old part of Grove to join the A338 via Oxford Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the original purposes of the Link Road was to divert traffic away from the conservation area in the centre of Grove and the plans for the GNLR in this application will stop that from happening. This application should be refused on the grounds that it does not achieve that objective. • When outline permission was granted for Monks Farm, the Decision Notice contained a condition requiring that the road junction at The Maples should only be built if an identified better alternative is not achievable. • We have not seen any documentation to suggest that any alternative has been considered in any way. The Grove Comprehensive Development Framework described in the Local Plan has not been written and developments are taking place piecemeal. • This application should be refused until the overall plan for the road network through Grove is considered as part of the Comprehensive Development Framework defined in the Local Plan and the routes in this application are justified by evidence that 'better alternatives' are not achievable.
Network Rail	<p>Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail continues their objection to this development as there is no provision to mitigate any impact of the development on the nearby level crossings and Network Rail cannot countenance increasing public use of level crossings on the GWR high speed line.
Oxfordshire County Council - Transport	<p>July 2022 Amendment – No objection, subject to condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amended plans are acceptable. • Cycle provision aligns with approved details in the S106. • Conditions required on construction access, storage of excavated material on site and restriction on occupations to maximum of 55 dwellings until such time that the Letcombe Brook Bridge and access to A338 is open. <p>April 2022 Amendment – No objection, subject to condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information has been submitted to address previous concerns. • Conditions required on construction access, storage of excavated material on site and restriction on occupations to maximum of 25 dwellings until such

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 28 September 2022

	<p>time that the Letcombe Brook Bridge and access to A338 is open.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alignment of the southern link road indicates a departure with regards to cycle provision detail previously agreed in the S106 legal agreement. If this is accepted a deed of variation will be required. <p>Original plans – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further information is required. There are several design issues that require further submissions to the Highway Authority for consideration.
Oxfordshire County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority	No comment.
Oxfordshire County Council – Archaeology	No objection.
Drainage Engineer	<p>April 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Swales have been added to drain sections of carriageway and previous comments are therefore addressed. <p>Original plans – Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an opportunity to increase the amount of ‘over-edge’ drainage from carriageway areas to swales and OCC Highways are likely to request this as part of any S38 assessment. There is space to incorporate this along the road corridors and it should be included where feasible.
Thames Water	No comment.
Environmental Health – Contamination	No observations to make.
Environmental Health – Protection	<p>No objection, subject to condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of noise mitigation for plots 1 to 3
Environmental Health – Air Quality	<p>April 2022 Amendment – Comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome inclusion of EV charging for all properties with onsite parking and the provision of four multi-chargers for vehicles without on plot parking. <p>Original Plans - No comment.</p>

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 28 September 2022

<p>Housing Development Team</p>	<p>June 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <p>April 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleasing to see changes incorporate 3 x 2 bed houses for rent and 8 x 2 bed flats for shared ownership. <p>Original Plans – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised layout required and inclusion of affordable dwellings. • The plans currently indicate affordable units to be all apartments which makes them distinguishable from market housing and they are clustered to one area. • There can be complications in letting out 2 bed flats on 2nd floors for rent – RP evidence these are acceptable will be required.
<p>Conservation Officer</p>	<p>April 2022 Amendment – Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to the satisfaction of the Landscape Officer, no further comments. <p>Original plans – Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed storey heights and layout appear consistent with the parameter plans from outline stage in terms of the relationship to the listed buildings to the east. • I echo the advice of the Landscape Officer regarding landscape detailing and planting plans where these are in part providing mitigation measures in the setting of the listed buildings.
<p>Countryside Officer</p>	<p>July 2022 Amendment – no further comment.</p> <p>June 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The updated Biodiversity Enhancement Plan is acceptable, and the provision of enhancement has been amended in line with earlier comments. <p>April 2022 Amendment – No objection, but</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted integrated bat boxes are omitted from the proposals. • Previous level of faunal habitat delivery needs to be reinstated. <p>Original plans – Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to the submitted Biodiversity Enhancement Plan are required.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to layout are required to reduce encroachment of built development into areas of green infrastructure and public open space as shown on the approved parameter plans. • Great Crested Newt surveys need to be updated.
<p>Landscape Architect</p>	<p>August 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amendments have addressed fencing and planting in association with the level changes adjacent to Cow Lane and the principal roads. <p>July 2022 Amendment – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I still do not feel the visual and safety aspects of the level changes around Cow Lane especially to the east of Cow Lane and the southwest of the roundabout have been addressed. • The link road is above the ground level adjacent to Cow Lane and embankments will be needed to retain the road and bring Cow Lane up to the new road height. Changes to Cow Lane require revised landscape plans, with planting to soften and put back the vegetation structure that will be lost to create the embankments and Cow Lane crossing. • I also expect fencing will be required next to the 1 in 1 slope to the southwest of the roundabout, as well as additional fencing to the bridleway crossing approach area which is adjacent to 1 in 3 slopes. A Condition will be required to cover this, so that if fencing is required by County Highways and Public Rights of Ways, details are approved with the District Council. <p>June 2022 Amendment – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern remains on proposed level changes and the road being above the adjacent Cow Lane and associated embankments that will be required. • Revised landscape plans also required to soften and put back hedgerow structure that will be lost. <p>April 2022 Amendment – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of previous comments have been addressed but a couple of issues remain to be resolved with regards to levels and rooting volume for new trees. <p>Original plans – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information required. • No planting plans have been submitted. • Coordination of lighting and trees needs to be demonstrated.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels do not show grading back to adjacent areas. • Revisions to footpath materials, fencing and planting areas required. • Landscape management plan is required. • Amendments are required to hard and soft landscape works, the play area and LEMP.
Forestry Officer	<p>April 2022 Amendment – No objection, subject to condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree protection details. <p>Original plans – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information required on tree species selection and tree protection measures.
Waste Management Team	<p>June 2022 Amendment – No objection.</p> <p>April 2022 Amendment – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments indicate no changes have been made to bin collection points. <p>Original plans – Holding objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information required on bin collection points and communal bin stores for apartments and revisions to plans to ensure obstruction free access.
Urban Design Officer	<p>July 2022 Amendment – comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the scheme is acceptable in terms of urban design, but there are some areas where frontage parking could be better organised within the street. • Suggest revising frontage parking for plots 39 – 46 as the arrangement proposed has minimal landscaping breaks, contrary to principle 4.25 of the Joint Design Guide.
Thames Valley Police Design Advisor	<p>Original Plans – No objection, subject to condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detail on apartment access controls and visitor entry.

3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 P22/V0321/DIS – Pending – awaiting outcome of this RM application.
Discharge of condition 7 (Construction traffic management plan) under application reference number P16/V0981/O

P22/V0644/DIS – Pending – awaiting outcome of this RM application.
Discharge of condition 6 (construction of site access) on application ref. P16/V0981/O (details for the Denchworth Road access).

P22/V1075/DIS – Pending – awaiting outcome of application P22/V1020/RM.
Discharge of condition 6 (construction of site access) on application number P16/V0981/O (details for the A338 junction, Kingside).

P22/V1080/DIS – Pending – awaiting outcome of application P22/V1031/RM. Discharge of condition 13 (Letcombe Brook Bridge details) on application ref. P16/V0981/O.

[P16/V0981/O](#) - Approved (08/04/2021)

Application for outline planning permission for up to 400 dwellings, extension to the Grove CE primary school, associated landscaping and infrastructure with all matters except access reserved. (As amended & amplified by information received 3 January 2018 & amended by drawings and letter received 13 January 2020).

3.2 **Pre-application History**

[P21/V2240/PEJ](#) - Advice provided (09/12/2021)

Strategy on phasing for future reserved matters applications on the site and key principles and expectations for the first phase of housing.

3.3 **Screening Opinion requests**

None.

4.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 A Reserved Matters application is considered a new application for planning permission under the 2017 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. The outline application was EIA development and was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) and an addendum update statement, and the following areas of potential impact were addressed: landscape and visual impact; transport; historic environment; ecology and nature conservation; water resources and flood risk; noise; air quality; socio-economic impacts; cumulative effects and residual effects and mitigation.

4.2 It is considered this Reserved Matters application falls within the ambit of the approved ES, and a further addendum is not required for this application.

5.0 **MAIN ISSUES**

5.1 The main issues in this case are:

1. The principle of development
2. Access
 - Parking
3. Layout
 - Residential amenity
 - Noise
 - Crime prevention
4. Appearance and Scale
 - Materials
 - Housing types and tenures
 - Affordable housing
5. Landscaping
6. Technical matters
 - Flood risk and drainage
 - Historic environment

- Biodiversity
- Conditions

5.2 The principle of development

The site is allocated for development in the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1 and outline permission for housing, was granted in April 2021. There are no material changes in planning policy and the established principle of the proposal remains acceptable.

5.3 Access

Policy CP33 of LPP1 actively seeks to ensure that the impacts of new development on the strategic and local road network are minimised, to ensure that developments are designed in a way to promote sustainable transport access and to promote and support improvements to the network that increase safety and improve air quality. Policy CP35 of LPP1 promotes public transport, cycling and walking and together with policy DP16 of LPP2 requires evidence to demonstrate that adequate provision is made for loading, unloading, circulation, servicing, and vehicle turning and acceptable off-site improvements to highway infrastructure can be secured where these are not adequate to service the development.

5.4 Access connection points into the site from the public highway (A338 junction, Kingside and secondary access via Denchworth Road / The Maples) were approved under the outline application and therefore, do not fall to be considered under this application. At the time the outline application was considered the proposal was indicated to build out from east to west, with all construction traffic coming off the A338 via Kingside and across the new Letcombe Brook Bridge. The site was subsequently sold to the applicant who now seeks to build out the site differently using both access points.

5.5 Much local concern has been raised over the use of Denchworth Road for access, including objections to the proposed design of the junction where it interacts with the Maples. However, this is not part of the reserved matters, and is not a matter to be considered as part of this application. The design of the junction and spine road was approved at outline stage, with construction detail and Road Safety Audit reserved by condition (with details now submitted under application P22/V0644/DIS). For information, in the light of concerns raised, the design of the junction has been reassessed by the Highway Authority who confirm it remains acceptable and is not detrimental to highway safety.

5.6 The Highway Authority has highlighted concern on the applicant's phasing and the associated Denchworth Road access being used ahead of the bridge completion but is mindful that to get access to the development site to build the bridge, access from Denchworth Road is required. Further work has therefore been undertaken to assess the impact of both construction traffic and residential occupation of dwellings in this phase on the local network ahead of the Letcombe Bridge being open.

- 5.7 The Highway Authority and applicant have agreed construction access via Newlands Drive will be for deliveries only, with no excavated material exported off site until such time that the Letcombe Bridge is constructed. This is to be controlled through the construction traffic management plan (details submitted under application P22/V0321/DIS). The plan will also restrict all deliveries to occur between 0930 through to 1600, together with temporary parking restrictions in the vicinity of the junction during construction.
- 5.8 In addition to these construction traffic restrictions, the Highway Authority seeks a condition restricting occupations of dwellings to no more than 55 dwellings. This is to ensure traffic movements on the local network do not become severe, given active travel measures to walk / cycle to schools and local facilities will not be fully available until the completion of the bridge and the associated link road. The applicant has queried the necessity of the condition, but officers consider such a restriction is required and meets the relevant tests for conditions to allow approval of Reserved Matters for this phase ahead of the bridge completion.
- 5.9 In terms of site access within this phase, there are three accesses from the approved internal spine road with a connecting road layout of primary and secondary streets. The Highway Authority has assessed the layout and raise no objection in respect of highway safety and vehicle ingress / egress or vehicle circulation within the site.
- 5.10 *Parking*
There is a mix of on street parking, on plot parking and garaging. The Highway Authority raise no objection to the proposed parking provision.
- 5.11 Overall, the proposal is acceptable in terms of access, parking and highway safety and accords with policy DP16.
- 5.12 **Layout**
Policy CP37 of LPP1 states that new development must demonstrate high quality design that responds positively to the site and its surroundings, creating a distinctive sense of place through high quality townscape and landscaping that physically and visually integrates with its surroundings. It sets out further design criterion for streets and movement, green infrastructure, social inclusion and safe communities, climate change resilience and that development must be visually attractive, with scale, height, massing, and materials appropriate to the site and surrounding area. Policy CP38 of LPP1 sets out more detailed design criterion required for strategic and major development sites. The council also has a newly adopted design guide which aims to raise the standard of design across the district.
- 5.13 The layout is acceptable. It respects the setting of the listed Monks Farm and accords with approved parameter plans on land use and internal access, and green infrastructure. The layout is based around a clearly defined network of informal streets and private drives and dwellings have been designed / positioned to front public space with private amenity space to the rear, to provide a coherent environment for all users and a sense of enclosure. There

is a mix of on street parking, on plot parking and garaging and bin and cycle storage can be accommodated within the plot for each dwelling.

- 5.14 The Urban Design Officer has assessed the proposal and considers overall it is acceptable, but there are some small areas where frontage parking could be better organised. This is in relation to plots 39 - 46. Principle 4.25 of the Joint Design Guide seeks sufficient landscape breaks equivalent to a parking space width every four spaces. The frontage parking in this location does provide landscaping breaks, but to ensure bin and pedestrian access to the highway, the breaks are not to the recommended width. Officers consider this is an acceptable compromise when considering the design of the overall scheme. The proposal is compliant with local plan policy CP37.
- 5.15 *Residential Amenity*
The layout provides an appropriate design response to existing dwellings and within the parcel, to accord with policy DP23 of LPP2 and the Joint Design Guide on residential amenity. Private amenity space is provided for all units, including apartments and is acceptable.
- 5.16 *Noise*
Policies DP24 and DP25 of LPP2 seeks to ensure development is designed to ensure it is not subject to adverse noise. Noise generated from road traffic on the Denchworth Road is apparent on site. The applicant has provided a noise impact assessment which indicates plots 1 to 3 could be affected and mitigation will be required. This has been assessed by the environmental protection team who raise no objection, subject to implementation of the report recommendations to incorporate acoustic trickle vents to these properties. This can be secured by condition 20 on the outline permission.
- 5.17 *Crime prevention*
The Thames Valley Police Design Adviser has raised no objection but suggests a condition on apartment security access details. These details are covered by building regulations, so a planning condition is not necessary.
- 5.18 **Appearance and Scale**
The proposed development is acceptable in terms of its appearance and scale. There is a mix of dwelling typologies reflecting traditional housing in the locality. Dwellings and apartment buildings accord with the approved height parameter plan with net density at 36 dwellings per hectare. The design of all the external elements of the proposal is considered to make a positive contribution to its appearance, with traditional design, form, and scale, together with the landscape treatment and the relationship of buildings within their environment.
- 5.19 *Materials*
The proposed materials of brick and weatherboarding with tiled roofs are acceptable.
- 5.20 *Housing types and tenures*
The wider development will deliver a SHMA compliant mix as required by condition 18 on the outline permission, but to enable flexibility in delivery of the

site the exact mix will vary between phases. The mix in this phase is acceptable.

5.21 *Affordable housing*

Affordable housing provision was secured through a S106 agreement at the outline stage. Initial concern was raised by the housing development team on the affordable mix within this parcel being all apartments. Through amendment the affordable housing has been changed to provide a mix of apartments and dwellings which is acceptable and supported by officers.

5.22 **Landscaping**

A detailed landscaping scheme is submitted with the application. The landscaping has been amended several times to ensure the content of the scheme is acceptable. The Landscape Architect has no objection to the latest proposal, with changes made to both hard and soft landscaping to address their initial comments. The Forestry Officer has requested a tree protection condition. This is included on the outline permission (condition 17). The proposal therefore accords with policy CP44.

5.23 **Technical Matters**

Flood Risk and drainage

Core Policy 42 of the LPP1 seeks to ensure that development provides appropriate measures for the management of surface water as an essential element of reducing future flood risk to both the site and its surroundings

5.24 A sustainable drainage scheme has been submitted which is acceptable. The Drainage Engineer raised an initial holding objection as there was an opportunity to increase the amount of over edge drainage carriageways to swales. The applicant has since addressed these with amended plans and the Drainage Engineer confirms no objection.

5.25 *Historic Environment*

Officers consider that the proposal would have no adverse impact on the settings of nearby listed buildings. The conservation officer has assessed the application and raises no objection. The proposal therefore accords with policies CP36, CP37 and CP38. In addition, there are no archaeological constraints on this part of the site and the proposal accords with saved policy DP39.

5.26 *Biodiversity*

Policy CP46 of the LPP1 requires development to avoid adverse impacts on valuable ecological receptors (priority habitats, protected species, designated sites, etc.) and secure net gains for biodiversity. Where impacts are predicted, proposals must meet the tests (related to need, benefit, and reasonable alternatives) outlined under policy CP46 to be acceptable. Net losses to biodiversity will not be supported

- 5.27 The countryside officer raised initial concern and sought amendment to the biodiversity enhancement plan. This has since been submitted and is acceptable to officers. The proposal therefore would accord with local plan policy CP46.
- 5.28 *Conditions*
The application seeks to partially discharge numerous conditions on the outline permission that are directly related to this phase of development. The details submitted pursuant to conditions 1 (RM drawings), 16 (Biodiversity Enhancement Plan), 19 (levels) and 20 (noise mitigation) are acceptable.
- 6.0 **CONCLUSION**
- 6.1 This application has been assessed against the development plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and all other material planning considerations. In considering the application, due regard has been given to the representations received from statutory and other consultees. These have been considered in assessing the overall scheme.
- 6.2 The site is allocated in the adopted local plan and there is an extant outline planning permission on the site for up to 400 dwellings and access to the A338 and Denchworth Road. Access to these roads is not a reserved matter subject to this application and is therefore, not for consideration as part of this application.
- 6.3 Reserved Matters details submitted in this application are acceptable. Subject to the recommended conditions, the application should be approved.

The following planning policies have been taken in to account:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1 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 - Science Vale Housing Supply ring fence
- CP7 - Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services
- CP15 - Spatial Strategy for the South-East Vale Sub-Area
- CP18 - Safeguarding of land for transport schemes within the South-East Vale Sub Area
- CP19 - Re-opening of Grove Railway Station
- CP22 - Housing Mix
- CP23 - Housing Density
- CP24 - Affordable Housing
- CP33 - Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
- CP35 - Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking
- CP37 - Design and Local Distinctiveness
- CP38 - Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites
- CP39 - The Historic Environment
- CP40 - Sustainable Design and Construction

- CP42 - Flood Risk
- CP43 - Natural Resources
- CP44 - Landscape
- CP45 - Green Infrastructure
- CP46 - Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity
- CP47 - Delivery and Contingency

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 2 policies:

- CP4a - Meeting our Housing Needs
- CP15a - Housing Supply for the South-East Vale Sub-Area
- CP15c - Grove comprehensive development framework
- CP18a - Safeguarding of land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area
- CP47a - Delivery and Contingency
- DP1 - Self and Custom Build
- 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
- DP29 - Settlement Character and Gaps
- DP30 - Watercourses
- DP33 - Open Space
- DP34 - Leisure and Sports Facilities
- DP36 - Heritage Assets
- DP37 - Conservation Areas
- DP38 - Listed Buildings
- DP39 - Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments

Neighbourhood Plan

There is no neighbourhood plan for Grove.

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Vale of White Horse Design Guide SPD

Vale of White Horse Developer Contributions SPD

National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance

Other Relevant Legislation

Human Rights Act 1998

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

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 28 September 2022

Equality Act 2010

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

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010

Author: Stuart Walker

Contact No: 01235 422600

Email: planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk