

APPLICATION NO.	P22/V0604/RM
SITE	Phase 1a Valley Park Land to the West of Great Western Park
PARISH	WESTERN VALLEY
PROPOSAL	Reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following consent granted under reference P14/V2873/O relating solely to Phase 1a of the overall allocation regarding infrastructure elements to enable works for Phase 1 and 2. An EIA was submitted as part of the approved outline permission.
WARD MEMBER(S)	Debra Dewhurst Hayleigh Gascoigne
APPLICANT	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire and Persimmon Homes
OFFICER	Adrian Butler

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that approval is granted subject to the following conditions summarised below:

1. **Approved plans.**
2. **Provision of tree and Moor Ditch protective fencing.**
3. **Protective fencing around tree T229.**
4. **Update the submitted Ecological Construction Management Plan and Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to add the construction clerk/management contact details.**
5. **Delivery of open spaces and connections to adjacent development parcels.**
6. **The development shall be carried out in accordance with the improvement works to Cow Brook and Meadow Brook specified in the Technical Note 52 Rv1 dated 14 September 2023 and the works implemented prior to any occupation and retained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.**
7. **Boundary treatment to the foul water pumping station to be approved.**
8. **Vision splays to be provided in accordance with the approved plan and thereafter maintained with no structure or vegetation except for trees, above 0.9m in height.**

The full wording of the conditions listed above is **attached** at Appendix 1.

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application is presented to committee as at the time of submission, the site was in Harwell Parish and Harwell Parish Council object. Since April 2023 the site is within Western Valley Parish.

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

- 1.2 This application is part of the wider Valley Park site which benefits from outline planning permission for up to 4,254 dwellings granted under application no. P14/V2873/O on 21 February 2022. This reserved matters application relates to infrastructure including a road, foul water pumping station and attenuation basins in the north western part of the Valley Park site and seeks approval for internal access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale associated with these. The site location and layout are shown on the plan **attached** as Appendices 2.
- 1.3 A signalised access to the site from the A4130 was approved as part of the outline permission and this access is being implemented. This access does not form part of this reserved matters application. Land is safeguarded as part of the outline permission for widening the A4130 should the HIF1 roads and bridges scheme be subsequently approved.
- 1.4 This application has been amended on five occasions in response to consultation responses and planning officer comments with revisions to biodiversity including impacts for watercourses, landscaping, tree protection, drainage, flood modelling, play area and equipment and temporary bus turning area.

2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

- 2.1 A summary of responses received is below. A full copy of all the comments made can be seen online at: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

Western Valley Parish Council	No objection.
Harwell Parish Council	<p><u>December 2023 Amendments</u> Object: Concerned that this development remains in the flood plain and as recently observed the 1 in 100-year occurrences seem to be occurring routinely.</p> <p><u>August and April 2023 Amendments:</u> No new comments but unless its previous concerns have been considered and taken on board they still apply.</p> <p><u>Original Comments:</u> Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application is premature – cannot comment until a Strategic Design Code (SDC) for the site is agreed and published. • Disappointed to see substandard cycle lane widths below the desirable minimum value of 2m as specified in the LTN1/20 • More time should be provided for the Parish Council to respond to the reserved matters and condition ‘discharge’ applications.

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

Milton Parish Council	No comments received.
Didcot Town Council	<p><u>December 2023 Amendments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question the removal of trees T170, T171 and T172 as they seem healthy and there is no immediate danger from the trees. • Also concerned about sewage and wonder whether Thames Water could accommodate for the site prior to the opening of the site. <p><u>August 2023 Amendments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest that the silver birch trees be located away from residential areas, as they produce a large quantity of pollen, which could cause allergic reactions. • Noted the non-native flowers in the Northern Hamlet LEAP planting arrangement. • Query if the entirety of the development is located in flood zone 1. • Some concerns regarding access and congestion during the construction, regarding the works on the two roundabouts, and would like to point out that extra care should be taken to allow adequate access to the A34. • Will access to this site include traffic lights? <p><u>April 2023 Amendments:</u> No objection.</p> <p><u>Original Comments:</u> No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council was unable to scrutinise the plans thoroughly due to the quantity of detail and the fact that Didcot Town Council were not a consultee on a current application linked to this one (P22/V0539/RM). The Committee ask that Didcot Town Council are consulted on every application for this development in future.
Residents	<p>One letter of representation has been received and the following concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to comment until the SDC has been agreed. • Phase 1 and 1a applications should not be allowed to proceed as contrary to planning conditions.

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

Ecology officer	<p><u>December 2023 Amendments:</u> Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paragraph 3.4.14 of the Ecological Construction Management Plan (ECMP) still suggests that open cut trenches will be used to cross the retained central stream watercourse. This is confirmed at 3.3.2 of the Watercourse Buffer Zone Scheme. However, at 3.4.19, horizontal directional drilling (HDD) is proposed for the same foul water pipe crossing underneath a ditch. I recommend that HDD is used to cross the retained central stream watercourse for the foul water pipe. <p><u>April 2023 Amendments:</u> Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The submitted Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP) is acceptable.• The submitted ECMP could be supported subject to deleting the open cut trench across the Central Stream watercourse for the installation of the foul drainage pipe. The applicant should use directional drilling underneath the central stream watercourse which would avoid any physical disruption to the watercourse and provide continuity of habitat to the species which use this feature, such as water vole. A detailed method statement is referred to in 3.4.17 and 3.4.18 but is not provided. This should be incorporated into the ECMP.• The watercourse buffer zone submission is generally acceptable but for the open cut trench crossing the Central Stream watercourse; directional drilling should be used.• Any dredging works, for the purposes of ecological enhancement to watercourses, should have the detailed method statement included in the watercourse buffer zone document.• The submitted Landscape Ecological Management Plan is acceptable. <p><u>Original Comments:</u> Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cannot comment until the SDC is agreed.
Drainage Engineer	<p><u>January 2024 Amendments:</u> No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Note that the Environment Agency have reviewed the flood modelling submitted and confirmed their objection withdrawal.

- The revised information submitted has now addressed outstanding concerns. We can therefore remove our objection.

December 2023 Amendments:

Comments:

- Double check assessments and check files are labelled correctly.
- The sections for basins 1A and 1B on Basin Sections Sheet 3, which I assume relate to section lines A-A and B-B on Basins Layout, indicate that the embankments of the basins will be higher than the surrounding ground. The design storm water level is shown as higher than the existing ground level from chainage points 0 – 15m approx., there is potential for seepage through the embankments and discharge on the lower lying land. Please provide construction details of the embankments to ensure they are watertight. If the levels are proposed to tie in with Valley Park and HIF scheme levels, this should be illustrated on the cross sections.
- With regard to the footway between the attenuation basin and adjacent plot details have not been submitted.
- Attenuation basin bank levels are lower than freeboard.
- Whilst the swales have been designed for conveyance, there is potential for seepage through the embankments whilst being utilised for storage during extreme storm events. Please ensure where embankments are higher than the surrounding ground levels, that they are watertight.
- For surface water catchment please ensure total size of each parcel in hectares and impermeable area is marked on each parcel.
- Sensitivity testing indicates a maximum water level of 58.003mAOD. Drawing 10219-HL-RM1-500-024 indicates bank levels of 57.973 and 57.999 for section 2 and 57.968 and 57.892 for section 3 – these are lower than the sensitivity testing.
- Updated drawing for foul water manholes, basin layout and landscaping have not been submitted.

August 2023 Amendments:

Holding objection:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flood modelling has been submitted to the Environment Agency. This will need to be approved as fit for purpose.• Trash screen risk assessments do not appear to have been provided.• Basin cross sections clearly show that the basins are raised above existing ground levels, with the maximum water level of 57.85m AOD, top of bank level of 58.15m AOD and ground levels in surrounding areas potentially 57.20m AOD or lower. Greater detail should therefore be provided on the proposed construction of the embankments to ensure that these will be watertight and constructed of suitable material to avoid water seepage through the embankment.• Detailed proposed levels should be provided on a drawing with topographical survey provided as a base. We note that there is a footway between the attenuation basin and adjacent plot and detailed levels are required along this to ensure that levels tie in with plot requirements and that the route of the footway is planned such that suitable gradients can be achieved as it approaches Cow Lane.• Some swale plans appear to be missing.• The sections alongside Cow Lane need further consideration. As the swale feeds into the attenuation basin, the freeboard level should continue along the sides of the swale. Not all high points are marked on the drawing levels table and details are needed showing the construction of the swale and embankments to ensure that water does not seep through the embankments into the adjacent watercourse.• Safety outfall screens and all screens on swales should be cranked with a top platform, not vertical.• The surface water catchment plan is insufficiently detailed. Please confirm the total size of each parcel in hectares and the impermeable area used for calculation purposes. Maximum allowable flows to each parcel spur based on the calculations should also be confirmed on the drawing for the case that parcel impermeable areas differ from the presumptions used in the future. 8) Calculations should consider latest FEH rainfall input data.• Foul water levels need reviewing.• Please confirm how access will be provided to the basins to enable forebays to be desilted. Detailed
--	--

	<p>levels should also be added within basin areas to ensure that all forebays and permanent water areas are suitably defined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The tree removal and protection plan does not match the phase lines of the engineering drawings. Trees T170 – T174 affected. <p><u>April 2023 Amendments:</u> Holding objection: <i>Surface Water Drainage Strategy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detailed calculations need to be provided confirming appropriate capacity for the drainage constructed for this phase taking into account all catchments as highlighted on the catchment plan provided.• Where feasible, basin side slopes should be varied to provide better integration with open space areas adjacent.• Please provide copies of risk assessments for headwall screens.• Not all plans that are marked as superseded appear to have been provided. For example, sections through swale 1.002 are missing.• Sections should be extended to incorporate Cow Lane Watercourse in full.• As basins are shown above existing ground levels, details of side slope design / lining should be provided to ensure stability / water tightness if full. <p><u>Original Comments:</u> Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flood Risk<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3. It is currently not clear whether further modelling work has been undertaken and agreed with the EA to address this issue. If not, the layout will need to be amended to avoid development in the flood plain.- A 10m buffer zone to retained watercourses is also required in accordance with local policy.• Surface Water Drainage Strategy<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Insufficient design information has been provided to allow a full review of SUDS and drainage for this reserved matter application.- Swales indicated in the FRA alongside main road corridors have been omitted and replaced with a piped network. Over-edge drainage to swales should be reinstated.
--	--

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- There is a swale crossing an existing watercourse leading from the A34 to the Cow Lane corridor adjacent to plot 2.002. As previously stated, this will not be acceptable, and an attenuation basin / widened swale system should be incorporated within the plots to the south of this watercourse to provide suitable attenuation for the plots.- Detailed calculations will need to be submitted assessing the capacity of the strategic drainage infrastructure. Detailed drainage layout drawings and details are also required for the elements within the red line boundary.- It is not always clear on the drawings where the red line boundary is for this application, and this should be clarified.- Check dam detail – how will the sleepers be held in place? A suitable foundation / abutment should be added either side of the swale. Detail also needs to be provided on how the pipe will be fixed to the sleepers and how the sleepers will be treated to ensure longevity. Where are check dams proposed?- Cranked trash screens will be required at headwalls draining water to a culvert / sewer. Screen sizes should be assessed in accordance with the CIRIA Culvert, Screen and Outfall Manual C786F.- Sewer sizes, gradients and node references need to be provided on a drawing linked to hydraulic calculations.- Swale sections do not appear to match the plan. Section 1 – for example on the plan goes through a swale and watercourse, however the section appears to show the swale below what may be the existing watercourse?- Swale 1.2 is deep with steep slopes. Side slopes should be between 1:3 and 1:4 for swales.- Proposed basin cross sections and level proposals are required. These need to detail all low flow channels and wetland features.• Basins should be designed in accordance with the SUDS Manual with silt forebays incorporated.
Forestry officer	<p><u>December 2023 Amendments:</u> Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• T229 (TPO T2) requires protective fencing and shown on the tree protection plan before it is arboriculturally acceptable.

August 2023 Amendments:

No objection

- Tree removal proposed will be mitigated by the proposed planting that should be secured by condition.
- As raised previously there are still trees including protected trees, adjacent to the site which could be affected by development including proposed works in close proximity, and no or inadequate protective fencing is shown around them. Protective fencing needs to be provided.

April 2023 Amendments:

No objection in principle.

- All the trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order are to be retained.
- The submitted Tree Works Schedule sets out the individual trees and groups that are proposed to be felled for this phase of the development. This list appears to be consistent with the Tree Removal Plans, with the exception of T126 which appears to be retained on the plans and G211 which appears to only be partial removal. This discrepancy needs to be clarified.
- The tree removal proposed will be mitigated by the proposed planting that should be secured by condition.
- The tree protection measures (fencing) shown on the Tree Removal and Protection Plans only appear to show trees within the redline boundary of this phase, or directly adjacent to the boundary, being protected. This therefore fails to provide a robust construction exclusion zone between development and some of the trees located outside of the redline boundary. Therefore, the Tree Removal and Protection Plans should be amended to show fencing to protect all adjacent tree RPAs including all trees and hedges adjacent to the site. This could be achieved by either protecting RPAs including having tree protection fencing outside of the redline boundary, or by installing fencing along the red line boundary of the site.

Original Comments:

Holding objection

- Cannot comment until the SDC is agreed.

<p>Landscape Architect</p>	<p><u>December 2023 Amendments:</u> Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The majority of my concerns have been addressed.• Trees located in the highway which will be adopted by Oxfordshire highways and they may comment on the species chosen. I assume that the species choice has been checked against the foundation design of the adjacent houses. <p><u>August 2023 Amendments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The majority of previous comments have been addressed.• Still a high number of birch trees proposed. <p><i>Play Area:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are still issues with the ergonomics of the play space with desire lines still passing through the swing area. It would be better if the swing area sat in a similar position to the play tower.• The addition of the trampoline is welcomed but the R34-ETP-004 version of the trampoline should be used as this allows more social play but also wheelchair usage of the trampoline which the specified R34-ETP-000 does not.• The talking tubes work best if they are not in direct eyesight. Having them either side of the rocks or planting would work better, if one were close to the path this is better for those who are less mobile.• As previously stated, it would be better to have the bike racks associated with the cycle route to the south, rather than associated with a footpath entrance to the play space to the west. I suggest just inside or outside the play area to the east of the gate rather than within the central area of play space as currently indicated on the plan.• The proposed mounding is too high in this location, with the proximity to the adjacent housing (less than 20m) and it does not have a play method of descent. 2m equals approximately a 1 in 1 gradient which is not acceptable. Prefer removal of the mound and leave the grass as informal play space or have a mound much lower.• The previous plans had the play equipment spread over a larger area which created a more comfortable space for play, in the amended version the play equipment is close to one other which opens up the risk of tight building margins associated with fall zones of equipment.
----------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Satisfied with the size of the play space and the area it is located in so these last issues with equipment and its location could be covered by condition. <p><u>April 2023 Amendments:</u> While the majority of the proposals are following the details of the Design Code, there are a number of issues and clarifications needed:</p> <p><i>General Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are a number of services, but I could not see if they require easements. Have the easements of the services been accommodated into the planting proposals, especially the route of the Foul Water Main and pumping station. The area around these features is very tight, and planting is located close to service routes.• The separate Tree and Shrub Palettes do not contain all the species illustrated on the plans. As these sheets lack numbers it is difficult to see the balance between the numbers of each species planted to look at biosecurity issues and to see if any one species is dominating the planting• There are many areas where seating has not been provided in the linear areas such as along the Moor Ditch and Cow Lane corridors. I note seating is predominately proposed as benches these are not accessible to all uses, seats with backs and preferable also arm rests should also be provided.• Planting details. I could not see where the Landscape Specification/ implementation details for the planting was, there is a superseded copy but no updated copy.• For the large areas of woodland planting, the use of fencing would be more appropriate, as this helps with deer damage, which was a problem at Great Western Park.• It would also be appropriate to undertake advanced planting to the north of the site and to the west, as early as possible in the site building phase, so these areas have a chance to establish and grow as the houses are built and occupied to mitigate the loss of the hedgerows on site. These areas of planting should not be in operational areas of the site during the construction phase.• The Landscape Management Plan does not contain a plan which indicates who would be
--	--

	<p>responsible for maintaining each area, such as Highway adoption areas.</p> <p><i>Moor Ditch corridor and Northern Attenuation Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revisit the planting locations of the proposed oak trees, have the planting distances been checked with the house foundation designs / root barrier locations? For example, the oak located towards the south western corner of the site could be located to the west of the footpath to increase the distance from the houses. The same comment applies with regards to distance from houses, root barrier and foundation design for the spine road tree planting.• At the northern edge, look at how planting such as trees and shrubs could be incorporated into the Suds slopes to break up the proposals. I note that the slopes are all proposed at a standard gradient for the whole Suds with no variation to help integrate the Suds into the open space.• Too much birch is proposed in the tree planting. Within the Moors Ditch area 3 <i>Betula utilis jacquemontii</i> 'Doorenbos' are proposed adjacent to 3 <i>Betula utilis jacquemontii</i> 'Doorenbos' which are proposed in the housing planting plans. There needs to be a better balance of long lived large canopy trees planted where there is space for these trees, especially to the north of the attenuation area and within the Moor Ditch Area.• The proposed woodland planting to the north of the attenuation area currently is very linear in form, there is opportunities to soften the edge such as the addition of a native woodland edge mix which would also increase the biodiversity of the planting.• Areas of permanent water are proposed but these are limited in area and are only located adjacent to the outlet pipe of the swale (which I assume will need to be kept clear of vegetation) rather than having water to softening areas throughout the swale which will have less operation constraints. <p><i>Cow Lane</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a need for tree work within the site, such as hedge rejuvenation along Cow Lane, more work is required than the statement Trees/ Hedgerows 'to be retained and protected'. This is not covered in the Tree Works Schedule.• There is also an expectation of seating areas along Cow Lane which are not illustrated.
--	--

- The road crossing of Cow Lane is not illustrated. Linkages from the housing area across to the east is poor as no north/ south footpath linkages have been designed into the eastern side of the housing area.
- There are areas with no tree planting proposed on the eastern side of the housing development, there should be some tree and shrub planting on the western side of the swale to soften its linear form.
- There is no link for the cycle route across Cow Lane to link to the east. At present it is terminating at Cow Lane.

Northern Gateway

- It is difficult to comment on this area as it is currently in isolation and needs to coordinate with the built form to the south to provide an element of usable more formal POS rather than more corridor open space.
- Again, the proposed Substation could have an impact on the design of the street scene in that area.
- The plans are indicating that there are level changes in this area with no space to accommodate street tree planting on the eastern side of the entrance road which are required to break up the mass of the attenuation basins and the bridge. Again, birch is proposed.

Play area

- The current design of the play area is not acceptable, and the proposal does not fully reflect Appendix 27 of the S106 Agreement including:
 - be designed to be interesting, varied, challenging and stimulating providing a range of opportunities,
 - designed with 'themes' to give a sense of place and varied play experience across the site
 - a minimum activity zone of 400 sqm and a minimum buffer zone of 20m
 - minimum of six play experiences per LEAP, suitable for up to age 11 and incorporate provision for disabled children.
 - should offer the opportunity for social play.
- The proposed play space does not currently have enough play value and does not provide enough accessible play features. The plan does not include the product reference numbers and specification details, so I cannot look all of them up to check the age range and the items provided.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The minimum of 400m² area, with an offset by 20m from the house frontage be marked on the plan.• A standard wet pour surface does not add to the play value of the space, more design detail should be provided.• The Hide and Slide tower does not look like it provides other play opportunities such as a climbing wall or fireman's pole, it looks like it only accommodates the youngest children, as does the seesaw.• The wobbling log bridge does not provide much play value, especially in isolation.• There is a desire line between the slide and the seesaw which passes through the swing, this is not ideal in safety terms.• There are many more items of play equipment which provide inclusive play, such as roundabouts, trampolines, play panels, assessable swing seats, social play areas and talking tubes etc.• Recommend that the walnut tree is moved outside the play area and a different feature tree is used in the play space, as walnut fruit and its associated nut are not ideal in play.• It would be better to have the bike racks associated with the cycle route to the south, rather than associated with a footpath entrance to the play space, it would also allow more of the hedgerow to be retained. The western entrance to the play area is not related to any road crossings, so it may be better to just have the southern and eastern entrance.• Without information about the proposed height and function of the mounding it is difficult to comment if these are appropriate features.• The play space sits within a wider park space and there should be formal park features such as seating areas outside the play space such as a circular bench around a feature tree.• More vegetation is proposed to be removed as shown on the Tree Removal and Protection Plan, than is illustrated on the Landscape Plan. <p><i>Recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• That the scheme is amended to take into account my comments above. It would help if the adjacent housing planting proposals were also shown greyed out like the housing built form so it can be
--	--

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

	<p>clearly seen how the planting proposals of both the Strategic Application and housing coordinate.</p> <p><u>Original Comments:</u> Holding objection Cannot comment until the SDC is agreed.</p>
Environment Agency	<p><u>19 February 2024 response:</u> <u>Flood Risk:</u> No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• While the risk of flooding is reduced and there is no risk in relation to the 1% + climate change scenario, we cannot categorically say that the site is outside of flood zone 2 so technically the applicant won't be fully in compliance with the condition as the extents of the 0.1% flood have not been submitted to us. However, the PPG Flood and Coastal Change (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 7-002-20220825) requires development to be assessed against the design flood. The design flood is 1% annual probability flood with an allowance for climate change. With the improvement works being implemented, during the 1% annual probability flood with a 41% allowance for climate change, flows are shown to be contained within the channel across the development site.• In terms of the flood map for planning, it won't be updated in relation to our response to this application. If the applicant wishes to change the flood map they will have to go through a separate process. We have previously communicated this. <p><u>Watercourses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We have reviewed the applicant's response to consultee comments and they have satisfactorily addressed our remaining concerns related to nature conservation and the requirements of condition 26 of application P14/V2873/O for this phase. <p><u>12 February 2024 response:</u> <u>Flood Risk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flood modelling confirms to their satisfaction that flood flows will be contained within the local watercourses when considering high flood risk scenarios now and in the future due to climate change. We are confident that the site is not considered to be at high risk of flooding and their flood risk objection to the application is withdrawn.

Watercourses:

Objection:

- The applicant does not appear to have responded to the previous objection relating to compliance with condition 26 of the outline permission.

Condition:

- *The development shall be carried out in accordance with the improvement works to Cow Brook and Meadow Brook specified in the Technical Note 52 Rv1 dated 14 September 2023 and the works implemented prior to any occupation and retained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.*

Original Comments:

Objection:

- In the absence of any acceptable flood risk assessment (FRA) we object to this application and request that further information is submitted to address our concerns.
- Current flood mapping held by the Environment Agency show that some of the proposed infrastructure works fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3, which is land defined by the planning practice guidance as having a high and medium probability of flooding respectively. The applicant has submitted flood risk modelling intended to demonstrate that land currently shown to be at risk of flooding should be redefined as Flood Zone 1. The applicant's modelling extends the agreed modelling carried out for the HIF proposal, however, there is currently insufficient detail in relation to hydrology and sensitivity testing.
- We object to this application due to its impact on the nature conservation value of the existing watercourses. The plans as currently submitted are not in strict accordance with the requirements of condition 26 of the outline planning permission. The applicant should be asked to submit details of how the plans for this phase are in accordance with all elements of conditions 26. In particular, we seek confirmation from the applicant of whether any lighting is proposed within or adjacent to the watercourse buffer zones and how impact to the riparian corridor will be prevented. This may be of particular relevance to the Moor Ditch and whether it will be a requirement for the cycle path to be lit.

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any formal, hard landscaping should be removed from the plans except for previously agreed foot or cycleways. We also seek confirmation that all landscaping within the buffer zones is native as required by this condition. Finally, currently, only the Moor Ditch is shown as a retained watercourse. The second retained watercourse should also be shown on relevant plans alongside details of how these areas will be designed to meet the requirements of condition 26.
<p>Oxfordshire County Council – highways</p>	<p><u>December 2023 Amendments:</u> Holding objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously visibility splays were acceptable in principle based on 30mph design speeds. On further assessment with the adoption of the Local transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) and OCCs commitment to ‘Vision Zero’, it is required that visibility splays be based on 20mph design speeds. The applicant is therefore requested to amend all vision splays. Trees should be located to the rear of the visibility splay where appropriate. Previously design concerns were raised about street lighting scheme being altered and no longer being acceptable. The applicant highlights that drawing number 10219-HL-RM1-100-1300 rev G is based on the design issued by OCC. The applicant is requested to liaise directly with OCCs traffic team and provide confirmation of the approved streetlighting scheme which considers tree locations. However, I am satisfied that this can be achieved by way of a suitably worded pre-commencement planning condition. Only two drawings were provided to the Road Safety Audit (RSA). The resolution of the RSA recommendations must be resolved and approved by OCC in advance of planning permission being granted as the findings may result in the red line boundary having to change due to road safety remedial measures being required. The proposed cycling facilities on the carriageway accord with the site Strategic Design Code. However, the RSA has identified that the proposed cycle lane widths do not accord with LTN 1/20. On this basis, the design of the proposed spine road needs to be adjusted to incorporate 1.7m wide cycle lane(s). To achieve this, it is requested that the carriageways is

	<p>amended so that where it measures 6.5m wide an extra 200mm is provided to the cycle lanes.</p> <p><u>August 2023 Amendments:</u> Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The comments do not include those of the HIF1 team with whom the applicant should liaise directly.• The street type and hierarchy are now shown.• Vision splays are acceptable in principle although proposed trees will obstruct them which is unacceptable on safety grounds. The Road Safety Audit needs to assess vision splays.• Relocation of proposed bus stops addresses previous concerns.• Street lighting designs are not acceptable having been changed to 10m columns from the 8m tall columns agreed by the County Council.• Trees should not be located within a minimum 10 metres of a street lighting column and a minimum of 1.5m from the carriageway or if within 1.5m of the highway, confirmation is required from the applicant that the proposed tree's canopy will not overhang adoptable extent and that a suitable root barrier can be installed. Trees that are within 5m of the carriageway or footway will require root protection. Where tree canopies extend over the footways and carriageway, please ensure the minimum crown height of 2.4 metres.• The temporary bus turning area needs to be reviewed further as the swept path provided demonstrates a bus cannot fully use this facility i.e. the temporary bus stop turning circle facility is too close to the extent of the boundary.• The footways, cycle routes and street types proposed appear to accord with the approved Strategic Design Code and are acceptable.• Proposals appear to be DDA compliant. <p><u>April 2023 Amendments:</u> Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• These comments are incomplete and do not include the county council's HIF1 project team's assessment of the proposal. It is recommended that the applicant liaises directly with this team.• The drawings should include dimensions for the streets.
--	---

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visibility splays are acceptable in principle but they show some trees in the visibility splays which are not acceptable. • Trees should not be located within a minimum 10 metres of a street lightening column and a minimum of 1.5m from the carriageway. Trees that are within 5m of the carriageway or footway will require root protection. Where tree canopies extend over the footways and carriageway, please ensure the minimum crown height of 2.4 metres is specified. • The bus stop on the eastern side of the road will restrict forward visibility, meaning vehicles heading south may be tempted to overtake on the outside of a bend with inadequate visibility. It is recommended that this bus stop is relocated. • Swept path analysis show large vehicles manoeuvres along the main street and proposed junctions are mostly achievable but geometry dimensions for each junction should be labelled on the plans. A 5m long car also needs to be used. • The temporary bus turning area needs to be enlarged otherwise a bus could not use it without turning outside the area. • The footways, cycle routes and street types proposed appear to accord with the approved SDC. • A long section(s) of the streets is needed to demonstrate compliance with the Equalities Act 2010 with a maximum 1:21 or 5% gradient. • An updated Stage 1 Road Safety Audit is requested with this providing an updated designer response confirming the recommendations of the RSA stage 1 have been actioned accordingly for this reserved matters application. <p><u>Original Comments:</u> Holding objection Cannot comment until the SDC is agreed.</p>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council – Lead Local Food Authority (LLFA)</p>	<p><u>August and April 2023 Amendments:</u> No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans have been updated and the scheme now meets LLFA standards. <p><u>Original Comments:</u> Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The drawings are not clear and confusing • The keys on the drawings are incomplete

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Red line does not match drawings.
Oxfordshire County Council – Archaeology	No objection
Thames Water	<p><u>August 2023 Amendments:</u> No comments to make.</p> <p><u>April 2023 Amendments and Original Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the information provided, the information provided relates to internal drainage and not Thames Water connection. Therefore, no comments are offered.
106 Infrastructure and Development	<p><u>April 2023 Amendments:</u> No comments received.</p> <p><u>Original Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEAP layout plan does not correspond with specification set out in S106 (Appendix 27).
Waste management team	<p><u>April 2023 Amendments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for changing the size of the waste collection vehicle to reflect our fleet. <p><u>Original Comments:</u> Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The large refuse vehicle shown on the tracking plan is significantly smaller than our fleet. Will need to be re-planned with correct vehicle details.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 [P23/V2835/NM](#) - Approved (11/01/2024)

Non-material amendment to application P14/V2873/O to varying Planning Condition 10 (Framework Plans), attached to the outline consent.

[P23/V0667/RM](#) - Approved (28/09/2023)

Reserved Matters submission relating to phase 1P pursuant to outline planning permission P14/V2873/O, comprising 172 dwellings with associated infrastructure and landscaping.

[P22/V2798/DIS](#) - Approved (01/09/2023)

Discharge of condition 10 (Framework Plan) under application reference number P14/V2873/O

[P22/V2744/RM](#) – Under consideration

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

Reserved Matters application relating to Phase 1T of Outline Planning Permission P14/V2873/O for scale, layout, landscape and appearance comprising 246 new homes with associated infrastructure with 35% affordable housing.

[P22/V2338/DIS](#) - Approved (24/02/2023)

Discharge of condition 6 (housing delivery document) on application P14/V2873/O.

[P22/V2407/DIS](#) - Approved (24/02/2023)

Discharge of condition 11(Phasing Plan) on application P14/V2873/O

[P22/V2066/DIS](#) – Approved 22/11/2022

Discharge of condition 9 (Strategic Design Code) on application P14/V2873/O. (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).

[P14/V2873/O](#) - Approved (21/02/2022)

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.

4.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 The outline application was subject to an Environmental Statement that addressed ecology, landscape and visual, historic environment, flood risk, traffic and transport, transport, air quality and climate, noise and vibration, agriculture, and community and socio economics. The environmental information already provided is considered adequate to assess the significance of effects of the development on the environment. This information has been taken into consideration in considering this application.

5.0 **MAIN ISSUES**

5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. There is no neighbourhood plan for the Western Valley Parish or covering this site, so the development plan for this case comprises of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (the LPP1) and the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (the LPP2).

5.2 The relevant planning considerations are the following:

- Principle of development
 - The Valley Park Strategic Design Code and Framework Plan
- The Reserved Matters:
- Internal access

- Appearance
- Landscaping
- Layout
- Scale
- Flood risk and drainage
- Biodiversity

Principle of development

- 5.3 The site is allocated for housing by the LPP1 and benefits from an extant outline planning permission for housing granted under application no. P14/V2873/O. The principle of development is therefore established. The outline permission also approved access to the site including a signalised junction with the A4130 and this is not for consideration as part of this Reserved Matters application.

The Valley Park Strategic Design Code and Framework Plan

- 5.4 Policy CP37 of the LPP1 seeks to ensure that all new development is of high-quality design that, amongst other aspects, should respond positively to the site and surroundings and be physically and visually integrated with its surroundings. Policy CP44 of the LPP1 seeks to ensure that key features, such as trees and hedgerows, which contribute to the nature and quality of the landscape will be protected from harmful development and where possible enhanced.
- 5.5 The site is subject to an approved Strategic Design Code (SDC) and Framework Plan which the development needs to comply with and which were permitted under applications P22/V2066/DIS and P22/V2798/DIS. These accord with design policies including Policies CP37, CP38 and CP44 of the LPP1, the Joint Design Guide, the Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan and NPPF design guidance.
- 5.6 The SDC, outline permission plans and Framework Plan show a play area (Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP), attenuation basins, public open spaces within this reserved matters application site parcel and these are included within the application.

The Reserved Matters

Internal Access

- 5.7 The proposed main road design complies with the S106 agreement associated with the outline permission, the approved SDC and the main road and its western verge and footway were approved as part of application P23/V0667/RM all of which were agreed in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) as highway authority. The 18.3m width of this highway is required by the S106 agreement to comprise:
- A 6.3m wide carriageway
 - 1.5m wide 'on road' cycle lanes north and south bound (the cycle lanes are additional to the 6.3m carriageway width)
 - 2.5m wide verges/parking on both sides
 - 2m wide footways on both sides

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

- 5.8 Notwithstanding, OCC Highways has raised a holding objection as they seek that both cycle lanes be widened to 1.7m. They argue that the cycle lanes need to be widened to accord with LTN 1/20. However, LTN 1/20 was in place at the time the S106 was signed by OCC and the outline planning permission issued and OCC had no objection to 1.5m cycle lanes at that time. In response, the applicant also makes reference to the S106 agreement, the approved SDC, and points out an incorrect 6.5m road measurement given by OCC in its response whereas the road proposed as required by the S106 agreement is 6.3m wide, that the Road Safety Audit (RSA) did not raise any safety issues, that the western signalised access through the S278 agreement process has been approved by OCC with 1.5m cycle lanes, that the road was permitted under a more recent application (P23/V0667/RM), with 1.5m cycle lanes and that as a reserved matters application, the detailed matters for consideration relate to landscaping, scale, appearance and layout. Planning officers have considered this matter and conclude that because the road measurements accord with the S106, the SDC and application P23/V0667/RM all of which were supported by OCC, the carriageway widths are acceptable, and there is no reasonable ground to withhold reserved matters approval on this basis.
- 5.9 The road is to have a 20mph speed limit and the proposed vision splays at junctions and forward visibility proposed have at the request of OCC, been revised to reflect the speed limit, show proposed trees are outside vision splays and are therefore, acceptable. Street lighting can be agreed by OCC under section 38 of the Highways Act and there is no need for a planning condition. Bus stop locations on either side of the carriageway have been agreed with OCC, include extra pedestrian crossing points and visibility for pedestrians crossing cycle paths which address the two issues raised in the RSA which in turn assessed highway geometry and visibility plans. The temporary bus turning circle in its revised form is also acceptable.
- 5.10 Footway and cycle ways are shown within the site in accordance with details agreed as part of the outline permission. These include retaining the existing public footpath in the western open space, cycle/footway links in the south connecting to housing parcels, sports pitches and open space planned to the south, links to Cow Lane, and cycle and footways in the northern open space connecting to those beside the A4130 and to Cow Lane and including informal footpaths around the attenuation basins.
- 5.11 The proposed road accords with the S106 agreement and the approved SDC and the proposals comply with policies CP33 and CP35 which encourage sustainable travel and DP16 of the Local Plan.

Appearance

- 5.12 The road, visitor parking and associated cycle lane will have asphalt surfaces. Combined cycle/footways will also be asphalt providing the S106 required all weather surface. However, the public footpath in the western open space will be a rolled hoggin surface with timber edging to minimise its impact for Moor Ditch.

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

- 5.13 The attenuation basins are designed to accommodate flows from the Valley Park housing development and the HIF1 roads and bridges scheme should it be permitted. The basins are an irregular shape and have variations in depth up to 2m deep, with grassed sides and floors to provide a naturalistic appearance and allowing some water to pool in the interests of biodiversity and alert members of the public to their purpose. The foul pumping station is underground with access hatches at ground level, with access to it via a grasscrete surface and a hedge planted on the southern side.
- 5.14 The LEAP and Local Area of Play (LAP) accord with the council's Developer Contributions SPD being 20m and 5m from proposed dwellings and are in accordance with the S106 specifications. Play equipment is designed to be inclusive, for individual and social play and include a play tower with slide, pod swing, trampoline, seesaw, roundabout and hearing pipes. There is also low mounding, timber logs, seating and a rail fence on three sides to roads and cycleways. The play area includes seating, asphalt paths and cycle parking. They will be overlooked by planned housing.
- 5.15 Appearance complies with the approved SDC and is compliant with policies CP37 and CP44 of the Local Plan.

Landscaping

- 5.16 Native trees and hedges are proposed in accordance with species detailed in the SDC and relevant to the open space typologies defined in the SDC e.g. wetland habitat for the attenuation basins to the north and Moor Ditch in the west. Trees subject to a TPO are retained and this has resulted in part of the road being moved further to the east and consequently three unprotected ash trees marked T170, T171 and T172, are to be removed to accommodate the road, cycle lanes, a bus stop and footway. Protective fencing around tree T229 which is subject to a TPO can be required by condition. Around 220 linear metres of hedgerow will be lost with some of this lost to allow access points to Cow Lane. 930m of hedgerows are retained and 660m are proposed to be planted. Overall, a net gain in tree and hedgerow planting is proposed and the proposals are considered compliant with the SDC and policies CP37 and CP44 of the Local Plan. Condition 15 of the outline permission requires timing for delivery of hard and soft landscaping to be agreed prior to development commencing.

Layout

- 5.17 The approved SDC, Framework Plan and plans associated with the outline permission indicate the locations of the road and open spaces and the proposals accord with the details. A condition is required to ensure the open spaces shown are delivered and made safe for public use whilst built development takes place. As mentioned above, the southern end of the road has been adjusted to the east to retain protected trees. A temporary bus turning area is included to allow buses to enter and leave the site until the proposed road connects to other roads planned in the wider development.
- 5.18 As required by condition 26 of the outline permission proposed open space creates a corridor beside this watercourse and the open space is over 8m wide

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

and 20m wide along most of its route and up to 30m wide in parts. This is required to protect water vole colonies. More recent water vole surveys have not found evidence of water vole using Moor Ditch but the spaces made available will ensure satisfactory off-sets in case water vole do return to Moor Ditch.

- 5.19 Layout is acceptable and accords with the SDC, Framework Plan and policies CP37, CP46 and DP30 of the Local Plan.

Scale

- 5.20 Scale is the height, width and length of each building proposed in relation to its surroundings. In this case no new buildings are proposed. As explained above the road, cycle and footways accord with the S106 and SDC in terms of widths.

Flood risk and drainage

- 5.21 Condition 36 of the outline permission was added at the request of the Environment Agency and it states, "*With the exception of the access works and associated infrastructure, no built development approved by this permission shall be located within Flood Zones 2 or 3*". Following the applicant's submission of flood modelling, the Environment Agency advise flood flows will be contained within local watercourses when considering high flood risk scenarios now and in the future due to climate change. The Environment Agency is confident that subject to a planning condition, the site is not considered at high risk of flooding and they have withdrawn their previous flood risk objection.
- 5.22 The flood modelling recommends realigning Cow Brook to flow into a ditch on the western side of Cow Lane, a 200mm raise in the north bank for approximately 75m, and for Meadow Brook, enlarging a culvert from 600mm to 1.25m x 0.75m height matching channel dimensions, removing a footbridge (not part of a public right of way) and raising the bank 200mm in this location. It is these works that the Environment Agency recommends are secured by condition as they will prevent overtopping of the watercourses and on site flooding will not then occur.
- 5.23 Flood mapping has not been updated to date following the flood modelling mentioned above and there are parts of this site within flood zones 2 and 3. The Environment Agency has explained that the PPG Flood and Coastal Change (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 7-002-20220825), requires development to be assessed against the design flood. The design flood is one percent annual probability flood with an allowance for climate change. With the improvement works being implemented, during the one percent annual probability flood with a 41 percent allowance for climate change, flows are shown to be contained within the channel across the development site. Subject to the condition recommended by the Environment Agency, there are no flood risks to the proposals and future users of them. Although there is conflict with condition 36, there is no evidence, given the Environment Agency's comments and subject to the recommended condition, for withholding reserved matters approval for non-compliance with condition 36.

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

- 5.24 A surface water drainage scheme is to be approved under condition 24 of the outline permission and does not need to be approved as part of this application. This development will not result in foul water flows. Thames Water has no objection in respect of foul water drainage. The proposals are considered policy CP42 compliant.

Biodiversity

- 5.25 As required by conditions 18, 19, 26 and 27 of the outline planning permission, this application is supported by a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP – condition 18), a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP – condition 19), a retained watercourse buffer zone scheme (condition 26) and Ecological Construction Management Plan (ECMP – condition 27). Furthermore, as recommended by the council's ecologist, the retained watercourse buffer zone scheme and ECMP have been revised to delete reference to open cut trenches for crossing the watercourse and to include the recommended drilling to install a foul water drainage pipe beneath the Central Stream watercourse and they are now acceptable. The BEP and LEMP are considered acceptable and this is confirmed by the ecologist.
- 5.26 The proposals are considered compliant with condition 18, 19, 26 and 27 of the outline permission and to accord with policies CP46 and DP30 of the Local Plan. The LEMP and ECMP do need updating to include site management contact details and these can be secured by condition.

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 This application has been determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposals result in no adverse harm. The proposal is considered development plan compliant as a whole and compliant with the S106 agreement and approved Strategic Design Code for the Valley Park site and relevant conditions attached to the outline permission. Therefore, it is recommended that the reserved matters are approved

The following planning policies have been considered:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1:

- 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 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
- 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

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

- CP40 - Sustainable Design and Construction
- CP42 - Flood Risk
- CP43 - Natural Resources
- CP44 - Landscape
- CP45 - Green Infrastructure
- CP46 - Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity

A Regulation 10A review (five-year review) for Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) has been completed. The review shows that five years on, LPP1 (together with LPP2) continues to provide a suitable framework for development in the Vale of White Horse that is in overall conformity with government policy.

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2:

- CP4A - Meeting our Housing Needs
- CP15A - Additional Site Allocations for the South-East Vale Sub-Area
- CP16B - Didcot Garden Town
- CP18A - Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area
- 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
- DP30 - Watercourses
- DP33 - Open Space

Joint Local Plan Preferred Options

The Council is preparing a Joint Local Plan covering Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire, which when adopted will replace the existing local plans. Currently at the Regulation 18 stage, the Joint Local Plan Preferred Options January 2024 has limited weight when making planning decisions. The starting point for decision taking will remain the policies in the current adopted plans.”

Neighbourhood Plan

There is no neighbourhood plan covering the site.

Adopted Guidance

- The Joint Design Guide 2022
- 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
- Community & Infrastructure Levy Legislation
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990
- Human Rights Act 1998

Vale of White Horse District Council - Committee Report – 6 March 2024

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010
Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Case Officer – Adrian Butler

Email – adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk

Tel – (01235) 422600