

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P22/V2744/RM</a>
<b>SITE</b>	Phase 1 Valley Park Didcot
<b>PARISH</b>	WESTERN VALLEY
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	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. (As amplified by additional information 9 January 2023 and amended by plans dated 3 July 2023, 26 September 2023 15 November 2023, 7 December 2023, 5 February, 14 February, 1 March and 26 March 2024).
	(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)
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Debra Dewhurst Hayleigh Gascoigne
<b>APPLICANT OFFICER</b>	Taylor Wimpey Adrian Butler

---

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

**1. Approved plans**

**Pre Occupation or Other Stage Conditions**

- 2. Boundary treatments provision**
- 3. 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**
- 4. Materials to be agreed**
- 5. Noise mitigation - Passive ventilation systems and glazing providing 31dB and 25dB attenuation for those residential properties fronting the A4130 and northern plots along the main road respectively. 1.8m high walls on the western boundaries of plots 97, 98, 102, 120, 136, and 144, 1.8m high walls on the eastern boundaries of plots 115, 131, 137 and 145, 1.8m high walls between plots 99 to 102, 115 to 120, 131 to 144, 2.4m wall on western**

- boundary of plot 145, and a 2.5m high wall on the northern boundary of plot 98.
6. Noise mitigation implementation verification report
  7. Cycle parking for each dwelling to be provided prior to occupation of each plot
  8. Electric vehicle charging points in accordance with approved plan

**Post Occupancy Monitoring and Management Conditions**

9. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the improvement works to the Cow Brook and Meadow Brook as specified in the Technical note 52 Rv1 dated 14 September 2023 and prepared by Brookbanks. These works shall be implemented as approved prior to any occupation and retained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.
10. Permitted development rights removal – extensions, dormer windows, outbuildings
11. Retention of garages for parking

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

**Informatives**

1. No construction shall take place within 5m of the water main. Information detailing how the developer intends to divert the asset / align the development, so as to prevent the potential for damage to subsurface potable water infrastructure, must be submitted to and approved by Thames Water.
2. Interference with a water main may be an offence under s174 of the Water Industry Act 1991. Any work that may require diversion of a water main, works within 5m of a strategic water main or piling within 15m of a water main could need the approval of Thames Water.
3. Bird nesting
4. Broadband provision
5. Need for a S278 agreement under the Highways Act
6. It is an offence under S151 of the Highways Act for vehicles to carry mud onto roads
7. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx. 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes.

**1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL**

1.1 The application is presented to committee as the Parish Council objects.

1.2 This application is located on 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. It relates to a parcel of housing in the northern part of the Valley Park site and is shown on the plan **attached** as Appendix 2 and the scheme layout plan **attached** as Appendix 3.

## Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

- 1.3 Valley Park is not reliant on the HIF1 scheme going ahead. On and off site services and infrastructure provision including timing for their delivery which will include healthcare provision, schools, cycling and footpath links, public open spaces and play areas, community facilities and local centres are secured through the S106 agreement associated with the outline planning permission. Their provision does not fall to be considered as part of this application for reserved matters approval and this application is not an opportunity to amend requirements for their provision.
- 1.4 The application seeks approval of reserved matters with these being internal access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. The application has been revised following the applicant's review of planning officer and consultee responses with main changes being to the layout of development including the provision of mews streets in the west, deleting access from the main street to courtyard parking for flats, redesigning the south western corner of the site deleting private road access on the front in favour of a mews street to the rear and relocating flats away from the southern boundary with them being replaced by houses, increase in terraced units on the main road frontage in place of detached and semi-detached dwellings, providing focal points, increased rhythm to secondary frontages, addressing highway safety matters, revised garden sizes and revised landscaping.

### 2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

- 2.1 A summary of the responses received to the current proposal is below. A full copy of all the comments made can be seen online at [www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

Western Valley Parish Council	<p><u>November 2023 Amendments</u></p> <p>Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There are still approximately 50% of properties not compliant with the design guidance on private dwelling areas.</li><li>• The developer has still not committed to a two tree net gain across the development, and we ask how the January 2024 10% biodiversity net gain requirement for major developments will met.</li><li>• It is disappointing that these homes will not meet the Future Homes Standards, however, are pleased to hear Phase 2 will meet the standard.</li><li>• We acknowledge that the combined footpath/cycle way meets the design code, however we encourage you to exceed these minimum requirements and request that cycle lanes are constructed to the highest standard of 3m to enable pedestrians and cyclists to live together harmoniously.</li><li>• In anticipation that the HIF1 project receives planning approval and the project progresses,</li></ul>
-------------------------------	--

we ask that additional elements be added to the closest homes or the boundary of the site to mitigate against excess noise, from not only the at capacity current road, but also the anticipated additional noise resulting from the HIF1 implementation.

*Planning officer response:*

- *All garden sizes now meet amenity space standards.*
- *This council does not have a two tree net gain policy. Four U category trees will be lost and a category C1 tree group lost and the Forestry officer advises they should not be considered a constraint to the proposed development. New tree planting is proposed and considered adequate for mitigating tree loss.*
- *This is an application for reserved matters approval and the outline planning permission which predates January 2024 10% biodiversity net gains, was held compliant with core policy 46 of the LPP1 and it secures biodiversity enhancements on site as well as a £200,000 financial contribution towards biodiversity improvements.*
- *Future Homes Standards are potential changes to Building Regulations and are not planning policy or guidance.*
- *Off-road cycle/footways are to be 3m wide in accordance with the outline permission.*
- *Noise mitigation can be secured by condition.*

July 2023 and October 2023 Amendments

Object:

- The Parish Council thank the developer for updating the drawings from the original application to include solar panels on all homes, rearranging plots to improve access to homes and ensure minimum 10m length of private amenity area before then next building.

The objection relates to:

- The drawing for the private amenity areas indicates that there are a number of properties not compliant with the VoWH design guidance on total area, however many of them appear to be non-compliant, but the back to back distance is often being measured to the next boundary, not the back to back dwelling distances. We thank the

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

	<p>developer for tweaking the layout to better allow for a compliant private amenity area, however note that property 244 has an obscure private amenity area, effectively split in to two non-compliant areas. Can anything else be done to better provision plot 244 with usable private amenity area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mature trees should be retained rather than removed as proposed or a two tree net gain provided.</li> <li>• Unclear from plans and accompanying statements whether Harwell Parish Council's request for the 2025 sustainability standards have been addressed. We reiterate this request and ask that these homes meet the 2025 sustainability standards.</li> <li>• The northern boundary of the site remains as a footpath, with no cycle path to the northern and eastern boundaries, or footpath along the eastern boundary. Request proper provision for cyclists and pedestrians are provided around the entire site with cycle lanes constructed to the highest standard of 3m.</li> <li>• In anticipation that the HIF1 project is approved and the project progresses, we ask that additional elements be added to the closest homes or the boundary of the site to mitigate against excess noise, from not only the at capacity current road, but also the anticipated additional noise resulting from the HIF1 implementation.</li> <li>• Ask for confirmation of completion and opening dates for the play area, common park land, Cow Lane improvements and connection to this development.</li> <li>• Ask that all developers include provision for defibrillators at no less than 500m interval across the new developments. After installation, the Parish Council would consider taking on and managing them, with an appropriate stipend to cover costs.</li> </ul>
<p>Harwell Parish Council</p>	<p><u>November 2023 Amendments:</u>  Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previously highlighted flooding issues have still not been addressed in this latest revision.</li> <li>• All bedrooms should be double bedrooms to enable the most use.</li> </ul>

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum build standards have been met, but the developer should be striving to meet the Future Homes Standards</li> <li>• Health Provision in this area needs to be in place before this application is approved.</li> <li>• The new trees and lighting columns are too close together and should be moved further apart.</li> <li>• The cycleways do not flow through other parts of the development and should connect to Cow Lane.</li> <li>• Some of the private amenity areas still do not meet the minimum standards of the Vale of White Horse DC Planning Policies.</li> </ul> <p><u>Previous Comments:</u></p> <p>Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solar panels promised are not included in the application.</li> <li>• Some gardens do not meet the Joint Design Guide expectations.</li> <li>• Access to some gardens are a concern e.g. passageways around other gardens.</li> <li>• Loss of existing mature trees; the scheme should be designed around existing trees.</li> <li>• Disappointed with the lack of commitment to 2025 sustainability standards.</li> <li>• Lack of health care provision.</li> <li>• Lack of cycling infrastructure on the north and eastern boundaries.</li> <li>• Amenities should be provided earlier.</li> <li>• Concerned at the play area being beside a planned main road.</li> </ul> <p><i>Planning officer response:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Solar panels are proposed.</i></li> <li>• <i>All other matters including tree retention, health care provision, cycling infrastructure and play areas together with timing for provision, were decided at outline permission stage and are not relevant to the consideration of this application.</i></li> </ul>
Milton Parish Council	No comments received.
Residents	<p>Eight responses have been received as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Harwell Parish Council comments.</li> <li>• Lack of solar panels promised by the applicant.</li> </ul>

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of electric vehicle charging points for each dwelling.</li> <li>• Considering that the future homes standard comes into force from 2025, it is disappointing that there is no commitment to provide air heat pumps and these should be provided now given the climate emergency.</li> <li>• Lack of play ground and other amenities on this site. Building of the play area should be brought forward as the site is completely remote and detached from any other facilities already constructed.</li> <li>• No healthcare provision for anyone moving into this development with all three GP surgeries in the area closed to new patients. This should be resolved before any houses are constructed.</li> <li>• Where will residents receive medical, dental and schooling with current oversubscriptions.</li> <li>• Inadequate garden sizes not according to the Joint Design Guide.</li> <li>• Loss of trees contrary to the council’s declaration of an ecological emergency.</li> <li>• Crime Prevention Officer’s comments need to be resolved.</li> <li>• A condition should require full delivery of the biodiversity enhancement recommendations.</li> <li>• The frontage along the A4130 on the north side of the site only shows a footpath and not a footpath/cycleway as on the southern boundary. It is likely that both cyclists and pedestrians would want to use this route and the plans should accommodate real world usage.</li> <li>• Similarly, there appears to be no cycleway provision on the eastern boundary. The cycleway diverts from the eastern boundary in the south east corner but none of the plans indicate what it is intended to be connected to.</li> <li>• Lack of a link to Cow lane which prevents access to the local area by cycling or walking</li> <li>• The frontage design for the A4130 lacks ambition and scale.</li> <li>• Encouraged to see the proposal includes 147 buildings with swift bricks.</li> </ul>
Oxfordshire County Council – Highways	<p><u>March 2024 Amendments:</u> No objection:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 7.5m wide shared surface streets should provide an additional 0.8m service/margin strip.</li><li>• Cycle and pedestrian connection details are now acceptable.</li><li>• Visibility splays are acceptable</li><li>• The Road Safety Audit is satisfactory</li><li>• Car and cycle parking provision is satisfactory</li><li>• Initial concerns about a cupboard door obstructing parking in a car port cannot be substantiated.</li><li>• EVCP should be secured by condition.</li><li>• A street lighting scheme in relation to landscaping should be secured by condition.</li></ul> <p><u>February 2024 Amendments</u></p> <p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To be adopted by OCC some areas encompassing a 7.5m wide shared surface space would be required to provide an additional 0.8m service/margin strip.</li><li>• Connection details of the on-site cycle and pedestrian routes to the Main Street (and other on-site routes) need to be designed correctly - 2m wide and splayed.</li><li>• A visibility splay is obstructed by a parking layby and the applicant needs to clarify this.</li><li>• Two roads are not proposed for adoption but it is unclear why an adjoining footway is shown to be adopted? Clarification needed.</li><li>• A ramp is required at the start of all shared surface carriageways and the entrances to the shared surfaces will require an extension of the footway to the top of a ramp and 2m wide tactile paving provided both sides.</li><li>• Footways will be required on both sides of the typical estate road carriageway to a minimum width of 2.0m if these roads are to be adopted.</li><li>• Some on street parking needs to be removed to provide a 6m wide carriageway or the road will not be adopted.</li><li>• Raised table traffic calming is acceptable.</li><li>• A Designers Response should accompany the road safety audit (RSA) with the Overseeing Organisation agreeing and signing off the RSA Recommendations.</li><li>• Street lighting will need to be agreed.</li></ul>
--	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The parking schedule needs to be clearer to ascertain on-plot and visitor parking suitability.</li></ul> <p><u>Conditions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Visibility splays – 2.4m x 25m</i></li><li>• <i>Car parking as per approved plans</i></li><li>• <i>Garages to be retained</i></li><li>• <i>Provision of roads in accordance with OCC specifications</i></li><li>• <i>Provision of estate roads prior to occupation (except the wearing course)</i></li><li>• <i>Street lighting to be agreed</i></li><li>• <i>Cycle parking in accordance with approved plans</i></li></ul> <p><u>November and December 2023 Amendments:</u></p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In the previous response concerns were raised with some of the 7.5m wide shared surface areas being designed to adoptable standards. It was stated that for this arrangement to be adopted by OCC in the future, that some areas encompassing a 7.5m wide shared surface space would be required to provide an additional 0.8m service/margin strip on the opposite side from the street lighting column. This is to enable future maintenance to be undertaken as and when required.</li><li>• The applicant in their response state that that the road width has not been amended as this has been provided as per the agreed and approved Strategic Design Code (SDC). The applicant should note however that whilst the layout may be in keeping with the SDC, this minor detail should be incorporated not only to ensure full compliance with OCC's adoption criteria but to ensure that complications do not arise as part of any future S38 technical approval process.</li><li>• It was previously highlighted that whilst routes to adjoining parcels are indicatively shown, that the connection details to on-site cycle and pedestrian routes to and from the adjoining parcels be clearly demonstrated. These details are required to ensure the accesses from Parcel 1T that connect to the Main Street (and other on-site routes) are designed correctly.</li></ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The applicant in their response state that this is not relevant to the current application as this falls outside the scope of the red line boundary. OCC does not accept this justification and requests that the required details be provided in order to ensure suitable connections are proposed.</li><li>• With regard to internal visibility splays, whilst the applicant has amended a number of locations need to be revised to ensure that splays conform to both the SDC and OCC's adoption criteria.</li><li>• Vision splays should not be obstructed by on-street parking bays and trees. Whilst it was previously requested that adjustments be made to tree locations in order to ensure requisite splays be achieved, It is unclear from the above snapshots whether this is in fact the case. This should therefore be addressed.</li><li>• The applicant should note that a ramp is required at the start of all shared surface carriageways. The entrances to the shared surfaces will require an extension of the footway to the top of a ramp and 2m wide tactile paving provided both sides as per the attached standard detail below. I note roads 10, 16, 17 (western end) and 20 appear to be a shared surface carriageways but have no ramps proposed at the start point.</li><li>• Concerns were raised the swept path analysis drawings and associated visitor parking bays having to be moved back from the carriageway (adjacent to plots 61, 70, 73, 94, 101, 143, 144 etc). This issue has not been addressed by the applicant.</li><li>• With regard to car parking provision, it was previously requested that a car parking schedule confirming the number of allocated parking space per housing plot/house type be provided. Whilst this has been provided, the submitted information does not contain the number of bedrooms associated with each house type/plot. This makes it difficult in ascertaining whether the number of allocated spaces is sufficient. This also applies for the on-site cycle parking requirements for the site.</li><li>• Concerns were previously raised with the proposed car port facilities being usable as shown on drawing HT: PT21-01 as it shows</li></ul>
--	--

	<p>the door opening inwards towards the carport where a vehicle may be parked causing an obstruction. The applicant states that <i>“carports have widths of 3.2m for single carports and 6.2m for double carports. Doors to units open inwards so there would be no clash with carports”</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit provided has only reviewed two drawings which is not acceptable as all drawings provided for the planning application must be reviewed to ensure this is completed robustly.</li></ul> <p><u>September 2023 Amendments</u> Holding objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Routes to adjoining parcels are indicatively shown, however no connection details to these on-site cycle and pedestrian routes to / from the adjoining parcels are still shown. These design details are required to ensure the accesses from Parcel 1T that connect to the Main Street (and other on-site routes) are designed correctly. In the absence of this information this element of the design cannot be considered.</li><li>• Internal vision splays of 2.4m x 25m, for a design speed of 20mph, are shown at the proposed junctions. In a few locations landscaping obscures vision splays and trees should be relocated outside the vision splays.</li><li>• No vision splays are shown from parcel 1T to the main street to serve this parcel. An amended vision splay plan is required showing these highway design details.</li><li>• Clarification required for proposed level of car and bicycle parking provisions.</li><li>• One design issue that has arisen since the adoption of the Design Code is with the 7.5m width requirement of the shared surface area. For this arrangement to be adopted by OCC in the future an additional 0.8m service / margin strip is required on the opposite side from the street lighting columns to enable future maintenance to be undertaken as / when required. Some of the proposed shared surface areas for the application will need to be adjusted to incorporate this additional 800mm service strip. The 9m shared surface area remains acceptable (i.e. 2 x 1.5m service strips provided).</li></ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Subject to confirmation the proposed streets meet the approved design code, the submitted swept path analysis drawings are considered acceptable. However, these drawings have highlighted a couple of areas that require some minor amendments involving some visitor parking bays being moved back from the carriageway e.g. spaces adjacent plots 61, 70, 73, 94, 101, 143, 144.</li><li>• There are a couple of areas where pedestrian facilities need to be made wider behind visitor parking spaces in accordance with the design code.</li><li>• Clarification of traffic calming is required in streets with straight sections of over 70m.</li><li>• The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) provided has reviewed one drawing which has not been submitted with this planning application, which is not acceptable. A revised RSA is required.</li><li>• Having reviewed the submitted house type plans and the parking schedule provided the house type references for both sets of information do not tally with each making it not possible to assess if an appropriate level of car parking, per housing plot has been provided.</li><li>• It remains unclear if the proposed visitor parking levels accord with the council's parking standards. Clarification is required.</li><li>• Vehicle tracking plans appear acceptable.</li><li>• Parking spaces and garage sizes meet expectations.</li><li>• Car ports do not look useable due to internal widths shown and a door shown to open inwards into the car port where a vehicle may be parked causing an obstruction.</li><li>• Each plot is allocated an EVCP which is welcomed.</li></ul> <p><u>Original Plans:</u> <u>Objection:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No connection details to the on-site cycle and pedestrian routes to / from the adjoining parcels are shown. These design details are required to ensure the accesses from Parcel 1T that connect to the Main Street (and other on-site routes) are designed correctly. In the absence of this information this element of the design cannot be considered.</li></ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is unclear if the proposed streets throughout Parcel 1T accord with the cross-section dimensions identified in the approved design code for Valley Park. This requires confirmation as there are several areas shown where the proposed streets do not appear wide enough to allow a refuse vehicle to pass a parked or on-coming vehicle.</li><li>• The entrances to the shared surfaces throughout Parcel 1T require an extension of the footways to the top of the ramp and tactile paving provided. This design issue is identified in the accompanying Road Safety Audit (RSA), dated 6th January 2022, for this reserved application. A revised site layout drawing is required.</li><li>• Some tactile paving has been drawn incorrectly and requires amending.</li><li>• For carriageways that are straight for over 70m will require some form of traffic calming to ensure vehicle speeds are less than 20mph. This appears to have been provided throughout Parcel 1T. However, the submitted RSA has identified the location of some of these features being a potential safety issue. The location of these traffic calming features will need to be agreed.</li><li>• The RSA only reviews one of the site drawings provided (ref 5963.95 Rev P01) which is not acceptable. The full drawing pack should be audited.</li><li>• A street lighting and tree drawing has been provided. It is recommended the required internal junction vision splays are also shown on this drawing to ensure these three design considerations are shown together.</li><li>• Any proposed highway trees must not conflict with streetlights and must be a minimum 10m away and a minimum 1.5m from the carriageway. Trees that are within 5m of the carriageway or a footway will require root protection.</li><li>• The level of car parking provision does not appear to accord with OCC's revised Parking Standards. A parking schedule confirming the number of allocated spaces per housing plot / house type is needed.</li><li>• A number visitor spaces parking spaces are shown located within dedicated parking areas with allocated parking spaces for nearby</li></ul>
--	---

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

	<p>housing plots. It is requested that such arrangements are reviewed with such visitor spaces being located on-street spaces and designed into the street scene. It should be noted that the number of visitor car parking spaces being provided are expected to accord with the new car parking standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bicycle parking does not appear to have been considered. Such parking provisions are required and should be provided in accordance with the minimum standards quoted in OCC's Parking Standards.</li> </ul>
Oxfordshire County Council - Drainage	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The correct CV's (volumetric run-off coefficient), have now been used.</li> </ul>
Oxfordshire County Council - Education	<p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is covered by a S106 agreement addressing education.</li> </ul>
Oxfordshire County Council – Archaeology	<p>No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The outline permission contains conditions that require phased archaeological mitigation in advance of development.</li> </ul>
Thames Water	<p>No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As there are no changes to the proposed foul/surface water drainage strategy, Thames Water has no comments to make.</li> </ul>
Environment Agency	<p><u>19 February 2024 response:</u>  <u>Flood Risk:</u>          No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

	<p>shown to be contained within the channel across the development site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li></ul> <p><u>Condition:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the improvement works to the Cow Brook and Meadow Brook as specified in the Technical note 52 Rv1 dated 14 September 2023 and prepared by Brookbanks. These works shall be implemented as approved prior to any occupation and retained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.</i></li></ul> <p><u>September 2023 Amendments:</u></p> <p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• The submitted Technical Note 52: Cow Brook Modelling Water Levels Dated 17th July 2023, states 'The existing hydrology was considered to be adequate.'. However, there is no information to justify why the hydrology does not require updating.</li><li>• The applicant must identify whether there have been any changes to hydrological techniques since the original hydrological</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>assessment was undertaken (i.e., new software or guidance that should be applied) and whether there have been any changes within the catchment which should be considered. This may include changes in topography, structures and development which would mean the hydrology should be reconsidered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In addition, there should be some sensitivity or residual uncertainty analysis to take into account the potential impacts of changes in techniques and/or data.</li><li>• In addition, we are requesting further justification for the hydrological approach (using the existing hydrology). We ask the applicant to confirm what methods have been used to check the data remains up to date and the results still accurate. It would be very helpful to know if they have replicated the approach the previous study took to compare what an updated flow estimate would look like alongside further evidence of decision making processes.</li><li>• Finally, as alterations to the approved HIF model have been made by lengthening the reach, sensitivity testing should be carried out on key parameters and the results explained within the reporting so that the modelling uncertainty can be assessed.</li></ul> <p><u>Original Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In the Thames area we are not able to provide comments relating to a reserved matters application and so a standard response to the consultation will be made to that effect.</li><li>• With regards to flood zones and alterations to the flood map, the response (dated 9 May 2016) to the outline application P14/V2873/O, stated that “<i>the northern part of the application site contains portions of Flood Zones 3 and 2, in accordance with our Flood Map. These represent land that has a high (1% AEP) and medium (0.1% AEP) probability of flooding. Refined modelling submitted by the applicant, and approved as fit for purpose by us, confirms that these flood extents are less than shown by our Flood Map. The Supplementary Environmental Information (SEI), dated September 2015, to support the Environmental Statement explains</i></li></ul>
--	--



Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

	<p><i>that there are still parts of Flood Zones 2 and 3 at the northern part of the site but that all proposed buildings can be located outside of these.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further to this an amendment to the flood map for planning was made following the approval of the applicant’s modelling in 2019. Comparing the flood map prior to this amendment and the flood map after the amendment, the areas of flood zone 2 and flood zone 3 in the north of the site have been reduced, but not wholly removed. The revision of the flood map resulted in the addition of flood zones to various ditches/watercourses. As such condition 36 on the outline permission would still apply and should ensure development is outside of these areas.</li> </ul>
<p>Drainage Engineer</p>	<p><u>February 2024 Response:</u> No objection: Based on the Environment Agency latest response the previous holding objection can be removed.</p> <p><u>November 2023 Amendments:</u> No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calculations should be tested using FEH rainfall data and CV values of 0.95 for roof areas and 0.9 for paved areas in accordance with local standards for submission for any discharge of condition application relating to this application.</li> <li>• The applicant is reminded that the current Environment Agency flood maps still show areas of this phase in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Whilst we have no comments on the flood modelling report submitted under application P22/V2624/DIS, revised modelling needs confirming with the Environment Agency as suitable for a flood map challenge to enable this classification to be changed given the related planning condition prohibiting development in these zones.</li> <li>• Land Drainage Consent will be required from the District Council for proposed crossings and changes to ordinary watercourses.</li> </ul> <p><u>September 2023 Amendments:</u> Holding objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The detailed layouts provided do not provide sufficient primary treatment in line with the</li> </ul>

	<p>requirements of the Flood Risk Assessment. It is noted that a 15% reduction in peak runoff is required. For this phase, discharge is directly to tertiary SUDS and avoids secondary SUDS features running from other areas of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More consideration therefore needs to be provided for the requirements of the agreed Flood Risk Assessment for the site to ensure that sufficient primary SUDS are included within the parcel. It is noted that the report indicates that; <i>“Primary treatment of run off from driveways/parking areas will be provided utilising conveyance through filter drains and similarly treatment of run off from private shared surface areas will be provided utilising over-edge drainage to filter strips/drains prior to discharge to the main drainage system”</i> This is not reflected in the designs submitted.</li> <li>• Note that flood modelling has now been submitted to the Environment Agency and await their detailed feedback.</li> </ul> <p><u>Original Comments:</u> No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The general drainage information appears broadly acceptable.</li> <li>• Calculations should be tested using FEH rainfall data and CV values of 0.95 for roof areas and 0.9 for paved areas in accordance with local standards for submission for any discharge of condition application relating to this application.</li> <li>• The applicant is reminded that the current Environment Agency flood maps still show areas of this phase in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Whilst we have no comments on the flood modelling report submitted under application P22/V2624/DIS, revised modelling needs confirming with the Environment Agency as suitable for a flood map challenge to enable this classification to be changed given the related planning condition prohibiting development in these zones.</li> </ul>
Urban Design Officer	<p><u>July 2023 Amendments:</u> Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no key design issues that would need resolving or mitigating as part of the application.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some additional tree planting could be incorporated by plots 75/76, 98, 99, 115, 118, 245 and block F12C. These locations do not appear to conflict with street lighting, forward visibility splays, or services and utilities.</li> </ul> <p><u>Original Plans:</u> No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme is acceptable and compliant with the strategic design code (SDC) as regards its principles and character area including materials and vernacular. The scale and massing of key buildings and how the scheme addresses the spine road is acceptable.</li> <li>• The design and layout of parking across the scheme including parking courts is acceptable from an urban design perspective, although there are minor areas where improvement could be achieved including removing some redundant garages or minor amendments to one or two parking spaces.</li> <li>• The level balance of private amenity space provided across the scheme is acceptable, there are some shortfalls on 5 properties, this represents 2% of properties not being strictly compliant across the scheme. To provide the additional space required for all gardens to have a compliant size would require re-design that would most likely materially diminish the quality of the current layout. The depth of gardens is not an issue of concern across the scheme, as where this occurs the overall back-to-back distances are acceptable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Minor Concerns/Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plots 60 and 61 would benefit from rearranging their parking to better address the street and incorporate a tree within landscaping to the site of plot 61, breaking up its south facing elevation.</li> <li>• Switch the parking allocation for plots 12 and 13 so 12 is closer to its plot.</li> <li>• The garage could be removed from plots 40/41 as it seems unnecessary and can increase the garden size of plot 41.</li> <li>• The garage within the parking court serving plot 50 is not required and should be removed.</li> </ul>
<p>Crime Prevention Officer</p>	<p><u>November 2023 Amendments:</u> Comments:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Notes the applicant references to previous incidents involving electronic access control gates, however these were isolated incidents over 13 years ago. Electronic gates are a very common feature in developments, both commercial and residential, across the country. There is sufficient technology and safety standards that resolve the concerns raised by the applicant, and the HSE article noted is a warning not a recommendation not to install gates. To ensure no risk to pedestrians, automated gates supplied and installed must meet the relevant statutory safety standards and be CE marked accordingly. Specifiers may wish to satisfy themselves that installers of powered gates are appropriately qualified, trained and follow recognised industry guidance that also allows for accessibility and ease of operation.</li><li>• The end units of block F12B overlooking plot 65 have a blank gable end overlooking parking and do not turn the corner. All corner units must be dual aspect to maximise surveillance over the public realm. Additional windows must be added in this gable to enhance surveillance.</li><li>• Maintain my recommendation that cycle stores must be robustly secured and should have fob access extended to them, without which I would have significant concerns over their security. The use of a single storage area for all cycles increases the pay-off for an offender to gain entry. If these are not clean, pleasant and safe places to access residents will not use them, bringing cycles into communal areas instead creating fire safety concerns. I am unable to see any justification for not providing this given the access control system will already be within the apartment block.</li></ul> <p><u>July 2023 Amendments:</u> Holding objection:</p> <p><u>Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Curtilage parking and garages are still vulnerable to crime due to a lack of surveillance. Additional windows must be added in the side elevations overlooking</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>parking to provide surveillance and protection – plot 65 for example.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Plans still indicate parking courts remain unlit, this is a fundamental concern that must be addressed for my objection to be removed.</li></ul> <p><u>Apartment blocks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Unable to locate floorplans for apartment block F12C within the updated housing packs so am unable to comment on this building.</li></ul> <p>Flat block F12A (145-153):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A footpath appears to lead from the street (next to plot 246) to a ground floor apartment bedroom window? This has been indicated on the refuse tracking plan as a route for bin collection but appears to be a drawing error?</li><li>• Unable to locate floorplans for plot 246/FOG unit connected to this apartment block?</li><li>• The FOG access into the car part must be secured with electronic fob-activated gates.</li></ul> <p>Flat block F12A (84-92)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ask that the footpath connecting this building to the road opposite plot 93 is removed. It seems to have no purpose.</li><li>• The second set of doors to the bin store should also be removed – the store should only have one point of access and must not be promoted as a cut through route, undermining the security of the store and creating risk. Bin collection should take place within the parking court.</li><li>• The rear access route for plots 82/83 should be enclosed along the length of the private parking court, additional fencing or wall should be added to separate these private routes from the private parking court.</li></ul> <p>Flat block F2 (47-52)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The floorplans provided do not appear to match the coloured planning layout provided – there is a window in the ground floor apartment where it appears this is an adjoining wall for example?</li><li>• The parking court must be lit with bulkhead or column lighting.</li><li>• The second set of doors to the bin store facing out onto the road should be removed – they lack surveillance increasing the risk of unauthorised entry attempts and the store should only have one point of access. Bin collection should take place within the parking court.</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>Flat block F12B (53-61)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The plot numbers on the floorplans do not appear to correspond to the coloured planning layout?</li><li>• Again a footpath appears to lead from the street (next to plot 60 parking) to a ground floor apartment bedroom window? Appears to be a drawing error?</li></ul> <p><u>Bin stores / BCP's</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bin stores are shown with no internal access for the residents, requiring a high level of opening and closing to take place via the double doors shown in the shell of building. Bin stores often attract crime and anti-social behaviour, specifically drug offences, rough sleeping and arson. The double doors shown are particularly difficult to secure robustly requiring one leaf to lock into the other in the right order.</li><li>• Single wide doors should be used to allow self-closing hinges and locks to be provided and operated via fob access. Alternatively where double doors must be present a point of entry from the resident's corridor could be considered, this would reduce the risk of them being left insecure but again should include fob access into and out of the residential corridor must be present.</li><li>• Some bin collection points are located alongside the vulnerable side or rear boundary of a dwelling, creating a risk that bins may be used as a climbing aid to gain entry over the boundary into the rear</li><li>• BCP's must be located in public areas a sufficient distance away from dwelling boundaries to prevent bins being used as climbing aids.</li></ul> <p><u>Cycle stores</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• These must be robustly secured and again should have fob access extended to them, without which I would have significant concerns over their security. The use of a single storage area for all cycles increases the payoff for an offender to gain entry. If these are not clean, pleasant and safe places to access residents will not use them, bringing cycles into communal areas instead creating fire safety concerns.</li></ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The external door must meet the minimum standards of LPS 1175 Issue 8 B3 or STS 202 Issue 6 or equivalent.</li></ul> <p><u>Rear access routes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rear access routes across the development are vulnerable to crime and ASB due to having gates located significantly recessed in secluded alleyways. All rear access routes must be secured in line with the front of the building line (as indicated below), and should be secured with self-closing gates fitted with key operated locks that are operable from both sides.</li></ul> <p><u>Original Plans:</u></p> <p><u>Objection:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Where possible on plot parking is preferred. In any case, a parking space must be covered by active surveillance from the dwelling that it serves.</li><li>• Unallocated parking should be located on-street or in areas where it is covered by good surveillance from surrounding dwellings, but not located where it poses a risk of creating neighbour disputes and community tension. E.g. on plot unallocated parking is not acceptable.</li><li>• Visitor parking to the south of the site is located alongside a footpath with no surveillance to one side, leaving vehicles vulnerable to crime. In order to protect vehicles from crime and reduce the opportunity for crime, parking should be protected by defensible space and planting to provide standoff between the parking spaces and the footpath. Visitor parking should be provided on-street where it is covered by surveillance from surrounding dwellings.</li><li>• The row of carports to the rear of plots 39-44 will be problematic in terms of opportunities for crime as they expose the vulnerable rear boundary of these plots whilst restricting surveillance over them and parked cars, particularly in hours of darkness. There is some surveillance provided by units opposite however I would strongly recommend this area is reconfigured to remove these car ports and provide suitable protection to the rear boundary of these plots.</li></ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking courts remain insecure easily accessible, unlit and exposing vulnerable residential boundaries and leaving to crime. As rule, parking courts should be avoided as they can attract those intent on crime and antisocial behaviour. Rear parking courts should be completely avoided, as they undermine the security provided by a secure perimeter block.</li> <li>• Bin stores are shown with no internal access for the residents, requiring a high level of opening and closing to take place via the double doors shown in the shell of building. Bin stores often attract crime and anti-social behaviour. Single width doors should be used to allow self-closing hinges and locks to be provided and operated via fob access. Alternatively where double doors must be present a point of entry from the resident’s corridor could be considered, this would reduce the risk of them being left insecure.</li> <li>• Some bin collection points (BCP) are located alongside the vulnerable side or rear boundary of a dwelling, creating a risk that bins may be used as a climbing aid to gain entry over the boundary into the rear. BCP’s must be located in public areas a sufficient distance away from dwelling boundaries to prevent bins being used as climbing aids.</li> <li>• Cycle stores must be robustly secured with fob access extended to them, without which I would have significant concerns over their security. The use of a single storage area for all cycles increases the pay-off for an offender to gain entry. If these are not clean, pleasant and safe places to access residents will not use them.</li> </ul>
Landscape Architect	<p><u>March 2024 Amendments:</u> Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No numbers on the Plant Schedule to follow changes in species and the distribution of species on site, as requested.</li> <li>• More species diversity is required for these trees to provide seasonal interest, biodiversity and biosecurity.</li> <li>• Still a tree proposed on top of the permeable sub-base area, east of units 1 to 11.</li> <li>• Only one access point onto the cycle/ footpath to the south proposed, which is on the</li> </ul>



	<p>western side of the site. There needs to be more permeability as the POS to the south.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• These comments do not impact on the site layout and can be addressed by condition.</li></ul> <p><u>February 2024 Amendments:</u> Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Previous comments from the 28 November do not seem to be addressed in the revisions.</li><li>• There are a number of locations where trees have been removed or their size, downgraded predominately to feature shrubs, I note there are no numbers on the Plant Schedule to follow changes in species and the distribution of species on site. For example parking courts predominantly contain feature shrubs rather than trees that are large enough to break up the mass of the built form and parking. This includes the use of Amelanchier alnifolia Obelisk which is now proposed in the car park for units 1-11 and 54-62. The Obelisk is also proposed to break up on street parking, again the size of the tree is not substantial enough to be used for this function. Where there is space for a larger tree to be planted this opportunity should be taken.</li><li>• There are still numerous areas where service runs pass through tree rooting areas.</li><li>• There are places that sufficient rooting volume has not been provided, such as the Pyrus calleryana Redspire in the courtyard.</li><li>• There was no clarification as requested that SUDS has been designed to accommodate the proposed tree planting where it is on top of the SUDS design.</li><li>• There is only one access point onto the cycle/ footpath to the south, which is on the western side of site.</li></ul> <p><u>November 2023 Amendments:</u> Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The amendments have addressed some previous issues but additional information has highlighted other issues and there are still a number of issues that are a concern with regards to the proposals.</li><li>• There are a number of places that trees are located over the drainage crating areas. Have these been designed to accommodate the tree planting into the design?</li></ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The engineering layout plans indicate that in a number of places that drainage routes run through tree planting locations. The service runs need to be located away from the vicinity of the tree planting locations.</li><li>• While private lighting does not need to follow the 10m offset as required by highway lighting it is not appropriate for a lighting column and tree planting to be in the same location. Private lighting should be checked for clashes and the lighting columns moved accordingly.</li><li>• The external boundary and treatments layout plan illustrate different boundary treatments to those on the external works plans.</li><li>• There are no links from the adopted highway areas onto the cycle path to the south, the cycle route provides links to other areas of the site such as Cow Lane or the playing fields to the south and therefore direct access points are required from the housing areas to aid connectivity.</li><li>• As previously requested opportunities for reinstating street trees should be fully explored. In many locations the proposed tree planting locations were just on the edge of the 10m offset from lighting columns and located on the opposite side of the road. Crating can be used to increase rooting volume where rooting volume is not sufficient to ensure the longevity of street trees. There are a number of locations that trees could be reinstated with slight tweaks to locations of lighting columns, species and rooting volumes. Service runs should be designed to accommodate tree planting locations, especially on a green field site such as Valley Park.</li></ul> <p><u>September 2023 Amendments</u> Holding Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A number of trees have been lost or down sized in the revised plans. It is not clear why these trees have been lost. In many places the trees lost are on the opposite side of the road to a light fitting, and therefore there may be some flexibility on the 10m offset from lighting columns to allow the tree to be planted.</li><li>• Five trees along the north side of the northern entrance road, between plots 14 to 24 are lost</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>and additional trees should be planned back into this street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Two trees have been lost along the main central road, again additional trees should be planned into this street.</li><li>• Loss of two trees west of plot 120, loss of tree west of plot 102 and 2 trees south of plot 103. These trees should be reinstated.</li><li>• A number of trees have been down sized to shrubs such as Ribes sanguineum.</li><li>• The street between plots 243 to 245 will have a hard appearance. There will be 12 parking spaces accessed from the street without any softening.</li><li>• The wall of plot 245 should be softened with planting.</li><li>• It is disappointing that an easement prevents the planting of trees along the northern site boundary to soften the built line of houses.</li></ul> <p><u>July 2023 Amendments:</u></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Trees proposed within highway verges to be adopted by OCC need to be approved by OCC. The trees are predominately single species along the central west/ east road through the housing area, this does not reflect the OCC Design Guide with regards to species diversity, with no more than 20% of one species.</li><li>• Along the eastern section of the northern boundary, there is space for additional trees, especially north plots 118, 115, 99 and 98. Opportunities should be taken for tree planting on the northern boundary as there is limited space between the footpath and the Suds basins for planting to soften the built form.</li><li>• The lighting and drainage plans indicate that these predominantly coordinate with the proposed tree planting positions.</li><li>• My comments on the tree species and additional trees, do not impact on the layout of the built form, so could be covered under Condition. Standard landscape Implementation and Management Conditions are required.</li></ul>
--	---

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

	<p><u>Original Plans:</u> No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It would be useful to have the associated infrastructure information to understand how the sites integrate especially on the northern and southern boundary, especially in relationship with the level changes needed for the SUDs features.</li><li>• The Landscape Plans contains a summary of the implementation and management details but it would be useful to have a plan which indicates who is responsible for each area of the site, i.e. Manco or houseowner.</li><li>• Any trees proposed within highway verge areas of County Council Adoption will also need approval of species from the County Council.</li><li>• With regards to boundary treatment the walling returns for plots 73, 78 and 115 should sit behind rather than proud or at the same level of the built line especially where the boundary is visual due to parking spaces.</li><li>• The southern cycle route is not proposed to link back up to the street, but only on to Cow Lane. This doesn't aid choice of routes and connectivity.</li></ul>
Forestry Officer	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The tree removal plan shows that all of the existing trees within the site boundary for this phase of the development are proposed for removal. The majority of these trees are of low arboricultural quality when assessed against BS 5837:2012 and should therefore not be considered a constraint to the proposed development. None of these trees are protected by the TPO that protects trees throughout the wider site.</li><li>• The planting shown on the planting plans will satisfactorily mitigate the proposed tree loss.</li><li>• The Arboricultural Note submitted with the application suggests that no tree protection measures are necessary. Whilst no retained trees are located within the site boundary for this phase, there are trees adjacent to the site. Therefore, as a minimum fencing will be required around the site boundary for this phase to ensure there is a barrier between the site and the adjacent trees.</li></ul>

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

	<p><u>Conditions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Tree protection to be agreed.</i></li> <li>• <i>New landscaping and its long term management.</i></li> </ul>
Ecology Officer	<p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site does not contain any habitats or landscaped areas of increased ecological value.</li> <li>• Generally satisfied that the extent of built development does not conflict with parameter plans approved at outline.</li> <li>• The submitted Ecological Construction Management Plan (ECMP) has been informed by a range of additional ecological surveys (page 14). These separate survey reports should be provided to the LPA. The ECMP is satisfactory but will need to be updated with relevant contact information once contractors are appointed.</li> <li>• A protected species licence will be required for the removal of a tree within the phase 1 site, but this is adequately compensated for through the provisions of the Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP). The submitted BEP is acceptable.</li> <li>• Whilst likely outside of the scope of this current application, it is noted that the ecological constraints plan provided shows that the hedgerow immediately adjacent to the southwest corner of the current application site as being removed. This hedgerow is shown as being retained on the hedgerow retention plan approved at the outline stage. I defer to the opinion of the case officer as to whether or not this requires addressing under this application.</li> </ul>
Environmental Protection Team	No objection subject to the mitigation identified in the submitted noise assessment being implemented.
Housing Team	<p><u>November 2023 Plans:</u></p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This planning application forms Phase 1T of the wider outline permission under application P14/V2873/O. This application is required to be in accordance with the Housing Delivery Document (HDD) dated February 2023 approved under application ref. P22/V2338/DIS. This phase includes 246 total</li> </ul>

	<p>residential units, comprising 160 market units and 86 affordable units. In accordance with Table 6.1 within Appendix C of the approved HDD. The affordable housing proposal now reflects an identical affordable housing mix to the one included in Appendix C, Table 6.1 of the HDD and sufficiently addressing previous discrepancies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Similar to previous submissions, proposed apartment blocks (F2, F12A and F12B) continue to include a total of six 2-bedroom flats on 2nd floors. Registered Providers (RP) advise that 2-bedroom flats should not be situated on 2nd floors or above due to difficulties surrounding housing management and not being suitable for family accommodation. Such units remain difficult to let, increasing the likelihood of void periods and potential of future under occupation. It remains advisable that the applicant explores alternatives to the provision of 2-bedroom flats on 2nd floors.</li><li>• Whilst minimum unit sizes form part of the S106 it is preferable that all affordable units meet Nationally Described Space Standards to meet RP requirements and preferences. The applicant is proposing a number of 2-bedroom units for 3 persons and 4-bedroom units for 6 persons. Due to current eligibility criteria and household demands, it is preferred that all unit occupancies are maximised, providing 2 bed units for 4 persons, 3 bed units for 5 or 6 persons and 4 bed units for 7 or 8 persons. Providing all bedrooms as double bedrooms allows all households to be considered for a property. Where there are single bedrooms, this is likely to prevent larger households being considered which increases their waiting time for suitable accommodation.</li><li>• Affordable housing units remain sufficiently distributed throughout the phase and do not exceed clusters of 15 units as per the S106.</li><li>• All parking spaces on land that is to be transferred to the RP are sufficiently allocated to individual affordable housing units.</li></ul>
--	---

	<p><u>Previous Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposed quantum of affordable housing units reflecting the target tenure mix agreed in the s106 for the outline permission.</li><li>• There remains a discrepancy between the number of 2-bedroom houses and 3-bedroom houses proposed for affordable rent in this phase and which needs to be revised to align with the mix set out in the Housing Delivery Document.</li><li>• Apartment blocks proposed include six 2-bedroom flats on 2nd floors. Registered Providers (RP) generally advise that 2-bedroom flats should not be situated on 2nd floors or above due to difficulties surrounding housing management and units being hard to let, as they are not always suitable family accommodation. It is therefore advised that the applicant revise plans and explore alternatives to the provision of 2-bedroom flats on second floors.</li><li>• Whilst minimum unit sizes form part of the s106 agreement, it is preferable that all affordable units meet Nationally Described Space Standards to meet RP requirements and preferences.</li><li>• It is noted that the applicant is proposing a number of 2-bedroom units for 3 persons and 4-bedroom units for 6 persons. Due to current eligibility criteria and household demands, it is preferred that all 2 bed units are provided for 4 persons, 3 bed units for 5 or 6 persons and 4 bed units for 7 persons. It remains advisable that the applicant revise plans to enable such provision.</li><li>• Affordable housing units are sufficiently distributed throughout the whole phase and do not exceed clusters of 15 units as per the s106 agreement.</li><li>• All parking spaces on land that is to be transferred to the RP are sufficiently allocated to individual affordable housing units.</li><li>• Pleased to see that the applicant has revised plans to provide parking provision for plots 83 and 84 on plot/adjacent to the respective properties, now avoiding their inclusion within the neighbouring parking court. Revised plans are considered acceptable in principle.</li></ul>
--	--

## Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

Waste Management Team	No objection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All individual properties have space to store a set of bins and access to present them for collection.</li><li>• All bin stores for the blocks of flats show the correct bin capacity.</li></ul>
Active Travel England	No comment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Its statutory consultee remit applies only to qualifying consultations that were made valid by the LPA on or after 1st June 2023.</li></ul>
Didcot Garden Town Team	No objection. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The amendments satisfy previous comments raised.</li></ul>

### 3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

P23/V2664/DIS – Approved

Discharge of Condition 10 (Framework Plan) on application P14/V2873/O

[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 (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 lands

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

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

[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.

[P22/V0604/RM](#) – Approved (11/03/2024)

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.

[P22/V0539/RM](#) - Withdrawn (31/08/2022)



Reserve matters submission relating to phase 1 pursuant to outline planning permission ref. P14/V2873/O. RM for phase 1 comprising 246 new homes with associated infrastructure and landscaping with 35% (86 units) of affordable housing at Land to the West of Great Western Park (Valley Park), Didcot.

[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 Vale 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 Part 2.

5.2 **The relevant planning considerations are the following:**

- **Principle of development**
- **The Valley Park Strategic Design Code and Framework Plan**
- **The Reserved Matters:**
  - Appearance
  - Landscaping
  - Layout
  - Scale
- **Access and parking**
- **Housing mix**
- **Residential amenity**
- **Climate change**
- **Biodiversity**
- **Drainage and flood risk**

#### **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 signalled junction with the A4130 from which this application site will be served.

**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, that 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) which the development needs to comply with and which was permitted under application P22/V2066/DIS, and Framework Plan permitted under application no. P23/V2664/DIS. The SDC and Framework Plan 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 defines character areas for the Valley Park site, and the development parcel in this Reserved Matters application falls within two areas; the north west part is part of the ‘Northern Gateway’ character area and the remainder is part of the ‘Northern Residential Neighbourhood’.
- 5.7 The Northern Residential Neighbourhood is divided into sub-character areas which for this application site include:
- The Northern gateway
  - The central core and hamlets;
  - The core (primary);
  - The core (secondary); and
  - The green edge.

These are shown on the plan **attached** as Appendix 4.

- 5.8 The Northern Residential Neighbourhood is to be designed to create an attractive, welcoming, lively and vibrant character created by a higher density urban environment with contemporary influences with housing structured around a movement and green infrastructure network.

**The Reserved Matters**

**Appearance**

- 5.9 The Northern Gateway features a four and three storeys building of contemporary design thereby providing a statement feature at the site entrance, with mass and a strong building line creating enclosure. This is continued through the Central Core and Hamlet which fronts the spine road leading south from the A4130, creating a consistent building line with terraced dwellings and flats containing three storeys with feature buildings at street corners defined by their height and materials. The dwelling designs provide frontage to the spine street with usable front doors with windows aligning horizontally with vertical offsets providing massing and height with primarily pedestrian width gaps between buildings to create the enclosure and the strong building line expected by the SDC. Materials are primarily red/brown brick for the walls with some

render and grey coloured weather boarding used for visual breaks to the street scene and for feature buildings, under primarily grey coloured tiled roofs although some feature buildings have flat roofs. Metal railings with brick piers and backed by planting define the front boundaries with the tree lined main street. The proposed main street frontage is reflective of the development permitted on the opposite side of the street.

5.10 The Northern Gateway and Central Core and Hamlet transition to the Core Primary and Secondary and Green Edge character areas and are distinguishable in terms of appearance by using a less formal street hierarchy including mews streets (providing covered parking for the main street frontage houses), dwellings of lower heights being primarily two storeys semi-detached or detached houses and flats above garages (FOGs), with predominantly wider spacing between dwellings for parking together with focal points and variation in appearance and materials creating an informal appearance and softer edge to the development. Dwellings turn corners with main windows facing streets. House types have balanced facades with clear fronts and backs. Dwellings are simple in form with rectangular footprints and pitched roofs with balanced windows with vertical emphasis. Materials are red brick with greater use of render and reconstituted stone and roof tiles in 'red' or grey colours. Front boundaries are mostly defined by hedges with some use of metal railings defining street hierarchies.

5.11 The appearance of the proposals is considered to follow guidance in the approved Valley Park SDC and also compliant with policies CP37 and CP38 of the LPP1.

#### Landscaping

5.12 Landscaping has been revised to address the landscape and planning officer comments with an updated plant schedule, greater variation in street trees providing seasonal interest, biodiversity and biosecurity. and more tree planting to the northern boundary to supplement the boundary hedge. Drainage and services are beneath parking bays and not beneath trees. At least four connections to the footway and open space to the north are shown and the reserved matters approval under application P22/V0604/RM two showed connections to open space to the south.

5.13 Lamp posts are shown to be 10m from proposed trees which is OCC's expectation and condition 1 of the recommendation ensures the scheme is constructed in accordance with approved plans. Walls rather than fences are proposed around the parking areas associated with the flats, parking spaces and to define boundaries in the public realm. The appearance of walls are softened in the public realm with the use of shrubs such as pyracantha and a mix of plants suitable for shade or sun with an appropriate mix depending on the orientation of the wall.

5.14 With the landscape officers comments addressed the landscaping scheme is considered acceptable and the proposal is compliant with the SDC and Policies CP37 and CP44 of the LPP1.

Layout

- 5.15 The layout comprises a hierarchy of connected streets with dwellings in perimeter blocks with clear fronts and backs. The western edge of the application site is defined by a main street serving the western part of the wider Valley Park site and the development provides a strong frontage with formal appearance. Secondary roads lead from the main street and in turn tertiary roads lead from them including mews streets and finally private drives, the private drives enabling lower density development and a softer green edge to the development particularly in the south and east. The mews streets are used to provide rear on plot parking for houses fronting the main street thereby avoiding frontage parking and courtyard parking which would diminish the scheme. The mews streets incorporate flats above garages to provide a frontage and passive surveillance. There is no policy requirement for electronic (or manual) gates and it is understood Registered Providers are not keen on their provision due to maintenance costs.
- 5.16 Parking courts are to be used as a last resort according to the SDC. It is accepted that courtyards of parking for flats are an acceptable exception and they are kept to a minimum with these surrounded by walls and including planting, and accessed from secondary streets.
- 5.17 The overall net density of development is 37 dwellings per hectare (dph) and accords with the primarily 35 to 45 dph parameter for this part of the site (the southern boundary to this application site has a parameter of 45 dph). Whilst public open space within this reserved matters application site is less than 15 percent, the wider provision of 17 percent open space across the Valley Park site needs to be taken into account and overall, the Valley Park development will be policy DP33 compliant.
- 5.18 The proposed layout is considered compliant with the SDC and Policies CP37, CP38 and CP44 of the LPP1.

Scale

- 5.19 Building heights reflect the parameters set at outline permission stage varying between 5.7m and 15m, and expectations of the SDC with two and a half, three and four storeys development along the western site frontage (the Northern Gateway and Central Core and Hamlets), with two and two and a half storey dwellings elsewhere reflecting the hierarchy of streets, character areas and providing focal points. The proposal complies with the SDC and Policy CP37 of the LPP1.

**Access and parking**

- 5.20 Policy DP16 of the LPP2 seeks to provide adequate provision for loading, unloading, circulation, servicing and vehicle turning and make provision for any improvements to highway infrastructure. Policy CP33 of the LPP1 seeks to promote sustainable travel and accessibility including minimising impacts on the local and strategic road networks. Policy CP35 of the LPP1 promotes the use of public transport, cycling and walking and to ensure adequate car parking is provided in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) parking standards.

- 5.21 Access from the A4130 via a signalised junction was approved as part of the outline planning permission. Road hierarchies and widths were approved in consultation with OCC as part of the SDC. All roads meet the SDC road width requirements. Whilst OCC requests some shared streets have a width of 8.3m to incorporate service strips either side rather than 7.5m, this does not accord with the approved SDC. Officers note that in responding to applications seeking approval of the SDC, OCC had required this shared street type to be widened to 7.5m including a 1.5m wide service strip/margin. In responding to application P22/V2066/DIS OCC advised “*The other cross sections that needed updating were the ‘Shared Surface’ design (now on page 59). These have been amended and widened for future service / maintenance requirements and are now considered acceptable*”. OCC’s request is contrary to the SDC and is not required for highway safety purposes. Officers consider the street at 7.5m wide benefits the scheme design creating enclosure, definition in street hierarchy and a design not dominated or arranged around car access.
- 5.22 Amended plans have been submitted addressing the last set of highway officer comments and there are now no objections. Vision splays have been adjusted to meet those required for a 20mph speed limit and vision splays avoid conflict with the location of visitor parking spaces. and the Road Safety Audit no longer identifies any safety issues.
- 5.23 Other than pavements for pedestrian use, no cycle/footways are included in this application site but cycle and footway links are required and secured as part of the outline planning permission which will link this site more conveniently to future on site facilities, Great Western Park and Didcot. In the meantime, details of links shown to the cycle and footway beside the A4130 and Cow Lane and links to the cycle/footway immediately south of the site. The spine road will be part of a bus route and include bus stops close to the site. The proposal is considered compliant with Policies CP33 and CP35 of the LPP1 and policy DP16 of the LPP2 and the SDC.
- 5.24 Car and cycle parking is clearly shown on the plans and now included in a parking schedule and is acceptable as confirmed by OCC in its latest response. Car ports are of adequate width and with doors to houses opening inwards, there is no conflict with parked cars. Each dwelling and flat is allocated an electric vehicle charging point which exceeds the requirements of condition 41 of the outline planning permission. Consequently, car and cycle parking meet the requirement of Policy CP35 of the LPP1.
- 5.25 In conclusion on this issue, the revised proposals are policies DP16, CP33 and CP35 compliant.

### **Housing mix**

#### **Affordable Housing Mix**

- 5.26 A condition of the outline planning permission required a Housing Delivery Document (HDD) to be approved for the wider Valley Park site although the condition recognises the need for this Document to be flexible and it can be updated as part of reserved matters applications. A HDD was approved under

application P23/V0667/RM and updated as part of approved application P23/V0667/RM to reflect that approved development. Policy CP22 of the LPP1 requires a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of current and future households. Policy CP24 of the LPP1 aims to provide 35 percent affordable housing which should be indistinguishable from the market dwellings and evenly distributed across the site. The proposal includes 35 percent affordable dwellings (86 dwellings) that are designed to be indistinguishable from market dwellings and they are in clusters of 15 or fewer and distributed across the site which meets the requirements of the S106 agreement.

- 5.27 The affordable housing mix shown in the table below accords with the S106 agreement for this development and accords with the HDD and Policies CP22 and CP24 of the LPP1:

	1 bed flat	2 bed flat	2 bed house	3 bed house	4 bed house
<b>Affordable rent</b>	8	16	18	19	3
<b>Shared ownership</b>	0	0	13	9	0

Market Housing Mix

- 5.28 Policy CP22 of the LPP1 requires a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of current and future households. This should be in accordance with the council’s current Strategic Housing Market Assessment unless an alternative approach can be demonstrated to be more appropriate through the Housing Register or where proven to be necessary due to viability constraints. Across the Valley Park site the outline permission expects a SHMA compliant development. A comparison between the proposed market housing and SHMA expectation is shown in the table below:

	1 bed	2 beds	3 beds	4+ beds
Proposed	7	41	74	38
SHMA	9	35	68	48

- 5.29 Whilst the market housing mix for this housing parcel is not compliant with the SHMA it provides a mix reflective of higher density and the design expectations for this part of the site, and additional two-bedroom units and a reduction in larger dwellings to ensure amenity space standards are met and consequently, the HDD has been updated as part of this application. Across the wider Valley Park site, the updated housing mix submitted with this application provides a SHMA and Policy CP22 compliant mix of market housing that does not exceed 4,254 dwellings on the Valley Park site.

**Residential amenity**

- 5.30 Policies DP23 and DP24 of the LPP2 seek to protect the living conditions of residents. The adopted Joint Design Guide recommends distances between dwellings of 21m back to back, 10m to fronts and 12m back to side which are met. There are no existing neighbouring dwellings and no occupants of existing dwellings are directly overlooked or overshadowed by the proposals. The

dwellings are reasonably separated to prevent unreasonable overlooking and overshadowing. Amendments to the scheme including additional smaller dwelling sizes in lieu of larger dwellings results in garden sizes meeting the requirements of the site SDC and those in the Joint Design Guide. Floor areas for the affordable dwellings accord with the requirements of the S106 agreement associated with the outline planning permission and the Nationally Described Space Standards as expected by policy DP2 of the LPP2.

5.31 The submitted noise assessment concludes occupants of dwellings will not be adversely affected by noise including that from traffic using the A4130 subject to trickle vents or acoustic air bricks and double glazing and 1.8m high fencing (plots 102, 115, 120, 131, 136, 137 and 144), 2.4m high fence west of plot 145 and a 2.5m high fence to plot 98. These requirements are now extended to other plots fronting the northern boundary and some return boundaries to gardens to ensure noise in rear gardens is at satisfactory levels i.e. 1.8m high walls are now included on the western boundaries of plots 97, 98, 102, 120, 136, and 144, 1.8m high walls on the eastern boundaries of plots 115, 131, 137 and 145, 1.8m high walls between plots 99 to 102, 115 to 120, 131 to 144, 2.4m wall on western boundary of plot 145, and a 2.5m high wall on the northern boundary of plot 98. A proposed condition also secures noise levels within homes.

5.32 Boundary treatments are shown as walls on the submitted external boundary and treatments plan which officers support, as walls are preferable from a design perspective. These measures can be required by condition and the proposal can therefore, comply with policies DP23 and DP24 of the LPP2. HIF1 is a scheme that does not benefit from planning permission and it needs to be designed to mitigate for its impacts on existing development and developments already permitted such as Valley Park but the noise mitigation and proposed condition also accounts for the HIF1 scheme proceeding.

### **Climate change**

5.33 The council has declared a climate emergency and Policy CP40 of the LPP1 encourages developers to incorporate climate change adaption and design measures. All dwellings include solar panels on their roofs and they are provided with electric vehicle charging points. The applicant's sustainability statement advises that all dwellings will be provided with air source heat pumps, a fabric first approach to heat loss with triple glazed windows and high quality/highly insulated roofs, walls and windows, energy efficient fittings, low flow taps and showers and waste water heat recovery will be used. The majority of dwellings have windows within 30 degrees of south and all dwellings allow for natural ventilation. The Valley Park outline planning permission requires a series of measures for active travel including a network of cycle and footways, bus services and a range of facilities and services on site to make the development accessible and seeking to reduce reliance on private motor vehicles for journeys. The proposal is Policy CP40 compliant.

### **Biodiversity**

5.34 Policy CP46 of the LPP1 seeks to protect important ecological receptors (designated sites, protected species, priority habitats, etc.) and secure net

gains for biodiversity. Where adverse impacts on important ecological receptors are likely, development must meet the criteria outlined under the policy to be acceptable. Net losses of biodiversity will not be supported. Policy DP30 of the LPP2 expects a 10m buffer to watercourses.

- 5.35 The site does not contain any designated sites or habitats or landscaped areas of increased ecological value.
- 5.36 The outline planning permission includes conditions aimed at enhancing biodiversity. As required by conditions 18 and 27 of the outline planning permission this application is supported by a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan and Ecological Construction Management Plan. Both documents are considered acceptable and their mitigation measures need to be implemented in accordance with the conditions. The proposal includes provision of 167 swift bricks, two swallow nests, four house martin terrace nesting boxes, four sparrow terraced nesting boxes and two starling bricks. In addition, ten bat boxes, 20 bee bricks, six insect ‘hotels’, and hedgehog ‘highways’ are proposed.
- 5.37 It is considered biodiversity enhancements can be delivered and the proposals do not encroach within 10m of a watercourse. The proposal is compliant with Policies CP46 of the LPP1 and DP30 of the LPP2.

**Drainage and flood risk**

- 5.38 Policy CP42 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. Condition 36 of the outline permission prevents built development in flood zones 2 and 3.
- 5.39 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.
- 5.40 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.



- 5.41 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.
- 5.42 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. Thames Water has no objection in respect of foul water drainage. The proposals are considered policy CP42 compliant.

**Conditions**

- 5.43 Conditions 14, 15, 17, 18, 22, 27 and 41 attached to outline planning consent (P14/V2873/O require the submission of a tree removal and protection plan, landscaping scheme, arboricultural report, noise assessment, biodiversity enhancement plan, lighting layout, ecological construction management plan and EV charging strategy respectively and these plans and documents accompany the application submission. The details are considered acceptable and partially discharge the aforementioned conditions in so far as they relate to this reserved matters application site.

**6.0 CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 This application has been determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is considered a well-designed development that results in no adverse harm. The proposal is considered development plan compliant as a whole and compliant with the Strategic Design Code for the Valley Park site and therefore, it is recommended that the reserved matters (internal access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale), are approved.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:

**Development Plan Policies**

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

- CP1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- CP2 - Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire
- CP3 - Settlement Hierarchy
- CP4 - Meeting Our Housing Needs
- CP7 - Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services

## Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

- 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
- CP22 - Housing Mix
- CP23 - Housing Density
- CP24 - Affordable Housing
- CP33 - Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
- CP35 - Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking
- CP36 - Electronic communications
- CP37 - Design and Local Distinctiveness
- CP38 - Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites
- CP42 - Flood Risk
- CP40 - Sustainable Design and Construction
- CP43 - Natural Resources
- CP44 - Landscape
- CP45 - Green Infrastructure
- CP46 - Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity
- CP47 - Delivery and Contingency

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 (LPP2) Policies:**

- CP4A - Meeting our Housing Needs
- CP15A - Additional Site Allocations for the South-East Vale Sub-Area
- CP18A - Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area
- CP47A - Delivery and Contingency
- 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
- DP25 - Noise Pollution
- DP26 - Air Quality
- DP27 - Land Affected by Contamination
- DP28 - Waste Collection and Recycling
- DP33 - Open Space
- DP39 - Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments

### **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

## **Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024**

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

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

**Tel –** (01235) 422600

**Appendix 1 – Conditions**

1	<p>That the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the following approved plans, <i>[plan no's to be inserted]</i>,</p> <p>except as controlled or modified by conditions of this permission.</p> <p>Reason: To secure the proper planning of the area in accordance with Development Plan policies.</p>
2	<p>All of the sites internal and external boundaries shall be enclosed in accordance with the details shown on the approved plot boundary details plan – DET-01 Rev D and external boundary and treatments plan – PL06 Rev. P. The approved boundary treatments for each building shall be completed prior to the occupation of that building, and all of the approved boundary treatments shall be completed prior to the occupation of the last building on the site.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, to provide privacy for future residents and to reduce noise levels to protect the living conditions of future residents. (Core policy 37 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and policy DP23 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2).</p>
3	<p>All road junctions shall be provided with visibility splays in accordance with the details shown on the approved visibility layout plan – 5963:95 Rev T4. All visibility splays shall be designed to ensure there is no obstruction to vision above 0.9 metre in height except for trees, relative to the centre line of the adjacent carriageway over the whole of each visibility splay area. Thereafter, the visibility splays shall be permanently maintained free from obstruction to vision except for trees.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to ensure tree lined streets (policy DP16 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 and paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework).</p>
4	<p>Prior to any development above slab level, details of all materials to be used externally in the construction of the buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be built using only the approved materials.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the area (core policy 37 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1).</p>
5	<p>Prior to their first occupation the dwellings and gardens shall be insulated against external noise by providing:</p>

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passive ventilation systems and double glazing providing 31dB and 25dB attenuation for those residential properties fronting the A4130 (plots 98 to 102, 115 to 120 and 131 to 145), and northern plots along the spine road (plots 1 to 14 and 42 to 62) respectively; and,</li> <li>• 1.8m high walls on the western boundaries of plots 97, 98, 102, 120, 136, and 144, 1.8m high walls on the eastern boundaries of plots 115, 131, 137 and 145, 1.8m high walls between plots 99 to 102, 115 to 120, 131 to 144, 2.4m wall on western boundary of plot 145, and a 2.5m high wall on the northern boundary of plot 98.</li> </ul> <p>Reason: To protect the living conditions of future residents from road noise in accordance with policy DP23 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p>
6	<p>Prior to the first occupation of plots 1 to 14, 42 to 62, 131 to 145, 115 to 120 and 97 to 102, a noise compliance report prepared by an appropriately qualified acoustician must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must suitably demonstrate that the approved noise mitigation measures referred to in condition 4 have been installed and completed in accordance with the approved scheme (or detail any minor variations). This report should as a minimum cover the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of the passive ventilation systems installed and their locations;</li> <li>• Details of the glazing installed and its acoustic rating;</li> <li>• Photographs of the walls erected.</li> </ul> <p>Reason: To ensure the requirements of condition 4 are implemented to protect the living conditions of future residents from road noise in accordance with policy DP23 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p>
7	<p>Prior to the first occupation of each dwelling, the associated cycle parking for residents and visitors associated with that dwelling shall be provided in accordance with the cycle parking strategy plan - 201.112 Rev B. Thereafter, the cycle parking shall be retained.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure adequate cycle parking is provided to encourage trips by sustainable modes of travel (core policies 33 and 35 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1).</p>
8	<p>Prior to the first occupation of each dwelling an active electric vehicle charging point (EVCP) to serve the users of the dwelling shall be provided for that dwelling in accordance with the details shown on the EV charging locations plan - 201.108 Rev C. Thereafter the EVCP shall be retained permanently to serve the vehicles of users of the dwellings.</p>

**Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 17 April 2024**

	<p>Reason: To promote the use of vehicles that can assist in improving the air quality in local settlements (core policy 33 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and DP26 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2).</p>
9	<p>No development within flood zones 2 and 3 shall be undertaken until the improvement works to Cow Brook and Meadow Brook specified in the Technical Note 52 Rv1 dated 14 September 2023 and on plan no's 10219-SK-RM1-052 and 053 (Phase 1 Cow Lane Amended Ditch Plan sheets 1 and 2) and 10219-SK-415 Rev A (Watercourse Clearance) have been implemented. Thereafter the approved works shall be retained throughout the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding on site (core policy 42 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1).</p>
10	<p>Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B and E of Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or the equivalent provisions of any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), there shall be no extension to any dwellings hereby permitted without the prior grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the living conditions of future residents (policy DP23 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2).</p>
11	<p>Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A of Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or the equivalent provisions of any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), the garage accommodation forming part of the development shall be retained for parking motor vehicles at all times and shall not be adapted to be used for any other purpose.</p> <p>Reason: To retain adequate on-site parking in the interest of highway safety by seeking to discourage on road parking (core policy 35 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and policy DP16 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2).</p>