

Crab Hill comments/questions:

**Response to the questions are provided in bold after each question.**

1. Would it be possible to include a bus waiting area/ transport interchange (area for bike parking and bus waiting with some visitor parking near the interchange) somewhere on the site?  
**This kind of input for potential functions should be included in the exercise to form the brief for the neighbourhood centre which will follow.**
2. Page 9. Is there any provision for separate cycleways through the development alongside the road network or are cyclists expected to share the pavements?  
Section 3.5.21 of the Design Guide 2015 requires: *Cycling routes and parking should be incorporated into the street design, with the form of cycle facilities responding to local context. Generally on-carriageway formal cycle lanes are encouraged.*  
**As discussed during the workshops, the strategy agreed through the Outline application was for cycle routes to generally be accommodated on the carriageway within the development, with off-street routes along the WELR and through open space where more appropriate to the parkland/landscape character.**
3. Potential for unallocated parking seems to coincide with swales in some areas on certain sides of the road (01 site wide strategy – section 6.2 page 11 figures 6 and 7) can the developers please explain how this will work?  
**The detail street design will determine the extent and width of swales and parking will be accommodated where feasible and as part of an overall design for the respective housing areas. Where swales are situated within open space, it may be that separate parking areas within open space are reached by crossing the swales.**
4. 6.5 Cycleways, footpaths and public transport routes (Page 16). This sections refers to the BOAT and the PROW from Lockinge to Grove. We understand that there are two PROW's which should be included: Footpaths 235/5 and 235/10 (see Transport Assessment Appendix I A - Alignment of BOAT.pdf from the original application.) In addition, we understood that the BOAT would be downgraded to a PROW (see the original design and access statement page 87) "Downgrading to a footpath / cycleway or bridleway of the section of BOAT running between Charlton Village Road and the northern side of the WELR.)"  
**The proposals are unchanged from the Transport Assessment submitted as part of the approved outline application which should be referred to for specific detail. The exact solution for crossing the BOAT are unresolved at this stage and will be subject to a separate application in the future.**
5. Page 17 Bus Provision  
The document refers to bus number 36. We have no knowledge of this service and require further information please?  
**This looks to be a typo as the services listed were as advised by the Council transport officer. From checking Stagecoach routes it may be that it is routes 31/x30/32 and 38 should be listed. Discussions are ongoing with the various bus providers and Oxfordshire County Council as to how the bus service will operate.**

6. We would expect bus 38 to go through the development as well as 30/31/32 can this be clarified please?  
**See above.**
7. 6.9 Lighting strategy mentions *“Some luminaires can now be fitted with shields to reduce obtrusive light and it is also possible to introduce part night dimming, in which the luminaires will dim down at times of minimal use”* but makes no commitment to use this type of lighting on a development which slopes towards the AONB. Can this be made a requirement please?  
**This is a design guide setting out options of different types of lighting that are suitable not fixing what they should be.**
8. 6.10.7 Adoption Highways *“It is proposed that tertiary streets / non-strategic highways will not be offered for adoption by OCC but will remain private and will become the responsibility of a private management company.”*  
Is this just an excuse for not building highways to county standards?  
**Tertiary streets / non-strategic highways are unlikely to be adopted by OCC due to the number of dwellings they will serve. The highways will be designed to a high standard in keeping with the rest of the development. Some flexibility is needed on the tertiary streets in order to accommodate services and drainage.**
9. What sums of money will be made available for the maintenance of these highways?  
**Contributions are not required for highway maintenance through new developments.**
10. 6.10.7 Adoption Drainage *OCC has historically adopted sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) as the Suds Approval Body, however recent changes in legislation have resulted in OCC adopting and maintaining SuDS that control highway run-off only. Where SuDS accept flows from the highways and development drainage, they will become the responsibility of a private management company (MANCO).*
11. What sums of money will be made available for the maintenance of these SuDS?  
**Page 125 of the s.106 Legal Agreement sets out the SUDS Maintenance which amounts to £372,000, or it will remain private and this sum not be required to be paid.**
12. 6.14 Foul Water Strategy. We are concerned that the foul rising main runs very close to the main water supply for the Grove Area, can we be confident that there will be no contamination?  
**The foul strategy is currently being developed to avoid the need for a new rising main from the site to the Wantage Treatment Works. However, should a rising main be required for the site, it will be designed in accordance with Sewers for Adoption and will be adopted and maintained by Thames Water.**
13. 7.6 Homes completed – can we have the number of lifetime homes in each category also identified on this table to ensure that a range of homes are constructed to Lifetime Homes standards?  
**An updated table will include the number of lifetime homes completed.**

14. 17.2 Please provide more detail of “WATER SERVICE MAIN DIVERSION”

**We are currently in discussion with Thames Water over the water main diversion. The aim is to let the water main remain in its existing location as far as possible by producing development layouts to accommodate it, including maintenance. Where this is not possible we will agree a diversion route with Thames Water.**

15. The development strategy does not meet the requirements of the Vale to have affordable homes “pepper-potted” through the development, but instead does not include any affordable properties in Phase 1 development (17.2) but includes 50% affordable in Centre East (17.3). It also only includes 10% affordable in South East (A & B) (17.4).

**The affordable homes can still be ‘pepper-potted’ within individual phases with the proposed strategy. There is no requirement to have the affordable spread absolutely evenly spread through the phasing and the approach actually ensures that a significant quantity of affordable housing can be delivered in the early stages of development. The s.106 Agreement does not require any affordable housing in phase 1.**

16. There is a large water main running along the western edge of the field behind Parsonage Close. The plan appears to show gardens over this water main. How will maintenance/ repair access to this be provided?

**See response to Q14.**

17. Why is the density adjacent to Whitehorns in Charlton 25 and that to the east of Parsonage Close is 30? This not reflective of the current density or plot size in Parsonage Close.

**The densities are as agreed and consented through the Outline application and set out on the parameter plans.**

18. No detail is provided of the screening between existing development and this development. What is the width and height of the proposed woodland between existing and new housing around the edge of Charlton?

**The indicative plot depths allow for a 10m wide landscape buffer. Heights will depend on the age of species that are planted.**

19. There are also no homes planned suitable for downsizers – a small number of bungalows built to Lifetime Homes standards near the A338 and A417 to allow access to bus services which don’t go through the development would be very attractive to the large number of older people in the area who want to downsize but still want private gardens and access to the town.

**There is no restriction within the documents to this type of property – this will be up to the individual house-builders/developers who will respond to market demand.**

20. LEMP 3 (page 7) refers to “Establishment of a 10 year aftercare plan for the new native woodland trees and shrubs” – when does this 10 years start given that the development of this site is likely to take at least 10 years?

**A 10 year after care period will apply to each area of woodland and shrubs as they are completed.**

21. Also – how does this relate to the statement in section 3.3. (page 13) “A woodland management plan will be created incorporating the first 10 years after care as described above and up to 25 years following the development”?

**A similar principle to the response to Q20 will be applied.**

22. LEMP 3 (page 7) refers to “Periodic cutting (once a year in late summer) of damp grassland associated with the SUDs drainage including swales and SUDs ponds” – yet 3.1.2.1. Maintenance (page 9) states that “Damp grassland within Sustainable Drainage System features (swales) will be cut twice a year, in March and again in September when plants will have set seed.” Which is correct?

**Once a year initially whilst the grassland established then the maintenance regime can be amended as necessary. The document will be amended to reflect this.**

23. LEMP 3.4 (page 13) refers to Multi-functional Green Spaces, yet these are not identified on any maps – can this be clarified please? What functions will these spaces provide?

**The multi-functional greenspaces are to be located throughout the development and are shown on figure 43 of page 50 of the Site Wide Strategy document. It is proposed that particularly on the multi functional greenspaces north of the WELR where possible will be sown as wildflower meadow, providing more biodiversity than just amenity grassland. The colouring on key on figure 43 is not very accurate for the multi functional greenspaces and will be updated.**

24. LEMP 3.4.1 (page 14) “Additional areas of grassland throughout the site should be managed at the discretion of the new landowner.” Which areas of grassland does this relate to and who is the new landowner referred to?

**This refers to lawns (private owners), playing fields (OCC), any other amenity areas (managed by MANCO).**

25. LEMP 3.5.2 (page 15) states “The removal of the hedgerows should be phased with replacement hedgerows and planting implemented prior to the loss of existing hedgerows, as well as the main hedgerows used by bats being mitigated by the replacement planting.” How can replacement planting be mature enough for the bats to use prior to the loss of existing hedgerows?

Can a statement be provides detailing which hedgerows will be lost, it is not clear from Appendix B?

**Refer to landscape parameter plan in strategy document. The maturity should not affect the bat routes as they will use it as a linear feature.**

26. LEMP 3.5 (page 16) How can the Barn Owls be moved to boxes on mature trees in the Country Park given that this will not be in place when the barn is demolished?

Also nesting spaces should be provided in buildings not in a tree or on the outside of buildings – see below:

The Barn Owl Trust advises that a permanent accessible nesting space for Barn Owls should be provided within one or more of the developed buildings to which the consent applies, and thereafter maintained. Barn Owls will use any type of rural building (domestic, industrial, agricultural etc.) and on-site provision can be made in any building provided that the entrance hole is at least 3 metres above ground level, big enough, visible and leads into

a nest chamber of adequate size. Typically, in a range of barn conversions the provision is made in the tallest one and in new-build housing the provision may be in a house or a garage block overlooking open countryside. Although the alternative provision can be more temporary, the permanent provision should be in a building that is expected to last at least 100 years and not in an unconverted agricultural building, on the outside of a building, in a tree, or on a pole.

<http://www.barnowltrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Barn-Owls-and-Rural-Planning-Applications-a-Guide-2015.pdf>

Barn Owls are afforded special protection from disturbance whilst nesting under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) as amended. As c. 75% of nesting cycles fall between March and August inclusive, this period should be regarded as the main breeding season and a restriction applied on the commencement of works during this period. This enables the local authority to fulfil one of their obligations under Section 25 (1) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981).

Nesting has been recorded in every month of the year. Please be aware that it is the developer's responsibility to ensure that nesting Barn Owls and their dependent young are not disturbed during development works.

No building and construction work should take place within 30 metres of any part of the site containing material evidence of Barn Owl occupation unless survey-based evidence has been provided to the Local Planning Authority that no birds are nesting (at the development site to which the consent applies) within 3 days of work commencing.

**It is not planned to physically move the owls but the proposal is to provide compensatory habitats. It is assumed that there will be no roosting in houses in the development as the presumption is that the country park is the main foraging area. The WELR provides separation from the residential development so the roosting habitat and foraging habitat is enclosed within this area. March to August will be avoided and bird nesting checks will be carried out before any existing nests are removed.**

27. LEMP 4 (page 17) *"The management plan should run for a period of 10 years."* – when does this 10 years start given that the development of this site is likely to take at least 10 years?  
**See response to Q20.**

28. The VWH Design Guide states that "The approach is to make sure developments fit the character of their local area, to make sure they look like they belong there." Yet the proposed building materials in the strategy seem to include a lot of wood cladding (using examples of Belgium or Cambridge) so it's going to look like any other development in Europe and won't reflect the existing character of our area. There is no reference to any attempt to reflect the character of the local area in the development.

**We would disagree with this statement – the precedent images and inspiration have been directly taken from local buildings and construction materials (which include timber cladding). The resulting material palette therefore reflects both the VOWHDC Design Guide principles and the local area. It is up to the Reserved Matters applications to set out the final designs and to ultimately determine the character, but the design strategy is specific to the locale and consistent with the VOWH Design Guide.**



29. 16.10 cross section diagrams A and B show green space and open space with no dimensions. Why is that the case?

**Dimensions are not given where the width of open space varies.**

30. Given recent announcements from the Government about the need for all weather playing surfaces – shouldn't the playing fields include an all-weather surface?

**There is no requirement for an all weather pitch as part of the outline permission.**