

	Major Issue
	Minor Issue
	Resolved/No action required

Consultee	Comment	Response	Resolved
Grove Parish Council	No Objection	No objection.	Y
Countryside Officer	<p>No objections to the MUGA, NEAP and landscaping proposals. I do not recommend that the update ecological walkover survey is accepted for the purposes of Condition 11(f).</p> <p>This does not need to prevent the grant of reserved matters consent though. The ecological walkover survey (Tyler Grange) undertaken in November 2022 is not to be relied upon to inform this phase. 1.13 of the ecological walkover survey states that GCN are likely absent from the site as amphibian exclusion fencing has been maintained to prevent recolonisation of the site following the capture and translocation of GCN under licence.</p> <p>The Tyler Grange report is proven to be inaccurate and not suitable to support this application by the ecological impact assessment (EclA) completed by Wildwood Ecology (survey undertaken in April 2023 - more recently) provided under P23/V1928/RM. This EclA found that amphibian fencing has been left in a state of disrepair around the site, pitfall traps remain in situ and are an entrapment risk to species, and have demonstrated GCN reconolised the site subject to this application. The phase boundary will need to be subject to an update survey and a review of the suitability of the site-wide GCN licence will need to take place.</p>	<p>The comment states that the report and walk over is not accurate or suitable to discharge outline condition 11. This comment is made on the basis that a Newt was found within the wider Grove Airfield development. It is important to stress this is not within the red line for this application nor within the scope of this ecological walkover and therefore it is not understood the bearing this has on a report nor its findings.</p> <p>The wider site has been subject to an updated GCN license that was confirmed in October 2024 (submitted with this application)</p>	Y
Forestry Officer	The submitted tree protection plan provides adequate details for the protection of existing trees with relation to the NEAP and MUGA installation. These measures should be in place throughout this phase of development. I am supportive of the landscape officers comment with relation to tree species selection, fastigate tree species should swapped out for larger canopy species as there appear to be the opportunity for this	Larger canopy tree species are now present within the replan.	Y

Consultee	Comment	Response	Resolved
Landscape Architect	<p>Reference needs to be made to the S106 Agreement with regards to the proposals for the site especially the MUGA. The MUGA is considerably undersized compared to that which was specified in the S106. While there may be a need to update the design with regards to current best practice, such as lower fencing, the proposed MUGA does not reflect what is specified in the S106.</p> <p>I suggest that reference is made back to the Open Space Development Brief with regards to trees species. While the Open Space Development Brief proposes planting including tree species this is not an exhaustive list but a good starting point. However, the tree species proposed for the park are not wide enough in range, they should be predominately parkland trees to take advantage of the space and more urban species used in the housing area such as the <i>Betula utilis jacquemontii</i>, <i>Carpinus betulus 'Fastigiata'</i> and <i>Acer campestre 'Streetwise'</i> should not be used in the Community Park. There needs to be more range of species used in the planting, too much <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> is proposed.</p> <p>It would make sense if the whole of the southern avenue was planted, the way the redline is drawn would mean only part completed paths and avenue.</p> <p>The Open Space Development brief states that Informal footpaths will comprise of mown grass and hoggin gravel footpaths in contrast to formal footpaths and cycle paths where bitmac is proposed. I would expect the footpaths serving the play space and the main avenue footpaths to the east and south to be bitmac as indicated in the Open Space Development Brief and also the S106, not the hoggin proposed.</p> <p>There is opportunity to increase the accessibility and play value of the play space, talking tubes could be linked into the plane theme, communicating between sections of the play area, also play tops to some of the picnic tables such as airport/ car maps and games boards.</p> <p>The two swing units are similar in design, I suggest a unit which includes an accessible swing seat such as J439 along with a playing together swing seat such as J438 would provide more traditional and accessible swing unit catering for a different age range.</p> <p>The integration of the NEAP with the wider adjacent POS should be designed into the wider parkland area. It would be appropriate to have picnic benches and seating in the wider POS and all the picnic benches to be accessible. I note the Open Space Development Brief states metal benches are proposed around MUGA and NEAP creating a feature with a different feel to this zone.</p> <p>The Open Space Development Brief also indicates where interpretation boards and bins are also expected in different areas of the POS, these have not been included in the design but are expected in this area of the POS.</p>	<p>The MUGA has been removed from this application, however space for a S106 compliant MUGA has been indicated within the plans.</p> <p>Tree species have been changed to address comments.</p> <p>Only part of the path can be accommodated in land under Persimmons ownership at this time. The land surrounding this is currently not within Persimmons ownership, as to future proof this route this section would be built in part thus avoiding any further issues in the future for the connectivity through this parcel.</p> <p>Path surfacing has been updated.</p> <p>The play equipment has been updated to incorporate more accessible play however talking tubes have not been incorporated as these can easily be vandalised and become a maintenance liability.</p> <p>Benches are incorporated in the wider area</p> <p>Bins and interpretation boards are now present in the wider POS.</p>	Y
Crime Prevention Design	No Objection	Noted	

Consultee	Comment	Response	Resolved
S106 Officer	<p>The scheme does not fully comply with S106 agreement:  MUGA is not large enough to accommodate full-size netball or tennis court  Lit pedestrian access to the MUGA is required  Lockers are to be provided at the MUGA entrance  Fencing height around the MUGA is below the required 3m</p> <p>In addition (not necessarily requiring planning permission)  Proximity of disabled parking drop off is not identified  Emergency vehicular access to the MUGA has not been demonstrated  Boot scraping is to be provided at the entrance  Cycle parking is required</p> <p>The LEAP appears to provide the necessary play experiences and is of a sufficient size – just a couple of areas where the requirements of the S106 are not met:  Access to be provided by macadam footpaths  Cycle parking is required</p> <p>The equipment will require a positive post installation RoSPA inspection before bringing the area into use and is to be subject to both practical completion and final completion inspection prior to transfer</p>	<p>The MUGA has been removed from this application, however space for a S106 compliant MUGA has been indicated within the plans. This has been done so in line with discussions with the council and the agreed strategy to progress this application. The MUGA will come forward in a separate future application in line with residential parcels to the north that will provide the required vehicular access. The potential to move the MUGA to the sports pitch area to the east was deemed not desirable by the town council.</p> <p>Access path surfacing has been updated.</p> <p>Cycle parking has been added.</p>	
Drainage	<p>It is assumed that proposed surfaces will be permeable with drainage potentially released at a slow rate to the swale shown on the main landscape drawing. It is however unclear from the information provided whether this will be the case and also how proposed levels will work. Some additional information should therefore be provided to confirm the strategy and drainage intention.</p>	<p>Regarding the need for a piped drainage solution this would not be required. Essentially as the hard surfaced areas are located within green landscaped areas the finished levels of the hard surfaced areas to the NEAP, MUGA and surrounding paths would be set so as to fall towards the green landscaped areas allowing any surface water to drain into these landscaped areas. This is standard practice when there is landscaped areas to drain to, avoiding the need for water to be unnecessarily diverted to specific piped drains/water courses. This follows the principles of the previously approved LEAP within the site.</p>	

Consultee	Comment	Response	Resolved
Leisure	<p>Proposal</p> <p>Reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for NEAP and MUGA following application ref. P17/V3130/FUL.</p> <p>LFAS/PPS</p> <p>The Leisure Facilities Assessment and Strategy Draft (2024) states that new MUGAs should be considered at the Strategic Housing sites, including Grove Airfield (South sub-area) (page 8).</p> <p>Vale of White Horse Leisure Facilities Assessment and Strategy - Vale-of-WhiteHorse-Leisure-Facilities-Assessment-Strategy-and-Action-Plan.pdf (whitehorsedc.gov.uk)</p> <p>Mutli-Use Games Area (MUGA) Specification</p> <p>Sport – The sports activities shown on the data sheet – Multi-Use Games Areas state basketball, football and handball. However, 4.0 of the MUGA Outline Specification states each MUGA will be suitably marked out for a range of activities including netball, tennis and mini tennis in accordance with the latest Sport England guidance. These sports should be included in the design. An example can be seen on page 36 of the Sport England Artificial Surfaces of Outdoor Sport.</p> <p>Size - The Multi-Use Games Area design sizing does not correspond to the Sport England guidance and is currently undersized. Once the size and layout have been adapted the designs can be checked with the relevant sporting bodies.</p> <p>Surfacing – The proposal drawing (15C) states that the surface of the MUGA will be bitmac. Section 2.1 of the S106 states that the surfacing will be a single porous material with drainage to prevent ponding. The surfacing will comprise two courses of open textures Bitumen macadam above a graded stone foundation and geotextile membrane. Confirmation is required to confirm that the bitmac surface is the same/equivalent or better than bitumen macadam.</p> <p>Confirmation that vehicles can access the MUGA for emergency use is required. There is no mention of other elements highlighted in the S106 such as Shoe/boot scraping equipment will be provided outside each gate. At the entrance of each MUGA: lockers will be available for players, there will be at least six cycle parking spaces.</p> <p>Aftercare/ ongoing maintenance of the MUGA should also be considered. Sport England Artificial Surfaces of Outdoor Sport - artificial-surfaces-for-outdoorsports-2013.pdf (sportengland-production-files.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com) Leisure objects to the proposed reserved matters design.</p> <p>Recommendations:  To review the sizing of the MUGA  To update the design/line markings of the MUGA to allow for netball, tennis and mini tennis.  To ensure the application aligns with the S106</p>	<p>The MUGA has been removed from this application, however space for a S106 compliant MUGA has been indicated within the plans. When further housing to the north comes forward inline with phasing access for vehicles will be provided and the MUGA application alongside. It is proposed that a DoV to the S106 and the MUGA delivery take place.</p>	
Env Health	<p>Thank you for consulting the Environmental Protection Team on this application. I have no objection to the reserved matters considered in this application. Regards</p>	<p>No objection</p>	
Env Protection	<p>I have reviewed the application from a contaminated land perspective and have no observations. Colleagues will respond separately with any air quality or general environmental protection observations, where requested.</p>	<p>No objection</p>	

Consultee	Comment	Response	Resolved
Highways	<p>Appendices 15 and 16 of the approved Section 106 agreement sets out the requirements for the proposed NEAP and MUGA. Having assessed the submitted information and accompanying drawings, I have the following observations.</p> <p><b>NEAP</b> 3 cycle stands have been provided off the northern 'Hoggins' footpath. I note that the number of cycle parking spaces has not been set out in the approved Section 106 agreement. On this basis, when considering that provision for cycle parking has been provided, I would have no comments.</p> <p><b>MUGA</b> Details of vehicular access to be provided for emergency use has not been provided. The submissions should provide dimensioned drawings clearly demonstrating that emergency vehicles are able to access and egress the site without impacting the safety and convenience of users of the site and the adjacent highway. Cycle parking in line with the section 106 requirements has not been detailed. This is required in order to ensure objectives and measures of the LTCP are met. No information has been provided in relation to the vehicle drop off point and disabled parking space within the site vicinity.</p> <p><b>Condition 11</b> The CEMP should detail where staff/contractor parking is to take place to ensure no indiscriminate parking along the adjacent network</p>	<p>The MUGA has been removed from this application, however space for a S106 compliant MUGA has been indicated within the plans. When further housing to the north comes forward inline with phasing access for vehicles will be provided and the MUGA application alongside. It is proposed that a DoV to the S106 and the MUGA delivery take place.</p>	
Sport England	<p>In terms of the submitted reserved matters, we have reviewed the documentation Sport England. Sport England does not comment on NEAPs as this out with our area of expertise.</p> <p>Regarding the MUGA, there is insufficient details submitted in order for us to recommend discharge of the reserved matters for the MUGA element.</p> <p>We require: a section though the MUGA at the edge; proposed levels of the MUGA; details of the drainage of the MUGA</p> <p>Once we received this information we be able to re-assess the application.</p> <p>Sport England Position:</p> <p>In light of the above, Sport England wishes to object to the details submitted, for the following reasons:</p> <p>If this application is to be presented to a Planning Committee, we would like to be notified in advance of the publication of any committee agenda(s), report(s) and committee date(s).</p>	<p>The MUGA has been removed from this application, however space for a S106 compliant MUGA has been indicated within the plans.</p>	