

**Summary of Comments received during the Additional Consultation,  
December 2009-February 2010**

<b>About You</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	
	<b>Number of responses</b>
<b>About You?</b>	199
Male	103
Female	91
Withheld	5
<b>Physical or mental impairment?</b>	
Yes	9
No	178
Withheld	12
<b>How old are you?</b>	
1-16	3
16-24	3
25-34	11
35-44	25
45-54	23
55-64	43
65+	79
Withheld	12
<b>Ethnic Group</b>	
<b>White</b>	
British	183
Irish	1
Other	1
English	5
Welsh	1
Withheld	8
<b>Black/Black British/ Mixed/Asian/Asian British/Chinese/other</b>	0
<b>Where did you hear about exhibition?</b>	
Council's website	18
Letter from council	34
Parish newsletter	21
Newspaper	43
One of our exhibitions	38
Leaflet	19
Word of mouth	13
On meridian Local TV	2
Poster in Wantage LSP	2
None of the above	7

From neighbour or local resident	14
Through original committee report	1
<b>Where did you find this leaflet?</b>	
Library	3
Council offices in Abingdon	4
Wantage LSP	4
One of our exhibitions	36
Delivered to door	3
<b>Suggestions to publicise consultation?</b>	
Local TV	8
Local Radio	10
Notice up in Post Office	2
Oxford Times and Mail	1
Local news sheets	4
Wantage & Grove Council to advertise	1
Public meetings	1
Email notification	2
Large notices around town	2
Leaflet provided to each household affected	21
Libraries and school	1
Direct press in parish magazines	1
Parish notice boards	3
Forms available in shops, health centre	3
Send notices to clubs and societies	1
Leaflets in Independent Advice Centre	1
Leaflets left in local surgery	2
Leaflets in Independent Advice Centre	1
Use Faringdon Area Protect	1
Use Focus on Faringdon	1
Wantage Herald	1
Village websites	1
Posters in empty shop units	2
Use Malthouse surgery	1
Presence on market day/sat mornings	1
Display at leisure centre	1
Display at senior schools	1
Posters at bus stops	1
Posted to each councillor	1
Community centre notice boards	1
Contact resident association	6
Contact large employers	1
<b>Any other comments?</b>	
Exhibitions to be open for longer	6
Exhibition badly organised	1
Too crowded in a small space	7
Supply plans to take away	1
Saw no advertisements for this event	2

What has ethnic group got to do with this	4
Please take note of what we are saying	1
Council newsletter has yet to arrive	1
Abingdon Deputy Town Clerk found out from Herald	1
Like to see full results of Consultation	1
Tell people they are happening in advance	3
website difficult to navigate	1
More info required about cancellations	1
Keep master plan and model in reception	1
More info in more detail in Abingdon Herald	1
Sop making only available by computers	2
Longer time for consultation required	1
Previous consultees have not been contacted	2
Why no age group under 16	2
Not fair consultation period was over bank holiday	3
Why did developers not attend	2
It would appear it's already forgone conclusion	1

<b>General Comments</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Support</b>	
Thank you for continuing effort and professional support given to parish councils on the Swindon issue.	
SEEDA welcomes the additional housing numbers to be accommodated on the identified sites.	
Defence Estates Operations South have no objections as proposals do not appear to impact upon MoD sites in the Vale.	
<b>Comments about the consultation process</b>	
Have no confidence that locals are being listened to.	16
Needs to be better publicity for public consultation.	7
Consultation took place over Christmas holidays, in contradiction with the SCI. This delayed post and deadline for comments had to be extended due to snow.	5
No revised Core Strategy document has been made available, just a summary leaflet.	5
Consultation events should be at the start of the consultation period, not the end. Insufficient time to comment.	4
Wantage exhibition was poorly laid out - too crowded and only one display on the Wantage development.	2
Council were unaware that North Drive was privately owned. North Drive Management Company and North Drive Residents Committee have not been consulted.	2
Minutes from SLAG should be made available.	
Information/plans/sketches at Vale offices were not clear.	
Leaflet omitted map showing houses planned south of B4493 between Harwell and Didcot - not the favoured location in January	

2009. Leaflet also omitted mention of improvements to Rowstock junction.	
Leaflet does not show a map of Wantage/Grove area.	
Leaflet looks expensive.	
'Your Vale - Your Future' suggests this consultation gives locals a chance to express themselves on a planning decision that has already been made by an unelected South East Partnership Board.	
Why has North Hinksey not been mentioned in the leaflet?	
Exhibitions are normally held in Cumnor/North Hinksey.	
Consultation should be about 'Our Vale', not 'Your Vale' - all in this together.	
Publication of meeting and cancellation of original meeting was woeful (Wantage).	
Why did councillors not attend the events?	
Mays Properties Ltd have had no response to numerous comments made on Preferred Options and would expect much higher involvement.	
Harwell Parish Council had no response to comments made on Preferred Options.	
Have Faringdon Town Council's previous comments been taken into account? Will we be given an explanation as to why the Vale has rejected significant parts of the submission?	
More direct consultation needed with parish councils affected by proposals.	
Consultation should be delayed until full evidence base is available, including the up to date retail study.	
Is this the final consultation on the Core Strategy? How can we influence other aspects of the Strategy? Will the final draft be published before it goes before the Vale of White Horse District Council Development Control committee?	
Council must give a reasoned justification for allocating the strategic sites.	
<b>Responded but had no specific comments to make.</b>	
Theatres Trust have no specific comments to make.	
Coal Authority have no specific comments to make.	
South East England Partnership Board have no specific comments to make.	
CABE unable to make specific comments but provide general advice on design issues.	
South West Councils will only respond when there are issues relating to general conformity or alignment.	

<b>Housing Other</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>

<b>Numbers &amp; Distribution</b>	
<b>Agree/suggestions</b>	
Decision that there would be no major housing south west of Abingdon welcomed. Traffic bad enough now. Facilities should still be improved though.	2
Welcome building of new housing as employment and to provide homes	1
Botley is considerable (750) and no extra, beyond 3 parcels identified, is needed.	1
I suppose that an expansion of housing in the Vale is a necessity.	1
Pleased that Council is considering allocating land for 12,175 homes to provide appropriate flexibility.	1
The provision in principle of new housing in the Grove/Wantage area to meet the needs of the RSS is supported.	1
Support council's acceptance of need for flexibility to meet the South East Plan's housing requirement for the Vale in accord with Government guidance.	3
As many new houses as possible should be built in the Vale to meet demand. Development should only be prevented for good reason.	1
Continued allocation of land at Grove Airfield is supported	1
Shrivenham residents do not wish the village to expand, are concerned about Swindon expansion, want a green buffer between village and expanded Swindon, are concerned about light/noise pollution and there is a clear need for housing for the elderly in the village.	1
We should survey our assets like a shipwrecked sailor i.e. finances, amenities, land areas and use them first to assist the taxpayer, the elderly and the young	1
Ten percent increase in housing will provide flexibility to deal with effects of recession. New houses should be directed to the main towns and villages.	1
New housing south of Park Rd Faringdon will support bus services.	
<b>Disagree</b>	
The additional consultation proposes the provision of more houses than required by the South East Plan. There is no need to go beyond the South East Plan numbers. If over provision is made, and existing consents cannot be withdrawn, it will lead to permanent loss of Greenfield agricultural land.	4
It is conceivable that after the 2010 general election, Government policy on development in the south east may be reviewed. This may give greater recognition to the need for the protection of agricultural land	1
Sufficient land is readily available to the north of Grove to accommodate the level of housing proposed at Crab Hill. Site is available, less intrusive in the landscape and is more sustainable. The site will also assist in the delivery of development at Grove airfield.	2
Sufficient land is readily available to the north of Grove to accommodate the level of housing proposed at the Harwell Science & Innovation Campus. Also this land is readily available and deliverable,	1

will lead to the early implementation of the northern link road – required for development of the former Grove Airfield, will fit in with the airfield site and the proposed new rail station, will have good access to existing employment opportunities and local facilities in Grove, will not lead to coalescence, will not involve land with agricultural or landscape value, will not have a harmful effect on the surrounding countryside and can be satisfactorily drained.	
Remain in favour of smaller provisions of housing attached to settlements such as Steventon and Radley. Earlier representations in respect of sites in these villages have not resulted in the inclusion of these sites in the Strategic Housing Land availability Assessment and the council is asked to explain the reasoning for this.	1
Sympathetic village growth would meet the requirements of PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' and meet the aims of PPS3 'Housing' for sustainable rural communities.	1
A more dispersed pattern of housing on small sites in the villages would aid housing delivery in a timely fashion and could be used for positive enhancement of the villages.	1
Important that development does not lead to the coalescence of villages.	1
More than the minimum of prime agricultural land taken for housing would be irresponsible. Available brownfield land should be used.	1
The council's approach to housing provision remains unsustainable as it fails to recognise and ignores the needs of the rural areas.	1
Abingdon is at capacity. It's a commuter town and traffic ruins environment.	1
Concerns about how 1200 homes can be built without developing on flood plains or green spaces and increasing the traffic congestion	2
SHLAA identifies land between Larkhill and Chain Hill (WG5a) but site is close to AONB, new development has increased traffic/parking problems in the area, there is a steep gradient on the site. Another site encroaches on the AONB (WG7a). Other more suitable sites should be developed.	1
SHLAA sites WG4, 5, 6 & 7 are in or next to the AONB. The AONB is a national landscape designation which should be protected from development and particularly light pollution. All other sites should be considered ahead of those in the AONB.	1
Land to the west of Manor Rd should not be considered suitable for development. It has been rejected previously on grounds of traffic and effect on the AONB and the situation has not changed. There is still no justification for building in the AONB and recent development has made the situation worse. There are also nature conservation interests on the site. Site is already being used as a car park. Also you are allocating houses without improving services. Should use less protected Green Belt land at Botley.	1
Development for even small numbers in Stanford in the Vale should be totally ruled out because of school capacity, sewerage and flooding that has been worsened by over development at Forest Grove.	1
Do not need as much housing land because of recession and reduced population forecasts. Housing and employment should be redirected	1

to less populated North.	
Should take account of Steventon facilitating 24 affordable houses, being subject to flooding and existing traffic problems.	1
Concerned about the effects development on Grove Airfield will have on Denchworth.	1
Housing south of Faringdon will increase pressure on poor infrastructure e.g. A420	1
Housing south of Faringdon could have implications for SSSIs which may need to be protected	1
Site A is included within the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework as it potentially contains valuable minerals. Mineral rights for these are owned by third party Grundon who have expressed interest in exploiting them. Although this may not be pursued, housing delivery may be delayed as a result. Site B however is within single ownership and unconstrained. The additional or alternative allocation of the western half of this site for 150 – 200 houses could ensure housing delivery in the first part of the plan period.	1
There is insufficient evidence to show that land NE of Wantage is deliverable. Instead the council should indicate that need will be met from small scale urban extensions such as at Chain Hill Wantage.	1
Object to allocation of 360 houses to rural part of the Rest of Vale area. Allocation should be increased to reflect sustainability of Shrivenham/Watchfield.	1
No extra housing should be built south of Abingdon because it would increase flooding and traffic problems.	4
There is no need for 10% more land for housing as targets are unrealistic, unnecessary and will lead to overprovision/loss of farmland. Also, the Conservatives may reduce numbers. But if more is needed land closer to main settlements in Green Belt should be considered.	3
More housing should be built in the villages rather than relying on the towns e.g. Steventon for up to 100 houses as it would support local services	4
Strategy is flawed as it concentrates housing in few locations, delivery will be delayed and control is in hands of a few developers. Smaller sites of 400 houses should be allocated.	4
Land for 1,000 house on north of airfield should be relocated to a number of smaller sites as the airfield is too large and is heavily dependant on infrastructure	2
Plan should consider a new town north of Grove/railway line	1
Faringdon centre is a ghetto and town has more than fair share of social housing. New development should help to improve infrastructure. Health centre will be at capacity and fire service has been reduced.	2
Infrastructure must be provided before development.	1
Capacity of site South of Park Rd Faringdon should be confirmed as 420 houses not 400 as there is a need for as many houses as possible.	1
Forty percent increase in population will cause large problems.	1

Houses should only be built if there are jobs. Houses should be big enough.	
Dwellings are being too small and do not cater for growing families or space for visitors or wheelchair users	1
<b>Affordable Housing</b>	
<b>Agree/suggestions</b>	
40% affordable housing should be a commitment in the Core Strategy to help local residents remain in the area.	1
Agree that that the 40% should apply to all developments of three or more	2
Support 40% of housing being affordable. House prices are very high for those moving from cheaper areas.	2
Applaud the good proportion of affordable housing proposed.	1
Affordable housing for local people is needed and can be built on brownfield/infill sites.	1
Support strategy for affordable housing particularly for young people.	2
Strategy should encourage elderly to downsize.	1
Support three house threshold as developers have been avoiding paying for affordable housing by only applying for 14 or less in towns. Will allow small scale development in villages for local people.	2
No comment on the threshold as it will not affect the large developments that we undertake.	1
Lowering of threshold is likely to increase demand for school places.	1
Full transport contributions will be required from affordable housing	1
<b>Disagree</b>	
Threshold of three units is too low. This will inhibit the development of small sites. Threshold should reflect current market conditions. Council's own evidence shows that only low value sites will be viable.	4
40% affordable housing on new developments over 3 no. houses is too high. Suggest between 10 and 20%. House prices will be depressed by high density.	2
Threshold should be 10 units	1
Affordable homes are a chimera. The problem is too many people.	1
How can you get 40% of 3 houses?	1
Important to have social housing but homeowners will have anti social neighbours e.g. drug dealers, violent people living next to them in same houses. Most people work hard to buy own houses and not rely on the state. 40% in private areas is too much	1
To build affordable houses for every three houses is silly. Needs to go back to 15.	1
Toolkit appears to be aimed at gaining maximum contribution through 106 Agreements which is contrary to Government guidance.	1
Don't insist on high proportion of social housing as most Vale residents work and should be able to afford to buy. Subsidised social housing for workers is a subsidy to inefficient employers.	1
The significantly lower threshold will reduce supply of larger houses which will reduce chance of employers recruiting new staff.	2
Lowering the threshold will have a negative effect on housing delivery.	

Ten would be a better threshold.	
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	
Police will require contributions to new infrastructure involving buildings and vehicles at: Grove Airfield, Shrivenham, West Didcot, Botley and district wide contributions to new vehicles	1
All housing should have maximum energy efficiency and innovative technology. Could benefit local economy.	1
Family housing with gardens are needed not flats that boost profit. Child development will be inhibited.	2
New houses should have larger rooms, decent gardens, at least two parking spaces, proper pavements no more than two storeys and buffer space for existing houses.	1
The proposed development between Shrivenham and Swindon should be dealt with in the same way as the reservoir.	1
Location of housing should be based on future transport needs which will need to be low carbon	1
Strategy should refer to district CHP provision.	1
To achieve more sustainable houses building techniques should be examined at the masterplan stage, demonstration homes should be built, basic design principles should be followed and CHP should be installed.	1
Note inclusion of suggested sites in SHLAA at Shrivenham and Botley but Green Belt is not sufficient reason to make a site unsuitable.	1
Shrivenham has an identified need for housing for the elderly	1
Agree that policy on size of houses should not be in the core strategy but should be in supplementary planning guidance.	1
Council must indicate dwelling mix in detail to allow a proper assessment of the impact of development.	1
LDF documents treat urban and rural as two separate areas instead of recognising their interdependence. This is a failing which must be addressed	

<b>Wantage, Charlton Housing</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Support</b>	
The Smith and Castle Partnership welcome council's commitment to this site. Development will deliver Wantage Eastern Link Road, a sustainable and mixed use development promoting walking, cycling and public transport, enhance vitality and viability of Wantage, and achieves the highest standards in design. Partnership own whole site – confirm land is available and will work closely with council in delivering this strategic allocation.	
Oxfordshire County Council express a preference for this site over South West Abingdon. Important to take a strategic overview of infrastructure requirements for this site and Grove airfield site to plan the locality as a whole, particularly in terms of transport and secondary provision with contributions from both sides. Site requires a detailed TA and contributions to the SCOTS Recommended Strategic	

Transport Package.	
Development provides greater markets, resources etc for local businesses and acts as catalyst for regeneration of market place.	
Link road to the east is in a good position.	
Pleased to see Charlton Heights only accessed by foot and cycle.	
Pleased to see new development includes open space/country park.	
Relieved to see education for new area is being thought through.	
West Hendred Parish Council in favour of a road from Grove to Milton Heights.	
Accept gap between Wantage and Grove should be maintained and that the site NE of Wantage causes less impact in overall terms than alternative sites.	
<b>Support subject to certain conditions</b>	
Before houses are built, infrastructure needs to be in place, including a drainage ditch or equivalent with a bridge over it.	5
Will there be sufficient parking, wide enough roads, pavements and proper cycleways on the new estate?	3
Railfuture (and others) support designation provided the new rail station is built and a frequent bus service connects the new development with Wantage centre, Grove centre and Grove station.	2
Must provide easier travel within and to and from Wantage/Grove (including viable alternatives to car travel). Publicise new X36 bus route and improve evening and weekend service.	
Ensure cycle paths integrate with the Wantage/Grove cycle network proposed by HarBUG.	
Provide extensive network of cycleways within Wantage/Grove and to other towns and employment centres.	
Junction of relief road with A417 would have to be controlled by lights, not roundabout to avoid a bottleneck.	
Maintain Charlton Village Road as a closed road and site the new facilities close to the eastern bypass for easier access.	
Must get traffic out of Wantage market place.	
In order to avoid Wantage becoming a commuter town, need to improve roads, public transport, facilities. Give town a real heart.	
Grove needs its own identity, public transport and facilities.	
New estate needs to be separate from current estate.	
Place people carefully in new homes, for example do not put young single mums next to old folk.	
Should carry out historic landscape/townscape characterisation and conservation area appraisals to assist management of change.	
Co-ordinate with town centre improvement study, Extensive Urban Surveys, Historic Environment Record and SMR for the area.	
Persimmon Homes support site provided it does not delay early delivery of Grove airfield site.	
Put open space next to existing houses and new homes other side of link road protecting views and wildlife and make school environment more pleasing. Also easier to access for special needs children and elderly living in Charlton.	

<b>Object</b>	
<b>Traffic concerns</b>	
Disagree with housing proposal due to increased traffic on existing roads (A417, A338, town centre and existing Charlton estate), particularly at peak times.	92
Do not want the Wantage Eastern Link Road road here.	18
Wantage Eastern Link Road will not ease increased traffic on the A417 to Harwell, Milton Park and Didcot.	16
Wantage Eastern Link Road will not help. (Development will mean 30mph limit so people will still go through town).	7
Poor public transport. Will there be additional bus services or existing routes be re-routed, adding to journey times?	5
Wantage Eastern Link Road needs to be extended to rejoin the A417 at Challow.	2
Concern over deliverability of site because north eastern link road is not guaranteed within the lifetime of the Core Strategy.	2
Link Road enables housing but housing needs the road?!	2
Need for a major road link from Wantage/Grove alongside proposed reservoir to A34 and railway station at Grove.	2
Do not create same problems as Abingdon in Wantage.	2
Concern over construction traffic.	2
Oxfordshire County Council comment it will be difficult to provide attractive public transport to this location as it does not lie on public transport corridors.	
Wantage Eastern Link Road should be from Williams roundabout.	
Link Road will be used as a 'rat run' to south Grove.	
Link Road will be dangerous – try driving down Harcourt road Oct-March, late afternoon when the sun is setting.	
What type of road will the link road be? (speed limits etc)?	
Traffic along new link road will cause major problems at its intersection with A338 at Mably Way.	
Need a new roundabout or traffic lights at entrance to Mably Grove housing estate.	
Essential to improve A417 to Rowstock road, including a cycle path.	
Census of traffic flow should be made available to public.	
Controlled crossing of link road by Crab Hill Lane is inadequate – need underpass or footbridge, although this would prohibit vehicles using the byway.	
Unsafe to mix pedestrians and cyclists with traffic in such a narrow lane.	
Denchworth Road is not a suitable through-route, must find alternative east-west route to avoid market place.	
Implications of extra traffic from Grove airfield development are not yet known - capacity of infrastructure needs to be assessed before additional large scale development takes place in Wantage.	
Proposal for new railway station at Grove is ill-considered. Must persuade fast trains to London to stop there or it will still be quicker to drive to Didcot.	
Committee Report is not clear about relationship between road and development.	

Issue of accessing villages such as East Hendred from the A417 has not been considered. Already requesting traffic lights which will be even more imperative if extra housing is built at Wantage.	
There is no reason why new facilities could not be accessed via the eastern bypass alone.	
Why are you encouraging car use by locating development at Wantage when you have said jobs will be located at Harwell and Milton Park?	
Parking on Upthorpe Drive and Harcourt Road is to the detriment of grassed area and footpaths, making it very muddy.	
<b>Object to number of houses proposed</b>	
Why is Wantage getting more homes than everywhere else?	23
Far too many houses are proposed in Wantage and Grove.	22
This local area is already taking a disproportionate amount of development (Grove airfield, St Mary's, Old Scrapyard, Garston school site, plus other smaller locations).	22
Can we see studies done with landowners of other sites around Wantage?	16
This number of new homes will destroy the character of Charlton village and ruin the feeling of security.	5
Council should not accept Government's targets.	4
Current housing market cannot support this number of new homes.	3
Why is Wantage getting 4,900 homes rather than the 3,400 allocated in the SE Plan?	2
The proposed housing development will increase current population by 42%.	2
Inappropriate for a remote town with poor road and transport infrastructure and small population.	2
Surely the development at Grove airfield more than fills government requirements?	
Build on Grove airfield first, if homes prove difficult to sell then no point building NE of Wantage.	
The density proposed is out of character for Wantage. It is also socially and aesthetically unsuccessful.	
Housing will naturally become available over next 20 years due to average age of population.	
<b>Alternatives to NE Wantage</b>	
Abingdon can surely absorb homes better than Wantage (10% increase in population compared to 30% increase for Wantage).	22
Should put houses in Abingdon, Didcot, Faringdon, near Harwell/Milton Park, south of Wantage, north of Grove, or in South Oxfordshire instead - Abingdon is a larger town and has more facilities/less transport issues than Wantage and Grove. Didcot has a better road network. South Wantage has more amenities and better roads. Please justify decision – what solutions were offered and rejected for Abingdon's traffic problems?	13
Better to allocate one or two small sites - perhaps at one or both ends of Mably Way extension to the A417.	3

Expand villages instead.	2
If development must stay in this area it should be north of Grove.	2
Build a new town.	
<b>Effect of new housing on town</b>	
Wantage will become a 'sink' town/Ghost town/Dormitory town. It will lose its historic character and charm.	26
You are duty bound by government to enhance market town character of Wantage and quality of life of its residents, not detract from it.	21
Town will become less attractive to business and customers due to traffic/parking problems.	4
Wantage will become a commuter town.	4
Social housing brings social problems, like at St Mary's.	2
Too close to current housing.	2
New development is too far from Wantage town centre.	
Wantage and Grove will soon become one large estate.	
<b>Facilities</b>	
What provision is to be made for the new residents in terms of schools, hospitals, GPs, dentists, emergency services, roads, parking, shops, pubs, leisure facilities, and library? These need to be available by the start of the project.	31
Disagree with housing proposal due to lack of jobs nearby. Naïve to think people will only work at Harwell and Milton. These extra jobs may not even materialise. Where do the projections come from?	30
Disagree with closing Local Service Point, Civic Centre, police station and magistrate courts.	16
Wantage and Grove have been starved of facilities whereas Abingdon has them in Abundance.	
Why is Abingdon getting improved shopping facilities and not Wantage?	
The Independent Advice Centre is concerned over the increase in population considering the loss of social services, the job centre and the local service point.	
Without investment in facilities, social problems will result.	
No room for town centre to expand.	
What assumptions have been made regarding the existing shop and post office in Charlton Heights?	
Secondary school proposal is for 1700 pupils – is this adequate for 4900 homes? What impact will this have on King Alfred's?	
A youth centre located between Grove the new development would be of great value.	
Should not place recreation facilities on the edge of town.	
Additional housing NE of Wantage would require the following police infrastructure: on-site single room (9m <sup>2</sup> ) with access to welfare facilities. TVP estimate this would cost approx £28,500.	
Must provide leisure facilities within new development. Existing leisure centre is not conveniently located.	
Contributions from both this site and Grove airfield site can be	

complimentary but should also be capable of being implemented independently.	
<b>Flooding</b>	
Disagree with proposals due to a concern over flooding, including pressure on sewer system.	11
Grove Green Flood Group and Grove Parish Council are concerned about increased flow of water into Letcombe Brook. Must cover this in Environmental Impact Assessment.	2
Ensure design uses SUDs methods.	
The villages such as the Hanneys, as well as Abingdon, will suffer due to increased potential flooding downstream from development.	
<b>Environmental concerns</b>	
Intrude on strategic gap between Wantage and Grove.	27
Concern over noise and light pollution.	27
Disagree with proposals due to the loss of countryside.	24
Disagree with proposals due to the loss of farmland.	10
Loss of green space and wildlife.	7
Approach to Wantage from north, south and east will be altered with a housing development on the skyline.	7
Conservation area will be detrimentally affected, historic character will be lost.	6
How many of the new homes will be zero carbon? Plus extra cars mean more emissions. This is not a sustainable location for development.	5
Impact on AONB -should be a buffer between development and AONB and conservation area. Natural England require further information on how visual impacts have been assessed and mitigated.	4
Disagree with using green field sites when other brownfield land is available.	2
Ensure Environmental Impact Assessment includes impact of Swindon new town development on the area, especially for issues regarding transport and highways.	
Sustainability Objective 15 in Sustainability Statement refers to the built environment, but not specifically the historic environment. Therefore this objective needs broadening.	
Oxfordshire County Council comment that the proposed development would affect some known archaeological features, but nothing of national significance. In the event of a planning application an archaeological evaluation would be required.	
Open space is at a lower level than proposed housing affording no views to the north.	
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	
Cycle ways/bridleways shown on plan linking new development to Charlton Village Road are on land in private ownership. You will not be granted permission of access. Do you intend to compulsory purchase it? There is no street lighting or footpath. It is also in a conservation area and seems to serve no purpose.	7

House values will drop dramatically.	2
Select Wantage and then use planners to justify decision rather than use an objective, open process.	2
Unsure whether this is the right location for extra housing.	
Who is paying for the new dwellings? Many homes are being repossessed by building societies so will still be paying monies on past accommodation.	
Should place homes near those responsible for the decisions!	
Housing development too close to The Clock House - prestigious local building.	
Is Waitrose car park going to be part of the development?	
No mention of other sites in exhibition indicating we have no choice.	
Questionnaire has no relevance to residents of Wantage who will not visit the new development.	
What is the timeframe for this development? 2026 is too broad - when will it start, what are the stages etc?	
Vale is being run by people who care little or nothing for Wantage.	
What are 'water attenuation features'?	
What compensation will there be for current residents? Will adequate fencing be provided to retain their privacy?	
I suspect Wantage is getting houses because council feel it will attract less hostile opposition.	
How many councillors live locally? None I suspect.	
Preferred Options Document (Jan 2009) outlined pros and cons of development at Crab Hill - 6 to 4 against development.	
There are things that are priceless, such as views and sense of security that planners feel we are no longer entitled to because of government driven targets.	
It seems if we have a road we have to have housing.	
There are no benefits of this new development to existing residents of Charlton Heights.	
Should have a mix of housing types which reflect Wantage.	
Concern over deliverability of site due to lack of evidence provided to support this site as a location for considerable development.	
Need to properly justify site and address constraints to ensure strategy is sound and deliverable.	
Wantage needs an integrated policy for housing, transport and employment.	

<b>Proposed Development North East of Wantage - Questionnaire responses</b>	
	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>1. Is the primary school in the right location?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
Right position, central to new estate.	3
Hopefully Charlton school will not be affected.	3
As far from existing school as possible (which causes terrible congestion).	3

Easy access for catchment area	
What is catchment area of new school?	
Most central location to Wantage town.	
Would serve the sports side of the cricket club well.	
Provides vibrant local centre aiding cohesiveness of new community.	
<b>No</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
Insufficient parking and drop off space	8
Too close to Charlton school.	6
What is to happen to Charlton school?	4
Crab Hill Byway is too narrow, is in a conservation area, and could not accommodate increase in traffic.	3
Too crammed in with houses.	2
Next to the scrap yard?!	2
Would exacerbate existing traffic problems in Charlton Estate.	
loaded question - assumes development is going ahead.	
It is in Grove Parish, access is not very good.	
Why move it? Save cost of moving.	
Not needed.	
Access must not be via Charlton Road which is too small.	
Very narrow roads for access and no footpaths.	
Is Crab Hill Byway a road?	
<b>Alternative locations:</b>	
Central to the new community.	3
Adjacent to roundabout on the Eastern bypass.	3
Other end of estate or more central to provide a hub.	2
Site at Garston Lane.	
Near Mably roundabout to serve Wantage and Grove	
In the greenways fields.	
North of new road with proposed site used as open space.	
Near to the boundary of new development as vehicle traffic is a big problem.	
Closer to A417 adjacent to playing fields and open space.	
Situated so that as few parents as possible need to use cars.	
Further east nearer new roads.	
<b>2. Should the existing cricket ground be relocated from Charlton Village Road to the centre of the new development adjacent to the school?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Reasons/comments:</b>	
Must have sufficient off road parking, cricket only clubhouse, new nets, landscaping and be as big as existing club.	2
Current cricket ground floods.	
So that the school can use it.	
A much better location than surrounded by housing.	
Club would be happy to discuss issues of relocation.	
Existing site generates parking on a bend on Charlton Village Road.	
Subject to school being relocated to the new site.	

Ensure wicket is playable after 2 years bedding in.	
Current landlord can no longer relocate within 1 mile if he wanted to as area is marked for housing.	
Reinforces central structural elements.	
Existing site does not contribute to character of conservation area.	
New development needs open space for sport and additional playing fields.	
If it is moved, use current site to expand open space.	
<b>No</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
New site is not big enough/wrong size and shape for a cricket pitch.	9
Leave it where it is for the continual use of people as at present.	8
Cricket grounds take years to become appropriate playing surfaces - time and money.	7
Linkage between Charlton village, church and cricket ground is historic so why move it?	6
Why move it? It will just be built on.	7
Unnecessary expense (including costs of preparing field plus nets, and a new fully equipped pavillion and equipment shed)	5
Club cannot afford it - would have to be fully funded by council or developers.	4
Current cricket club is well established and attended, highly rated, and generates income from many community groups.	3
What do the club think of this?	2
Seems planners saw a white patch on map and thought 'how many houses would fit there'?	2
Damaging effect on club which currently has a well established reputation.	2
Access and parking problems	
Ridiculous!	
What about the croquet club?	
In current position it is nearer centre of Wantage and wider population.	
Cricket pitch is considered by County authorities and OCA to be amongst best grounds in county.	
What compensation would be given to the club for the delay in creating a new club to match standard of existing ground?	
Additional facilities should be provided for new development, not relocation of existing ones.	
Alternative suggestion - leave cricket club where it is and provide strips of land on eastern and northern boundaries to include barn for equipment and parking.	
Playground and leisure facilities can be located on crab hill (or anywhere) - cricket grounds cannot.	
Would be an act of corporate vandalism to destroy a recreational asset.	
Cricket ground is an attractive entrance to any town.	
Should not move sports facilities to edge of town - deters young people and encourages driving.	
loaded question - assumes development is going ahead.	

<b>3. Is the structural landscaping in the right location?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
Any green areas are welcome.	2
Lovely views from garden.	
Pleased Crab Hill Lane is to be retained as bridleway, hope it will be sensitively landscaped.	
Takes advantage of views to the north.	
Landscaping around edge of development will compliment surrounding rural landscape.	
Presumably there will be green areas dotted throughout development and mature trees maintained or replaced if felled?	
<b>No</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
Do not understand the question/Not enough information.	12
Should be a buffer between old and new development.	4
What landscaping?! Not shown on map.	4
My view will be a new housing development.	2
loaded question - assumes development is going ahead.	2
New road from Mably Way to A417 is situated on horizon, it will only move traffic to further bottleneck at Hendred.	
High risk of flooding to existing houses.	
Prefer site C or D (in Preferred Options Report) as it would affect less people. No development is suitable for Wantage when facilities are being closed.	
Hard to tell - there should be some open space within the housing.	
Need large embankment next to proposed road to 'insulate' new development from noise pollution.	
Should be on the brow of the hill.	
Unclear whether Charlton Heights estate would be used as a rat run to and from new road. Keen that this doesn't happen, but a pathway would be acceptable.	
School could overlook northern views?	
Move link road to northern edge of development and join 2 open spaces together.	
Green areas need to be user friendly for dog walkers and players, even if it means fenced off areas.	
Not enough green open space on Grove airfield development.	
Need more landscaping to make development more attractive place to live.	
<b>4. Is the open space which is located to take advantage of the views to the north in the right location?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Reasons/comments:</b>	
Maintain nice views, place for wildlife and allows walks to remain.	5
There does not appear to be many open spaces, even small ones within housing site.	

Only place where you can see north.	
open space essential when housing is dense.	
This is not easy for us to see.	
Except the road runs through it! Move the road.	
Any green areas are welcome.	
Should be bigger to follow government wishes for a healthier Britain.	
Central open space is at the junction of green corridors, resulting in a 'heart' of the development.	
Presumably area is too steep for housing?	
Seems reasonable.	
<b>No</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
Denies views to current residents.	6
Should provide a buffer zone between existing and new development.	2
Open space is fine where it is.	2
Too near to main road.	
Too far away.	
More space within building site.	
It is being left for future use.	
loaded question - assumes development is going ahead.	
Too much greenfield open space taken up.	
Space should be behind Charlton Heights so that all can have a view.	
Playing field needed north of proposed road then country park down to old canal which should be reinstated as part of development.	
Only playing field being shown is relocation of cricket club - impossible to comment when council's intentions not made clear.	
Plans are naive and unthoughtful to communities of Wantage and Grove.	
Work on roads needs to be done before this.	
If link road is moved to north of development, open space would create views for those looking north into Vale, south at the Downs, and those looking onto communal area from Elm Road (may be welcome or not, ie footballs in gardens etc).	
What happens to area east of A338 in 20 years time?	
<b>5. Some of the open space north of the road could be a country park but this would mean playing fields being provided elsewhere such as on Grove Airfield or Tugwell Field south of the Portway?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
Area shown is big enough for playing fields and country park area elsewhere.	
If King Alfred's East site is sold for housing, more playing fields will be needed.	
It would mean no houses being built.	
Benefit of wildlife.	
Easier access to Wantage and Grove.	
Would benefit Wantage, Charlton and Grove.	

Leave some of our lovely countryside for us to enjoy.	
Playing fields are not compatible with a quiet and peaceful country park.	
Traffic problems.	
Secure site for others to enjoy.	
Grove airfield could easily cope with extra sports fields.	
Playing fields need to be central and accessible without cars. Therefore make use of Tugwell Field.	
<b>No</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
Both playing fields and country park needed - must be large rather than small patches.	20
Too far away from new development.	9
Question does not make sense	7
Too small.	2
Would have to cross busy A417 to reach Tugwell Field or might drive to Grove airfield.	
Playing fields need to be close to homes, therefore needed in both areas.	
Why should these be moved? Silver band fought for years for a place to build.	
Children would need to travel via main roads to Tugwell fields.	
Utilise King Alfred's east site instead of building more houses/apartments.	
It would be good to have playing fields and country park area elsewhere.	
Playing fields for who? Local schools/other groups?	
If there is not sufficient space for both, preferable to keep playing fields in present central location.	
Large playing area in country park close to new estate might be acceptable.	
Space should be retained as open farmland.	
Sport and recreation facilities needed in this area and at Grove.	
Tugwell Field has been partly built on.	
Depends if Community Park in Grove airfield is maintained and number of houses still being considered for airfield development.	
Need space for children/families as well as dogs.	
This development cannot be reliant on other developments as this could affect deliverability.	
Airfield should also have playing fields.	
<b>6. Should a new community centre be provided on the site if so where?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
But stupid to consider this when you are talking of closing civic hall.	2
Necessary, but existing facilities also need refurbishment and enlarging.	
We have no proper facilities in Wantage.	

What facilities are proposed to occupy the community building?	
Meeting point for new residents and existing residents. We are a bit set in our ways but things may have changed in 25 years!	
Shops and a pub should also be included in the plan.	
<b>Locations:</b>	
Near to school to provide a hub for the estate. Could share facilities such as assembly hall.	6
Central location to enable easy access to all.	4
Adjacent to roundabout on eastern bypass to allow easy access.	2
Planners should decide where it should be best placed to serve residents.	
Near Crab Hill byway.	
Near to new bypass/main road from Mably Way.	
Near the cricket ground if that is relocated.	
On site of current cricket ground.	
Away from proposed cricket ground.	
Close to A338 to provide for both Wantage and Grove.	
Near convenient access point to open space.	
Near Grove.	
<b>No</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
Should be in centre of Wantage	5
Unnecessary expense	5
Should be making use of existing facilities like Civic Hall and Old Mill Hall, and proposed community building on airfield site.	2
Youth centre is fine where it is now.	
Will be a focus for anti-social behaviour.	
Help silver band with their building?	
Who pays for it? Developers might pay for it to be built but leave it for cash-strapped council to manage.	
Surely the new community should be encouraged to integrate with the established communities.	
Would have to be separate from new school or cricket club.	
No proven need for a community centre (already providing school, village green and outdoor sport facilities).	
Tugwell or Wantage Park would offer more central locations.	
Should be located with in the alternative sites (B,C,D in Preferred options report)	
<b>7. Are the proposed footpaths and cycle ways in the right location to access facilities off site?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>16</b>
Provided they are wide, open, well lit and not enclosed or with buses on the side, which encourages crime.	4
Provided they are indeed cycle ways and traffic will not be allowed along them.	2
Need assurance they will not be turned into roads.	
Access to shops also required.	
Being able to access different areas of Wantage safely is paramount	

for children/families.	
Footpaths to the south will give residents a quieter route to Wantage town centre than main roads.	
Practical locations.	
Agree with pedestrian and cycle links on to Charlton Estate.	
Cycle ways should be complete and not end at roundabouts and junctions.	
Integrated into existing and new routes.	
Provide convenient links to local facilities, town centre and bus routes.	
<b>No</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Reasons:</b>	
Should go alongside better proposed Wantage-Grove bypass.	16
Is pedestrian/cycle access along A417 and new link road really a safe premise?	3
No idea - not shown on the leaflet.	2
Will lead to rat runs through Charlton Heights.	2
Section proposed from A417 adjacent to existing landscape feature, turning left onto un-adopted land to join Crab Hill byway serves no purpose.	2
Cycle way described above is on private land, unlit and used by vehicles - unsafe for public access.	
Not enough footpaths.	
Need to be plentiful and safe.	
Will increase flow of people and therefore litter and noise.	
Too distant from local services.	
Where are current cycle ways?	
More need to be along the side of main roads.	
Unnecessary if new houses are not built.	
Essential to provide 'proper' cycle ways to and from secondary schools.	
Grove Street is a death trap north of Ridgeway garages to zebra crossing.	
No reason for access to Charlton Heights.	
Because we don't want any of this here.	
Proposing cycle path connecting new development with town centre along Charlton Village Road is dangerous as it is so narrow.	
Crab Hill Lane is already dangerous (road layout, parking, vehicle access, use by pedestrians and cyclists)	
Impossible to decide without more detailed road plans.	
Cul-de-sacs should be kept closed.	
What facilities are accessed by Aldworth Avenue? Wantage is woefully short of facilities.	
Concerned Crab Hill byway is not listed as a restricted byway.	
Do not connect to any existing cycle ways or footpaths, particularly in Grove.	2
Footpaths should be separate from cycle ways and roads.	
Cycle ways through Charlton village are dangerous - too busy during school times.	

Need footpath over main roads, especially A338.	
<b>Other comments</b>	
Too crowded to spend time looking at plans.	3
Without more detail impossible to know about landscape or anything else.	
These questions are cosmetic, do not feel I am being truly consulted.	
I still think there are too many houses being built.	
Why am I being asked to comment on a proposal I disagree with?	
Why are we being asked to comment on something not yet decided?	

<b>Harwell Science &amp; Innovation Campus Housing</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Agree/suggestions</b>	
<b>Environment Agency</b> Regard should be made to PPS23 Annex 2 and the framework document CLR 11 in order to protect human health and the environment. If there is reason to suspect contamination then discussions with the EA may be appropriate and a planning application should be accompanied by a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA)	1
<b>Thames Valley Police</b> Require a single room of 9m2 on-site with access to welfare facilities and 1 car space. Estimated cost of £28,500	1
<b>Natural England and North Wessex Downs AONB Office</b> Concerned about proposed extension. Would advise that the core strategy should make clear that any redevelopment proposals should be compatible with the features for which the AONB is designated. Landscape assessments and mitigation proposals are needed before the allocation can be confirmed as well as consultation to ensure AONB policies are addressed.	2
<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b> The site is brownfield and has the advantage of enabling housing to be co-located with quality B1 employment. Support of the site would only be given however if it can be demonstrated that residents will have access to good services without the use of the car. Impacts on the surrounding road network would need to be assessed. Welcome a few primary entrances as shown. Housing will be beneficial for local public transport network and direct footpaths will be needed. Expansion of the nearer Chilton primary school would be developer funded with footpaths and cycle links to it. Contributions would also be sought for the new secondary school being planned for Great Western Park. Further involvement in the masterplanning process is encouraged.	1
More housing at Harwell Science & Innovation Campus would be next to existing and projected employment – less commuting on local roads and near A34 for other journeys, and more sustainable development.	5

The redevelopment of this land is consistent with the Government's priorities for delivering sustainable development including the promotion of mixed use developments that create more vibrant places. The new residential development would relate well to the existing Harwell Science and Innovation Campus and be of an appropriate high quality design. This would include the existing residential development. It would also include the provision of open space and landscaping.	2
If choice is between houses or industrial buildings, preferable to have houses.	1
If there is to be housing then the homes should be in keeping with the existing starter homes. Developer funding should also be sought in order to ensure amenities can be improved to cope with the increase in population.	1
Development may cause 'urban fringe' problems. To prevent this, development must bring benefits to existing residents and there must be proper provision of public open space within development.	3
These houses would have a minimal impact on Didcot.	1
More housing at Harwell Science and Innovation Campus would be on land outside the security fence, invisible from the Ridgeway and much of it previously developed.	2
The land at the Harwell Science & Innovation Campus is chalk and free-draining. Redevelopment would have almost no flood implications.	1
A report on the site's restoration was prepared in February 2009. The Liquid Effluent Treatment Plant in the south west corner is a high priority in terms of remediation. The area immediately to its north is categorised as 'not contaminated'. The remainder of the site is suitable for residential redevelopment.	1
Support the development on the condition that the bus service between Wantage, Harwell Campus and Didcot is strengthened	2
<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>North Wessex Downs AONB Office</b> Importance of AONB protection should be highlighted within the core strategy. The site has not been based upon an assessment of local need, alternative sites available or landscape capacity. AONB should only be used for strategic growth in exceptional circumstances and this has not been justified.	1
The Harwell housing site is not appropriate because the South East Plan policy CO1 states that the main locations for new development in Central Oxfordshire will be Bicester, Didcot, Wantage and Grove. Harwell is not identified as a suitable location for strategic housing allocation. Only limited development will be permitted elsewhere. Directing strategic new development elsewhere in Central Oxfordshire will adversely affect the co-ordinated approach to effective transport networks.	2
The need for these houses is the result of an iniquitous split of housing targets between the Vale and South Oxfordshire Councils. There is no need for these houses and demand is better met by	1

renegotiating the targets.	
Disagree with strategy of strategic housing at Harwell SIC and support instead smaller provision of housing attached to other large villages such as Steventon, Radley, Shrivenham, Cumnor/Botley, Kingston Bagpuize and Drayton or other larger sites in Grove.	5
There are other areas which would more closely follow the national and regional advice on sustainable development and the existing local policy context where 400 houses should be built, such as in a town or city and not in the countryside.	12
The Harwell housing site is not appropriate because the South East Plan policy CO2 requires that in the southern part of the county, economic growth should be based on the potential that established research and business parks have for intensification and the Harwell site has already been allocated for employment growth.	2
The core strategy needs to show that this fits in with the Urban Concentration Strategy and that this number of homes is sufficient to establish a sustainable community	1
Concerned that the housing may not be deliverable in the plan period	2
This housing allocation forms part of a strategic employment site in the Employment Land Review and current local plan policies resist the loss of existing business land.	3
The methodology of the Strategic Housing Land availability Assessment would exclude this housing site from consideration for housing allocation and yet no detailed justification is given for the departure from this methodology.	2
No details of the score of Harwell Science and Innovation Campus site facilities are apparent to enable it to be compared to the larger villages. The Study of Village Facilities (2009) shows Harwell itself scores lower than Steventon and Radley where sites do not have intrinsic and policy constraints.	1
Question the housing demand since Chilton Fields has taken been so long in the pipe line and not built yet	4
Local people and the North Drive Management Company, as a land owner with a vested interest in the site, should have been consulted about this by direct communication before it was proposed.	3
It is apparent from the public workshops held in early 2009 that there is no public support for new housing at the Harwell Science & Innovation Campus site.	1
The fenced-in section of the development area is not yet fully de-commissioned and cannot be developed.	1
Appropriate surveys need to be carried out to assess land contamination and noise from adjacent land uses.	3
There is much underdeveloped land within the UKAEA site boundary and as the site is progressively de-licensed, more will be available for development. The near derelict old 'prefab' site should be returned to housing. This would be brownfield development and benefit from closer proximity to goods and services, access to the A34 and next door to the primary school.	16
Existing 'special place', quality of life and historic character and sense of community at North Drive should be left alone.	28

Where can existing local residents walk their dogs if the houses are built.	6
The existing open grassland and wooded areas should be left as an open area for enjoyment and as a children's safe play areas with 'sense of freedom'.	46
The development site is predominantly meadow and woodland which cannot be classed as a 'brownfield' site.	9
The nature conservation value of the site will be destroyed.	27
Concerns on the impact on Icknield Way	5
The risk to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and loss of important open space and trees have not been adequately considered.	24
Existing houses will be next door to a building site, which will mean local children playing in another area 'out of sight' of parental supervision or exploring a dangerous building site.	2
Development will compromise the natural daylight to and privacy and outlook of the houses in North Drive.	11
More housing will create more refuse which will mean more rats.	1
More houses in the area will have a detrimental effect on the value of existing houses.	6
Development will cause some garages to be pulled down. It is not clear if additional garages will be built for people's use. As parking is extremely limited, this could be unsatisfactory and cause inconvenience.	7
While the Harwell Science and Innovation Campus site is accessible to some services on the HSIC site, it remains isolated from higher order facilities such as a supermarket or secondary school which would be necessary to support the 400 dwellings. Many of these services are also aimed for employees only, have limited opening hours and are on short term leases	10
This area does not have the necessary facilities, such as schools or shops, possessed by other towns and villages. This has implications for sustainability and pressure on surrounding towns.	33
Community provision must be adequate, eg services, open spaces and play areas, meeting place, leisure, bus services, health care etc to make the new development work as a community and provide activities for the additional children/young people to do.	23
Schooling sufficient for future children needs to be taken into consideration to ensure adequate school places in this catchment.	25
The 'shopping area' in Curie Avenue will need considerable development to support 400 no. new dwellings.	4
The housing is not fully thought through and there should have been more information including a site/environmental appraisal, its relationship with the existing houses and the design and safe access onto the A4185, the internal road pattern, the density, design and type of housing and associated areas.	26
The development would be built at a density of 40 dph which would be out of keeping with the existing style of housing, the AONB and the density proposed for villages	3
The environmental impacts of this development contradict the aims	5

set out in the Sustainability Appraisal.	
Concerned that the extra housing could cause problems relating to sewage, drainage and water pressure.	10
Concerned that the extra housing could cause problems relating to extra crime, refuse dumping, noise and lighting.	14
The traffic problems caused by the addition of 400 no. houses (in addition to the 275 no. houses at Chilton Fields) at the Curie Avenue junction, along the A4185, and through villages like West Hagbourne will need the appropriate transport infrastructure if the safety of pedestrians and children is not to be compromised. Majority of people would not work at Harwell.	37
The extra traffic would also cause additional pollution and noise problems.	4
There are fields over the road to North Drive for sale where the houses could be built.	1
This housing results from UKAEA's wish for short term gain. It does not have the Vale's interests in mind nor other people's happiness.	9
Local people were given to understand by the site owners that when the laboratories were demolished, the site would be returned to its former state as an airfield. The cost of these works is paid for by the public but the government recoup their costs by selling what is really public property.	1
The perfectly functional houses in South Drive should be used rather than destroyed.	11
The council does not have the sufficient man power needed to evacuate almost 500 homes in the case of a nuclear emergency	3
The many cycle and foot paths that currently run through the site must be preserved in order to maintain Harwell Campus' sustainability	6
The council should not propose any more housing than stated in the South East Plan unless there is a regional revision	1
Job forecasts have dropped due to the recession. Impacts of the economic situation should be taken into account.	3
Population forecasts predict growth in the young and elderly – these houses are located unsuitably for both these groups	2
If Didcot has lost its Growth Point status then the additional homes that were planned should also be removed. This would mean that the over provision at Harwell is unnecessary.	1
Additional housing at Didcot would be preferred instead of greenfield land that will further erode the rural character of Harwell parish.	1
What will be done in order to try integrate the two communities?	1

<b>Valley Park Housing</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Agree/suggestions</b>	
Support the overall strategy for Didcot	1
Supports the provision of housing west of Didcot but the extent of development may affect four parishes and two districts. Administrative borders should be changed accordingly so that the development is in	2

Didcot and can be serviced by a single authority.	
Support the development of 2150 homes west of Great Western Park. Desirable that a frequent local bus service is provided connecting to the town centre and railway station.	2
Note the cycle route through the development. This should be designed and built to be suitable for commuting cyclists so that at junctions cyclists do not have to give way to traffic joining from a side road.	1
Important to ensure that pedestrian / cycle links are made throughout the development and also connect to other routes so that this and the Great Western Park development become fully integrated with Didcot. Properly planned and realised routes would help ensure there was not excessive car traffic.	1
<b>Disagree</b>	
Natural England and others have concerns about possible development up to the boundary of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Information needed on how potential visual impacts have been assessed and mitigated for.	2
Didcot is being forced to expand to the west because the 50/50 development split in the South East Plan was provided by the Vale and South Oxfordshire Councils. This 50/50 split should be renegotiated. It should be split based on planning considerations. A larger fraction of the housing should be in South Oxfordshire District Council. The locations for housing north of Didcot are capable of more development than seems contemplated by the district councils. A change to the distribution of housing numbers between the Vale and South Oxfordshire councils would still be in general conformity with the South East Plan.	4
Objection to development south of B4493. This is <i>entirely</i> best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. The development of BMV will reduce the flexibility of planning to adapt to changing national priorities relating to food production. To accommodate more development north of the B4493, for example, the route of the link road could be modified, the Learning Park could be integrated more efficiently with the proposed secondary school or the masterplan land use areas could be more critically examined.	2
Development south of the B4493 also removes any way of preserving a rural gap between Harwell and Didcot. It also threatens the gap with the Hagbournes.	2
Concern that features shown in illustrative Masterplan may not be carried forward and implemented.	1
Oxfordshire County Council wish to be involved in the evolution of the masterplan to ensure all county service implications are taken into account and provision of supporting infrastructure is co-ordinated and timely. In particular with regard to Fire & Rescue response times, the use of Combined heat & Power from Didcot Power Station, further evaluation of any archaeology, more information from surveys of ecological/ biodiversity value and appropriate mitigation, the detailed configuration of the primary schools and the Learning Park, the	1

detailed design of all the transport elements and the funding and provision of new public transport links.	
The Master Plan shows development over all the area with the exception of the land shown as 'Learning Park'. The failure to include this land has probably meant a small area of land south of the Didcot – Harwell Road has had to be included in the plan.	2
The Master Plan identifies the land south of the Didcot – Harwell Road which is divorced from the main development area and which renders it unsustainable and inappropriate.	4
Master Planning should not be based on land ownerships because this will invariably lead to contrived and poor design.	2
Objection to exclusion from the proposed development of an area north of this area and immediately adjoining the Didcot Link Road. An attractive gateway to Didcot can only be achieved by including this excluded land.	1
Disappointing that owners of land within the developed area were not invited to discussions about the future planning of this area.	1
Important to remember that West Hagbourne is also affected by growth of Didcot to the west and has been affected in the past by Didcot's growth. Escalating traffic volumes require the provision of a relief road. Not acceptable for Vale and South Oxfordshire District Councils to consider these issues separately.	1
Plans of Valley Park show no green buffer along A34 and between the development and surrounding villages, especially as these abut the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	3
The countryside around Didcot is semi-urban fringe and the most accessible for Didcot's population. This fringe area should be managed and used to improve people's everyday lives.	1
No provision for a cemetery to cope with new residents.	1
The ancient bridleway 'The Driftway' was unfortunately cut by the building of the A34. Development may offer the opportunity to preserve and enhance this route and not become part of an urbanised buffer zone.	1
The land involved is classed as 'best and most versatile' agricultural land and must be protected from built development as a critical natural resource, as confirmed by a recent Government statement (March 2009).	1
It has been reported that the funding linked to the extra 1500 homes as part of the growth point has been withdrawn. If this is the case there should be an equivalent reduction in the dwelling number. Reductions in the number of jobs forecasts at Milton and Harwell Campus should also mean a reduction in overall housing numbers required	1
In previous consultations it was indicated this site was as sustainable as other sites in Didcot however this included Didcot Hospital which is not a general hospital and has no A&E services	1
The only roads that run into Didcot centre are the A4130 and B4493 which are both very busy. This has implications for the people living on Wantage Road	1
The housing density must not be increased	1

The whole area south of the B4493 could be used for housing – this could provide an extra 237 to 355 homes which could be subtracted from the Wantage extension.	

<b>Gypsies &amp; Travellers</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Agree/suggestions</b>	
Talked to council employee ten years ago when we had sites with amenities for travellers which they refused to use.	1
Remember the council housing travellers and their livestock on privately owned housing estates.	1
The extra provision of pitches at Redbridge Hollow should count towards the requirement for the Vale and should mean no further provision.	1
Support inclusion of policy for travellers in core strategy but location in Green Belt is provocative. However it may be the best option and travellers should be treated with dignity.	1
<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b> Strategy should indicate that SE Plan allocation of 12 pitches may increase. Policy should refer to access to the highway network.	1
<b>Disagree</b>	
The proposal for a gypsy and traveller site in the Green belt is a bad precedent.	1
Finding sites close to settlements may be difficult so criteria should refer to sites within a reasonable proximity of settlements.	1
Proposed site for travellers should be identified more clearly.	1
Reference to large vehicle manoeuvring should be restricted to travelling show people sites.	1
Criteria four should be rewritten to be positive to accord with Government guidance.	1
Plan should go to 2026 not just 2016	1
Criteria are supported but there should be a specific requirement for sites to meet all policies	1
Criteria should refer to amenity of adjacent residents and compatibility with adjacent land uses	1
Employment element of use makes it incompatible with residential areas.	1
Policy does not say that site occupiers should obey the law as they do not at present e.g. tax discs	1
Police are unable to explain numerous thefts from small businesses in the area	1
Access to traveller sites is not as free as to housing areas.	1

<b>Abingdon Town Centre</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>

Comments were received in two main ways; a 'tick-box' questionnaire and a general comments form. The responses from the general comments form and any comments from the tick-box questionnaire are summarised first followed by the tick-box questionnaire answers.	
<b>Health Centre &amp; Library – re-location</b>	
<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Including Malthouse Surgery</b> Re-location of Health Centre to upper floor is unsuitable because patients, who are likely to be ill, disabled, mothers and elderly, will find access difficult. Their needs should be a priority. Access for ambulance and evacuations in the case of an emergency could also be affected. Lifts are unreliable and off putting.	95
In order that they stay on the ground floor they should be relocated elsewhere in the town centre	2
Health centre should be expanded to cater for future needs	2
The relocation would serve to reduce rather than enhance the shopping atmosphere. It would have a detrimental impact on pedestrian flows.	2
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Malthouse Surgery</b> Surgery needs to be involved early on in the planning process to be able to use this as an opportunity to enhance and improve the services offered. Concerned that the health needs of the patients are not being addressed and that they may end up with poorer facilities than they have currently.	1
<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b> Welcome opportunity to consider relocating and expanding library as it is currently substantially lower than the requirement however this is subject to suitable funding from the receipt of the existing building. Population projections at 2016 require 930sqm. If the proposals require demolition of existing library then developer will need to fund re-provision in an agreed location and to an agreed standard and footprint. Library should be located in an area of high footfall with prominent ground floor location. At least a significant ground floor presence is expected if it cannot all be placed at ground floor. The building would also need to be fully accessible. Although it is the county's intention to vacate offices on 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor in medium term, the day centre has recently undergone refurbishment. As it is leased there would be no capital receipt available for its re-provision.	1
Library and health centre need to stay in the town centre	1
Surgery need not be in the town centre	9
Library need not be in the town centre	1
If placed on upper floors, visibility and access must not be compromised	22
Unclear whether facilities would be larger if moved upstairs	1
Transport links/drop off zone must be close by and accessible	5
It seems a waste of money that there are improvements being carried out at the moment if the surgery will be moved	2

Library needs improving with a pc area in which to work	1
<b>New shopping proposals</b>	
<b>Agree</b>	
<b>Sackville TCI Property (GP) Ltd (on behalf of Scottish Widows)</b> Proposals are in accordance with government policy in that it is in an accessible and sustainable location that can be integrated into the town centre to enhance the area. Joint working with all relevant partners will ensure a comprehensive approach.	1
Improvements are welcome/shopping environment and buildings are unattractive	102
Support proposals to improve appearance and replace and enlarge units	174
Some units need enlarging to attract some national companies	12
Support the range of uses described for the redevelopment of the Somerfield and Cargo stores. They are in accordance with PPS4.	1
A big chain hotel is needed	1
Competition is needed in the town to counter the likes of Tesco. Need a large supermarket with spending power.	6
Removal of canopies and replacement facades are more in keeping with Abingdon's character	1
<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Mays Properties Ltd</b> Welcome the Retail Study conclusion that Abingdon should be seeking to increase rather than maintain their market share. This revision has not however been published and made available to the public. Unclear on what basis a new major foodstore in the town was founded on when a smaller Aldi store was refused at Fairacres on the basis there was no 'quantitative need'. In order to improve its market share the council should promote and support further comparison floorspace/development in Abingdon beyond the small scale improvements proposed. Question whether there is a 'qualitative need' or whether this scheme is of an appropriate scale for the town (see relevant tests in PPS6)	1
Disagree with proposals/things are fine as they are	6
Cosmetic/less drastic improvements rather than demolition of the Charter would be preferred	4
There is already an oversupply of empty shop units with no retail interest/high turnover	26
There is already an oversupply/no need for offices, flats and hotels	2
The redevelopment of the Charter is at odds with the Preferred Options report and the findings of the Retail Study (limited need for more supermarkets). It will also take a considerable amount of time to deliver and may not be achievable in the plan period. This is contrary to PPS4.	1
Abingdon needs to stay independent and not turn into another clone town/will not be able to compete with the better choice available in nearby towns	15
The appearance is fine – need to concentrate on the shops/facilities	3

available instead	
Proposals would lead to less shops	1
Plans need to go further in improving the town centre	20
Improvements to the town centre are needed sooner/needs to be done quickly and with the least amount of disruption	6
A new supermarket will be in competition with other existing stores	5
It will exacerbate the traffic congestion. This needs to be sorted out.	34
There are enough food stores in Abingdon	66
Fashion retailers needed only, not a food store	44
Fashion retailers only as they don't require adjacent parking	1
Other shops would be preferred over fashion retailers	7
If a large store is necessary then bring an M & S	27
Proposals should include cinema/bowling alley/theatre/cultural place to bring people into the town	20
The proposals should include something like the 'xscape centre' in Milton Keynes	1
Canopies/complete cover is needed to shelter from rain and snow	108
No architectural merit to the fake old shop frontages - should work with what is there/bring in a more modern design for variety	10
Addition of roof tiles is unnecessary	2
There should be no flat roofs	4
The proposals seem out of keeping with the character of Abingdon	6
Need to keep small units for independent retailers. The rents also need to be more affordable.	55
Need to maintain a range of shop sizes	7
Need to support the locals shops that are currently in the town/involve them in the process	9
Oppose the name change from Bury Street Precinct	6
The Charter should not be redeveloped as the office uses provide diversity of land use	2
Should knock everything down and start afresh	4
The Charter redevelopment should happen before the cosmetic work which involves no gain of retail space	1
Doubts whether the artists impression is representative of the actual development	1
Artists impressions seems very similar to the current precinct	1
Abingdon needs to attract tourists instead	5
The council cannot force the increases in comparison and specialist shops that may take place over time	1
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Environment Agency</b> Abbey Shopping Centre falls within an area of fluvial flood risk. For this reason the sequential approach and the exceptions test need to be carried out. The Core Strategy should also set out criteria for the development to ensure flood risk is managed. Further liaison with the EA is recommended prior to the submission document being published.	1
<b>English Heritage and Oxfordshire County Council</b> The need to revitalise parts of the town are accepted however	2

proposals must respect historical context and setting of listed buildings and conservation area. The Urban Archaeological Database (UAD) and character appraisal of the conservation area should inform proposals. An archaeological desk based assessment would be expected.	
<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b> Further details are required for the design, parking arrangements and hotel. Details are also needed for the implications of the other options with open air parking. County requests further involvement in the planning process. Cycle link, footpaths and the bus waiting area on Stratton Way would all require careful consideration. Need further information on parking arrangements for the health centre and library. Re-development may also require extensive replacement of old drainage systems.	1
Emphasis should be on environmental improvement rather than comprehensive redevelopment	1
Social and public amenities need to be integrated with retail uses	2
Need more facilities in the town	2
Abingdon currently compares poorly with other towns	23
Buildings need to be environmentally friendly/made of good quality	2
Needs to be well designed and in keeping with character and heritage that enhances the market town atmosphere	31
Trees/seating areas should be include/preserved in the design	9
The redevelopment area should be extended to include more of the town such as the square	7
Should include the empty office block corner of Stratton Way/Stert St	1
Needs a better choice and quality of shops and environment as currently there are many of the same eg charity shops	72
There are insufficient independent shops	19
Cheap shops devalue the area	1
Need to ensure pedestrian link from Bury St to Bath St is maintained in order to preserve the independent stores located there which currently attract visitors to Abingdon and provide jobs. A frontage from the Cargo store would bring it back into the town centre.	12
Shops should cater to a different market than those currently there/ Waitrose or Tesco/must not be Tesco/must not be Iceland	17
Shops should be built over two floors so they can compete more with other towns	2
Closer to the time the Retail Study will need updating and may show different retail trends	1
Question what type of store will want that location	1
Concerns that recession might affect the proposals	1
Need more footfall/people need a reason to visit the town	10
Depends on the type of store/what is done. Details on this are needed	11
All the options include a food store which is at odds with the options described in other consultation documents. This may lead to confusion.	1
Food store should be built by Coxeters instead	1
Need to encourage a safe and vibrant night time town centre	2
This is one of countless other proposals that have never materialised	1

Concerns that the public's opinion won't be taken into account	4
Should encourage more live music events at pubs	1
<b>Parking</b>	
<b>Agree</b>	
Car park should not be on ground floor only as it would be unsightly and separate the new store from the town centre. The open air car park would not work well in urban design terms and would detract from the character and appearance of the area. It would also represent an inefficient use of land.	2
It will provide easy access to the town centre/shops	5
Current multi-storey is unattractive and inadequate	11
<b>Disagree/comments</b>	
<b>Including Environmental Health and Oxfordshire County Council</b> As this area forms part of the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) proposals would need to be supported by a traffic study and air quality modelling. Current proposal indicates access via Broad St onto Stert St - this assumes two-way traffic along the northern end of Stert St which is unfeasible. If traffic is directed southwards only congestion and air quality would be impacted. If access arrangements stay as they currently are then the exit onto Stratton Way would require traffic lights which would result in congestion. Traffic routing therefore needs to be considered carefully at an early stage. Oppose any narrowing of Stratton Way at the northern end.	2
<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b> Further information is required on the service area and access arrangements including details such as structural screening and implications for the pavements and taxi parking.	
Concerns about the implications on pollution levels that would result from a large multi-storey car park	1
Access on Stert Street would lead to more traffic in the town centre/ would require a reversal of AbiTS (one way system).	6
Access to the redeveloped charter area should be off Stratton Way rather than Stert St	1
Location is too difficult to access/town is already too congested	25
Should encourage public transport/walking instead	2
There should only be disabled parking in the town centre	1
Needs a great increase/enough parking facilities	17
Parking should be free/cheaper to attract shoppers back into the town. Must not increase parking charges	70
Should be free for residents	2
Should in integrated with the shops	1
Needs improved lighting	5
Multi-storey could be improved by removing Council reserved levels	2
Needs to be well designed, secure and reduce congestion	25
Disabled parking needs improving/maintaining	3
Need better toilets	1
Needs more cycle racks	1
Should build an underground car park	4

Parking should ideally be at ground level with easy access. Option 2 is preferred as open air parking is preferred by shoppers. Loss of spaces could be compensated by making it exclusive for the shoppers.	6
Needs to be easier to get in/navigate around/park	20
No different to current multi-storey	24
The loss of the multi-storey will affect the vitality and viability of the town centre.	1
The new car park should have charging points for electric cars as this could attract an electric car dealer to the town	1
Rye Farm car park should be extended	1
Need a park and ride	2
The ground floor could provide a drive through bay for loading and unloading	1
Parking facilities should be located at Coxeters instead	1
<b>Traffic</b>	
<b>Agree</b>	
Bus bays in Stratton Way are a success	1
ABITS has improved the pedestrian environment	1
<b>Disagree/comments</b>	
Congestion in the town is still a major problem to be addressed	43
The traffic needed to make the redevelopment viable could not be supported by the current transport scheme	3
Abingdon should revert back to the old traffic system as that worked better	2
The Stratton Way end of Bath St should be opened to allow lorries to avoid driving around Abingdon's small streets	1
Stratton Way/Bath Street junction (north) should be light controlled in all six directions with pedestrian crossing facilities	1
Narrow market town streets can never be expected to cope with traffic demands	1
Bus point should be in the town centre	1
Need good quality cycle lanes	1
One-way system makes cycling difficult	1
Cyclists are increasingly problematic and realistic solutions need to be found	1
Second bridge is needed	3
New junction at Lodge Hill is essential	5
Southern bypass is needed as Lodge Hill junction is not a suitable alternative	1
If the A34 cannot be improved then the idea of extending the Harwell strategic Link Road should be explored	1
<b>Other</b>	
<b>Including Vale Disability Access Group</b> All shops should be made accessible and any lifts made to the standards in the BSI buildings booklet	2

Stert and High Street should be pedestrianised	1
The Council only ever carries out short term improvements – long term vision is needed to address fundamental problems/has not made Abingdon a priority	4
Old Gaol was a missed opportunity to have a community use	1
Need something for the young to do	8
Unclear on timescales/scope of proposal	1
Could not find proposals on the web	1
Disabled access needs improving on south side of High Street	1
Need a safer pedestrian crossing from Waitrose into the town centre/pedestrians should be given greater priority	6
Need to promote the river more	7
An affordable community centre for all age groups is needed in the town	2
Streets need to be better linked with each other	3
Poor air quality in the town	1
<b>The 'tick-box' questionnaire</b>	
The 'tick-box' questionnaire asked for responses to various questions as well as asking for details of any other issues. A total of 280 questionnaires were returned. The questions are set out below together with the numbers of those who replied. Any other issues raised have been included in the summaries of the comments forms above.	
<p><b>'What do you like about shopping in Abingdon?'</b></p> <p>'Ease of walking around the town centre', 161 no. (58%)  'Pleasant Historic environment', 143 no. (51%)  'Quick journey time', 139 no. (50%)  'Good range of restaurants and bars', 64 (23%)  'Ease of parking', 43 (15%)  'Good range of shops', 41 (15%)  Additionally, 8 no. responses noted there was 'nothing to like' and 5 no. liked the good range of independent shops.</p>	
<p><b>'Is there anything you do not like about Abingdon?'</b></p> <p>'Lack of choice of shops', 206 no. (74%)  'Poor shopping environment', 190 no. (68%)  'Traffic congestion', 170 no. (61%)  'Poor parking', 119 no. (42%)  Additionally, 30 no. noted that parking was too expensive, 27 felt there were too many of the same types of stores and 23 no. felt there were too many empty shop units and a high turnover.</p>	
<p><b>'Where do you currently do most of your food shopping in Abingdon?'</b></p> <p>'Waitrose', 185 no. (66%)  'Tesco', 128 no. (46%)  'Somerfield', 47 no. (17%)  'Co-op', 24 no. (9%)  'Other food store in Abingdon/Market', 19 no. (7%)  Additionally, 21 no. responses noted they went to Didcot and 18 no. went to Oxford.</p>	

<p><b>‘Where do you currently do most of your other non-food shopping?’</b></p> <p>‘Oxford’, 185 no. (66%)  ‘Abingdon’, 84 no. (30%)  ‘Didcot’, 41 no. (14%)  ‘Witney’, 15 no. (5%)  Additionally, 20 no. responses noted that they went to Reading.</p>	
<p><b>‘Do you currently shop in the Abbey Shopping Centre? If so how often?’</b></p> <p>‘Weekly’, 151 no (54%)  ‘Less frequently’, 53 no (19%)  ‘Monthly’, 44 no (16%)  ‘Daily’, 31 no (11%)</p>	
<p><b>‘Do you agree new food store and fashion retailers will improve vitality of the town?’</b></p> <p>‘Yes’, 162 no. (58%)  ‘No’, 100 no. (36%)</p>	
<p><b>‘Which types of retailers are currently missing?’</b></p> <p>‘Fashion retailers and fashion accessories’, 156 no. (56%)  ‘Footwear’, 115 no. (41%)  ‘Cafes/restaurants/leisure’, 57 no. (20%)  ‘Food stores’, 53 no. (19%)  ‘Sportswear’, 40 no. (14%)  ‘Giftware/jewellers’, 31 no. (11%)  ‘Mobile phones’, 22 no. (8%)</p>	
<p><b>‘Do you agree that new parking at the Charter will make the town centre more attractive to visit?’</b></p> <p>‘Yes’, 164 no. (58%)  ‘No’, 70 no. (25%)</p>	
<p><b>‘What do you consider a reasonable fee for 2 hours parking in town centre?’</b></p> <p>‘Free’, 115 no. (41%)  ‘£1’, 84 no. (30%)  ‘50p’, 26 no. (9%)  Additionally, 9 no. responses felt 60 p and 8 no. said £2 was a reasonable fee. The rest of the comments ranged between free and £4.</p>	
<p><b>‘Do you or your family use the library? If so how often?’</b></p> <p>‘Weekly’, 86 no. (31%)  ‘Less frequently’, 71 no. (25%)  ‘Monthly’, 69 no. (25%)  ‘Never’, 45 no. (16%)  ‘Daily’, 3 no. (1%)</p>	
<p><b>‘The council thinks it is important the library and health centre be retained in the town centre. Do you agree?’</b></p> <p>‘Yes’, 255 no. (91%)  ‘No’, 9 no. (3%)</p>	
<p><b>‘If the council’s vision is realised do you consider you will shop more or less often in Abingdon town centre?’</b></p> <p>‘More often’, 186 no. (66%)</p>	

'The same', 72 no. (26%) 'Weekly', 54 no. (19%) 'Daily', 31 no. (11%) 'Monthly', 4 no. (1%) 'Less often', 4 no. (1%) Additionally 10 no. noted 2-3 times per week	
<b>Other stores which are currently missing</b>	
Bakers/Butchers/green grocers/fishmongers	42
Weekend/indoor market/organic shop	4
Ice cream shop/milkshake bar/outdoor cafe	4
Iceland	2
Hardware/DIY/electrical goods	43
Home/furniture/garden/pet store	12
General store	4
Department store	16
M&S	22
Fashion for older people	3
Men's clothing/tailor	12
Small independent shops	25
Ladies clothing/boutiques	2
Children's clothing	17
Underwear store	1
Next/Matalan/TK Max	2
Music store/DVDs/computer	42
Hobbies/craft/fishing	5
Antique shops	4
Cinema/bowling alley/theatre/art gallery	21
Quality stores	6
Cycle shop/car accessories	3
Dry cleaner	1
Toy stores	4
Off licence	1
Post office	1

<b>Abingdon - other</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>
<b>Fairacres Retail Park (FRP)</b>	
<b>Mays Properties Ltd</b> In spite of the economic downturn FRP has successfully completed phase 1 of its refurbishment. This has helped slow the rate of leakage of comparison spend outside the district. The Preferred Options report set out the council's commitment to FRP which was supported although the deletion of the term 'bulky' in 'bulky goods' was requested as it is not defined in PPS6 or draft PPS4. This commitment has not however been repeated in the document. If the council's approach is to prevent leakage to retail warehouses then the	1

strategy should set out how this will be achieved and what role development at FRP could play. Contributions and land have been given to improve a stretch of Marcham Rd and help towards the next section of ABiTS. Traffic at Ock St is still unacceptable. Object to the fact that planned developments in the town centre will further worsen this situation however FRP will still be expected to make contributions towards ABiTS to resolve the problem.	
<b>Facilities</b>	
There is not enough thought being put into providing facilities for young families and teenagers. Need a cinema/theatre and need to promote cultural and art events.	2
Need to do something urgently with the Old Gaol as this is vital to Abingdon's history	1

<b>Faringdon - retail</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	
The comments which have been summarised below have been received mainly in response to a leaflet entitled "The Future of Faringdon Shopping" that was circulated to over 900 households in Faringdon and the surrounding villages. This summary is laid out under the four questions asked in the leaflet. Comments that did not relate to the four questions have been included under "other comments" A questionnaire which was available at the exhibition on 26th Jan. asked the same four questions as the leaflet therefore to avoid repetitions the two sets of comments have been combined. A summary of the comments received from Oxfordshire County Council, Faringdon Town Council, Faringdon Area Project, and the landowners of two of the retail sites referred to in the consultation have been set out at the start of the report. In all 50 questionnaires were returned and 127 comments.	
<b>Oxfordshire county council</b> Support proposal to improve the vitality and viability of the town centre. If there is a need for additional floor space which can not be accommodated in the town centre Gloucester Street is preferred. For this option the impact on the local network will need to be mitigated and it should demonstrate that the site is sustainable. OCC do not support a new road from Lechlade Road A supermarket on Park Road would have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre, linked trips by walking would be less attractive. Developers would need to demonstrate how development here is sustainable. OCC transport comments agree with above but will require further details as to the design and car parking levels and arrangements for the town centre scheme, demand/capacity survey should determine if an extension to the car park is necessary. Of the two out of centre options they prefer Gloucester St as it offers greater opportunity for linked trips with the town centre and fits better with policy TC 2 of the	

southeast plan. If Gloucester Street site is chosen a bus stop will be required in the street.

**Faringdon Town Council**

Comment on three possible sites  
Alternative proposals only came to light because of Tesco proposal.

**Town centre**

Retail on offer in Faringdon is vital to the vitality and viability of the town centre. Both quantitative and qualitative of comparison goods on offer in the town centre need to be significantly improved before any convenience development is allowed outside the centre.

The option to expand Budgens would overcome some of the problems associated with the other two options. There are difficulties with this option:

- Budgens has little competition and perception that prices are high to the detriment of shoppers who can not travel out of the town
- 70 % leakage of shopping out of Faringdon is unacceptable
- Car park is inadequate which will not be addressed by 8 extra spaces
- Lack of free car parking will make it difficult for Budgens alone to attract leakage back.

Budgens should be encouraged to refit so that they can provide a significant alternative to a second supermarket.

**Gloucester Street**

Find proposal for a supermarket strange and impracticable .The site would be good for comparison shopping because:

- Access to the site would be dangerous to schoolchildren and cause congestion in the town centre
- Visibility of site is poor
- Site is suitable for mixed use development including a museum which would help improve the comparison offer in the town centre

Gloucester Street is more suitable for comparison shops rather than a supermarket

**Park Road**

A supermarket here has a number of advantages:

- Access will not add to congestion in the town centre
- It will provide the competition upon which retail thrives
- Benefit disadvantaged groups in the town

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce leakage out of the town</li> </ul> <p>A supermarket here also has disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could cause difficulties for existing retailers in the town centre</li> <li>• It will occupy a site that currently give manufacturing jobs in the town</li> </ul> <p>Supermarket here should be considered in the context of:  A plan to improve retail in the town centre by either developing the Gloucester St site for a mixed use scheme or/and developing the Portway area as an arcade of shops with accommodation  Improvements to foot and cycle routes from the site to the town centre  Free car parking for two hours at the Southampton Street carpark  Restrictions on the timing of lorry movements  An early acceptance of employment provision near to the town</p>	
<p><b>Faringdon Area Project included two statements</b></p> <p>1)General feelings about a plan for Faringdon  Outlined local food production in the Faringdon area  Budgens is capable of supplying the locality, they buy produce locally.  Need a larger car park in Southampton Street and free car parking for 2 hours. Extended car park will give Budgens the confidence to extend.  Park road site will destroy the Market Place and Cost Cutters; site should be developed into small businesses.</p> <p>2)Faringdon: A Thriving Vibrant 800 Year Old Town  People will not come into the Market Place from a supermarket on Park Road.  It would lead to the closure of the existing supermarket need a major food retail with competitive prices, good choice, quality, clean, helpful and commitment to the community and plenty of free for two hours convenient parking on level ground. Car park can be extended into Portway, Catholic church and Barclays bank car parks.</p>	
<p><b>Sandhill Consortium</b>  Has no particular views on the options to improve shopping in Faringdon but they note that a supermarket on Park Road would be closer to the new housing development and lead to less traffic congestion in the town centre.</p>	
<p><b>Musgrave Retail Partners Ltd. Rep Tiensa and Company (franchise owners of Budgens)</b>  <u>Budgens store</u>  Currently working towards a formal planning application to refurbish and expand the Budgens store.  Scheme will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sales area of 1,301 sq. meters (present store is 1,007 sq meters)</li> <li>• New back up area with customer café and toilets</li> <li>• Food range increased to 15,000 lines compared to existing 10,000</li> <li>• New frontage on to Marlborough street</li> <li>• Improved layout to car park</li> </ul> <p>Support the view that the car park should be free they would be willing to take over management and policing.</p>	

Proposal is in line with Government policy in PPS 4

Land north-west of Gloucester Street car park

Any development here is unacceptable

- Site is outside the development boundary in the open countryside and would harm the landscape and historic character of the North Vale Corallian Ridge.
- Development would not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area
- Development would result in the loss of trees and harm its ecological value
- Unclear how a supermarket will be accessed likely to have an impact on the conservation area and residential amenities
- Site has no physical or visual links with the town centre and will operate as an out of town location and could lead to closure of Budgens and the proposed investment at the store would be unviable. Store of 1,300 sqm sales would complete directly and replicate Budgens

Park Road

Tesco proposal is for sales area of 1,400 sq meters but they will quickly look to expand as it has done elsewhere there is potential on and adjacent to the site to do so.

- A store of this size would generate a turnover of £18.01m of main and top up shopping a large proportion of which will come from the town centre.
- Object because harm the vitality and viability of the town centre
- Site is not sustainable with no opportunity for linked trips and would operate as a stand alone out of town location
- Prejudice investment in the town centre
- No quantitative need for a large new food store.

The emerging core strategy needs to be updated to reflect the advice in the new PPS4 and in particular para.7.9

Consultation period should be extended until the updated retail survey is received.

**Barton Willmore on behalf of Faringdon House Estate**

Support a proposal for an allocation of the site at Gloucester for a new retail outlet which will assist in maintaining and enhancing the long term viability and vitality of the town centre

Agree with the Council that subject to the confirmation of the need for a new supermarket that their site adjacent to Gloucester St car park is the preferable location for the development.

Their own assessment demonstrates the need for a new supermarket in Faringdon in addition to any potential increase to Budgens. The question in their view is not if a new store is needed but where the best site is.

Scheme adjacent to Gloucester street car park

Site is approx. 170 meters from the town centre and consists of a proposed food store of 25,000sq ft gross and a sales area of 15,000sq ft(1,400sq.m). An illustrative layout of the store was enclosed with the submission, it consists of 100 new car parking spaces controlled by the store and could provide 2 hours free car

parking. Access to the store for both cars and delivery lorries is from the access road to the Gloucester St. car park, which would need widening on the west side, safe access to the school will be provided via the town park. Delivery vehicles arrival time would be outside the start and finish of school. Discussions will need to be held on the size of delivery vehicles. The site has two good pedestrian links to the town centre which is only 3 mins. giving good potential for linked trips between the store and the town centre. The sites contribution to the conservation area is at best neutral and is not part of the formal setting of Faringdon House. Any new building would have to be designed to meet the test of preserving or enhancing the conservation area. Several national operators have shown interest in the proposed store. No direct frontage on to the street would not reduce the viability of the store as most shoppers would be local.	
	<b>Number of responses</b>
<b>1. Do you think that an expanded Budgen's store, together with the existing shops in the town centre, would meet the needs of the town to 2026?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	64
<b>No</b>	50
<b>Comments in favour:</b>	
Need a food retailer in the town centre which has competitive pricing, good choice, clean, helpful and with commitments to the community and free car parking	3
Yes but Red Lion and the Post Office should not be demolished	2
Not necessarily Budgens need one of the larger supermarket chains	12
Only option as new supermarket in Gloucester street would lead to the closure of Budgens and have serious knock on effect on the town centre	
Yes but car park needs to be made more attractive	
An expanded Budgens will lead to opportunities for small businesses in the town	2
CPRE/VOWH first choice	
Budgens needs to remain as there are many old people living close by who will not be able to get to park road	
It should be made easy for Budgens to expand	2
It would not meet the total needs but would stop more people deserting the town	
Leave Budgens as it is and where it is	
Best option as it will give the town chance to build up and refill empty shops	
Budgens should be supported	
Yes but car park needs expanded and the store needs modernising staff need to show more courtesy	
Yes but more land needs to be made available for a store and car park	
Favour this option because this part of town is in desperate need of regeneration and investment	
Best option as it is better for those without cars either new site would	

mean those with our cars being on the wrong side of town.	
Yes because other options will result in a large empty shop in the town centre	
Budgens is adequate but if people want another brand of supermarket should look at what brand /chain could make the best use of the Budgen store rather than introduce competition	
Essential to thriving town centre and vibrant community.	14
Budgens and proximity to other shops help with social cohesion	
There are a lot of old people in Faringdon within easy walking distance of the town centre who will find it hard to walk to a more peripheral site	
Only viable option but needs to improve its basic stock	2
Ample scope for additional stores to open in a more vibrant town centre	
If Budgens reduced their prices and increased their range	2
Would support local suppliers	
<b>Comments against:</b>	
Waste of money for just another 400m2 of space	
400m2 is not enough	
No because there are more people in Faringdon now	2
No because town is dying due to lack of shops and free car parking why shop in Faringdon when you can park for free in Witney which has a greater range of shops	
Why would a bigger Budgens bring more people into the town it does not have the draw of Tesco, it is only the furniture shops which are on the edge of the town that bring people into the town	
improving Budges will not stop people shopping elsewhere for food and therefore bring people into the town	
Making Budgens bigger will make no difference because it cannot complete or offer choice of a major supermarket	
It cannot be all about Budgens keeping the town alive	
If you made Budgens half the size again and had 100 more car parking spaces it will not be as good as Tesco's	
Budgens is too restrictive/inappropriate for a large supermarket	2
Roads get very crowded	
Need more employment. There are not many existing shops.	
Expanded Budgens would result in increased car and lorries using the town centre which would defeat the benefits of the town centre improvements	
Why prop up a poor store, which has poor quality and is overpriced poor and those without cars can least afford their prices	
Expanded Budgens will not make much difference	
Competition will do Budgens good	2
Council should not protect Budgens as no real change is worse than the tescos proposal	
Budgens struggles to cope at busy times (milk, bread etc)	
<b>Other comments:</b>	
Depends on extent of expansion. Ideally all retail businesses would be focussed in town centre	
Not without substantial investment and a rebuild which would need a	

substantial increase in trade and more car parking and proper provision for delivery lorries	
Not on its own but is crucial to phase one of the portway plan ( see below)	2
Budgens is a third rate supermarket and devalues the future potential of the town	
Budgens needs urgent repairs to leaking roof and permanently open door onto Marlborough Street	
Aware of no plans are available of the intended store	
This option will not succeed under Budgen control, a complete new start is required with an operator with a proven track record this will involve expensive rebuilding	
Budgens should be encouraged to use local suppliers	
Budgens provides a good service and improving standard and service we wish them well	
A coop store in the town centre will encourage people into Faringdon	
Budgens option was undersold in leaflet	
Leaflet was heavily biased in favour of Budgens	
Where would Budgens expand to the catholic Church is not up for sale and the Post Office and Red Lion are listed buildings	
Budgens should be given all the support they can get from the planning Authority and individuals	
Budgens has improved since current management took over now stocks local products	3
Budgens is a good shop	
Existing shops are good and should be supported lucky to have such a diverse choice	
Would it be possible to return some of Faringdon's shopping character alongside Budgens but without Tesco	
Not prepared to compromise on quality and food ethics to shop in Faringdon	
Budgens store is limited by land which may not be available, if land were used for free car parking or residential or retail it might increase foot fall in the town centre	
Demolish Budgens and build new store on this site, including the car park. Either build multi-storey car park or extend car park towards the 3 storey 60s/70s buildings. This should be a free car park to encourage shoppers to town centre. This keeps traffic through town centre to a minimum.	
The best place for a new store with easy access would be on the Portway car park and the Lees, housing is unattractive and could be relocated onto the Faringdon House Estate site, Budgens could be redeveloped with small retail stores with housing above and a larger privately owned car park, this would secure the future of Faringdon	
Need a new store in the town centre is there an opportunity for a new store on the Lees and Portway housing and which could be landscaped with plenty of space for car parking	
Portway houses should be demolished and the car park extended plus mixed dwellings /flats built	2
Red Lion garden could be repositioned so that Brewery passage	

becomes longer thus extending the area for car parking	
Budgens needs to be redesigned to allow for more free parking and a range of shops like the Woolgate in Witney	
Budgens could be repositioned along Park Road as part of a new residential shopping area including hairdresser, post office and paper shop	
I shop at the co-op at Shrivenham or Highworth as both have good access free car parking and better value for money than Budgens	
Budgens should be knocked down and a car park built then visitors to the supermarkets on the outskirts have ample car parking to visit the town centre	
There is need for a greater imagination that 8 car parking spaces and an expanded Budgens	
Budgens could be redeveloped into a more up market store like the covered market in Oxford other premises could become cafes and restaurants late night opening supermarket elsewhere would draw people in until mid evening	
80% of residents shop out side Faringdon because of the lack of convenience for parking negotiating increasing levels of traffic and illegal parking	
Sad Faringdon does not support enough shopping facility for its current population or attract customers from surrounding areas	
Small shops will not stand a chance without another supermarket with a better range of goods	
Only if Budgens is huge has a wide selection of products at good prices with free parking that customers will use the other shops in the town	
Shops in Faringdon are expensive	
Most of the town centre is services rather than shops	
Do not shop at Budgens because it does not have the range /choice and is aesthetically unpleasing	2
Faringdon's growth requires greater competition	
Budgens food is bad, overpriced and in an inconvenient location	
Unreliability of basic food late in the day leads to people shopping elsewhere would prefer to shop in Faringdon if it had a reliable store	2
Only use Budgens when stuck and would not change my habit if Budgens was extended	2
Many people are in favour of Tesco because they don't like Budgens.	
Shopping experience in and around the market place should be improved	
Faringdon shops are frustrating they close at lunch time do not open late close and not over Christmas	2
Need to fill empty shops quickly	2
It would in conjunction with a second supermarket.	
Demolish some of nearby housing take in Catholic car park and Barclays bank and extend Budgens and car parking.	2
Site has more potential - Budgens is letting Faringdon down.	
Concerned about defeatist attitude of Budgens which plays into the hands of Tesco	
Budgens do not invest in the store or staff training	

Budgens do not provide high quality or cheap food	
Only deterrent to shopping in Faringdon is lack of free car parking and unnecessary to charge for car parking till 6:30 although fee is nominal with higher cost of food it is money down the drain for shoppers who can park free elsewhere	
Only use Budgens for top up shopping	
People do not shop at Budgens because it is over priced and lack of stock because there is no competition it can charge what it likes	6
Here that the cost of car parking is going up how will this help Budgens when car parking at Tescos is free	
If Budgens becomes unviable it could be used as a covered market arcade and car park	
To refit Budgens will severely restrict shopping in the store if CPO powers could be used to acquire adjacent properties this would give more flexibility to the development	
District and Town council should consider how they should help smaller shop keepers	
Existing site and Southampton street should be redeveloped Council should use CPO powers to flatten unsightly houses and put the town centre on the map redevelopment could make people feel safe and provide a gateway to the town centre more people will then come into Faringdon	
People use their cars for their main shop and will drive straight home with frozen goods so how will a foodstore benefit the town centre shops	
Could introduce a competitive element to Budgens by Threshers being a small express store	
Cost cutters should also be able to expand	
Shops should not be allowed to be converted to residential as shops become isolated from each other	
<b>2. Southampton Street car park gets busy at peak times – do you think providing 8 extra spaces is sufficient?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	21
<b>No</b>	74
<b>Comments on charging:</b>	
It should be free.	26
First hour should be free	
Greatest distraction of the town centre is the ridiculous and frustrating 40p car parking charge	
Free parking would assist Budgens especially if another store off Gloucester Street draw people into the town	
Witney has free car parking and as a result has better shops	
More free car parking needs to be the trade off of having a new Tesco away from the town centre	
Major reason for shopping elsewhere is the lack of adequate free car parking	

There is other parking relatively close to Gloucester Street.	
<b>Comments – Should car parking be extended:</b>	
Need more parking	7
Car park should be extended even if CPO is necessary	
Expanded car park would help but never not been able to park	
Need about 50 see 2005 survey	
Need about 20	
Southampton Street could be made 2 storey	8
Not enough if Budgens is to expand	2
Trade in the town is being starved by lack of parking	
Demolish middle group of Portway houses plus 2 next to Catholic church and extend car park	
Adjacent 1960's housing could be used for extra car parking and other small shops	
<b>Comments – No more parking needed:</b>	
Car park is adequate	2
In 12 years I have only once not found a space.	
Never not found a space	
Rare not to be able to park in the free places in the market place therefore no more spaces are required	
Car parking is ample more car parking does not align with OCC Local Transport Plan to reduce congestion and carbon emissions	
<b>Other comments:</b>	
Only if accompanied by more local shuttle buses	
What will have to go to make way for them how much will they cost?	
Providing just 8 would be a waste of money	
Key to town centre is to make adequate and accessible car parking	3
Could Gloucester Street car park be extended or made two storey	
Pay machines in the car park are anti-social, you have to stand in the rain and squint at your number plate	
Tricky question as a lot of people drive who do not need to, how about a free car park on Park Road as people may walk 600 meters if they do not need to pay then more disabled spaces could be made available in the town centre	
Would it be possible to extend short term ie 30 mins in the town centre	
Southampton Street needs better lighting, access and security	
Illegal off road parking is already a problem in the town centre which will be made worse	2
Spend less time on policing on street parking and use funds to enable on street parking	
Faringdon centre will never have enough parking to justify increase in floorspace in Budgens without spending unjustifiable sums of money to create as many spaces as Park Road	
Council should use CPO powers to extend car park into the Lees	2
No mention of how additional car parking would be funded can Vale afford to CPO	
Gloucester street car park should be extended and workers	

encouraged to us it.	
A few extra spaces will not encourage the 75% who shop outside Faringdon to change	
Extra 8 or 80 spaces will not improve the quality at Budgens	
If additional spaces are needed in association with extra housing car park could be expanded by buying additional land	
New car parks will be required with either of the two new stores	
Promote community bus and make space for it to drop off and pick up in the car park.	2
Bus service should be improved 66/65 is often unreliable	
Should be a free local bus from new development close to the A420 and the town centre	
Need more parent and child spaces	
An imaginative alternative is required.	
Would like to see better cycle facilities	
<b>3. Budgens has said if another supermarket is built they will not modernise or extend their store and it could lead to the store closing. Do you think a new supermarket should be built outside the town centre ?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	29
<b>No</b>	50
<b>Comments - Yes:</b>	
Imperative to retain and expand Budgens supermarket	
A new supermarket could be built even if Budgens has to close.	2
There is no suitable space big enough for a supermarket in town, so it has to be on edge.	2
Yes but depends on type of supermarket	
Gloucester Street better site to free up parking at Southampton Street.	
Favour either a small supermarket at Gloucester St or Park road which would provide competition to Budgens a large super market will rip the heart out of Faringdon	
Sadly yes because only deliverable proposals are the existing Budgens or Tesco but would need to be managed to increase footfall in the town centre	
Provide a better range	
If new store overcomes difficulty of connecting it to town centre	
People often go out of town anyway to visit the health centre and units along Park Road	
Improve alley to get to it and people would walk to town centre - its not that far!	
<b>Comments – No:</b>	
A new store will not take trade from the town centre as they are not competing for the same trade	3
Will result in a price war that will result in independent stores suffering	
No, weekly market will suffer	
Another supermarket on any site would lead to Budgens closing resulting in another empty shop	2
Need a new supermarket to support new development that is proposed	

Supermarket outside the town would be the end of individual shops in the town centre and have along term detrimental impact on the character of the town and its small businesses.	22
Another supermarket even on the edge of the town will result in the death of the town centre as has happened at Wantage	4
Lived previously in a town where a large out of town store was built resulting in a dead high street	2
Any development should be within town centre.	2
If Budgens is to be sacrificed this is the best site as it has better pedestrian access	
Park Road is too far from town centre and people will not come into the town centre exacerbating its problems.	
Building on greenfields can't be right.	2
With on line shopping and the community bus we do not need another supermarket	
No because it would impact on Budgens	
<b>Other Comments:</b>	
So be it, they have had the opportunity to develop but have not.	
Ignore their threat to close	
Budgens are blackmailing Faringdon if they are not good enough they should close	
Suspicious of Budgens comments but their business would be adversely affected and it would be unwise for them to invest heavily in the store therefore any new store should be in the town centre	
Budgens closing would be excellent redeveloped the site with a car park and boutique shops	
Rather build upwards or across the road or into empty shops.	
Few towns are able to squeeze a large store into the town centre, most have to comprise	
If central shops work hard they can draw customers in	
If a modern store can not be built in the town centre then a new store else where is unavoidable but it should be close to the town centre	
It will not close if planning permission is not granted for another use but if planning permission is granted for a block of flats it may pay the current owner to sell it may be more valuable redeveloped for an alternative use	
This is a matter for the operator rather than the LA	
Why do Budgens feel they need to close if another supermarket is built many towns have more than one	
Why do Budgens not refit and update their store now likely to be 2 years until another store is built	
Unlikely to use Budgens in the future it will be threatened by shopping on the internet	
Budgens needs a make over but this will not happen with the threat of Tesco's	
Park Road is not out of the town centre from a housing point of view.	
Reason people don't use town centre shops is because parking is controlled by the Vale, makes top-up shopping expensive.	
If Budgens closed, the site could be used to diversify shopping in Faringdon as it is a prime location.	

Threat of competition has brought prices down if an alternative shop is fended off prices will creep up again	
Budgens should move out and allow a new company to take over the store that is prepared to invest in Faringdons future	
Budgens should be replaced with a proper supermarket which would benefit locals and draw in visitors to use other shops	
No point in extending Budgens if its does not bring its prices down if it closes it could be replaced with a cheaper priced store,	
Budgens maintain a smaller store in Bampton	
Supermarket on Park Road will cause loss of Budgens plus other shops in town centre and Cost cutters in Marlborough Gardens to close	
Closure of Budgens would mean end of Faringdon retail community.	
<b>4. If a new supermarket is built, we prefer the land north west of Gloucester Street car park as it has closer links to the town centre. Do you agree ?</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	38
<b>No</b>	53
<b>Comments- Against:</b>	
Only one supermarket needed in the town centre.	4
Too much money would need to be spent on improving roads and access and ground conditions	2
New supermarket should not be built outside the town centre people do not make the effort to travel from a large supermarket to town shops it will kill the town centre	2
It is green woodland and should be maintained.	5
Too close to housing	
Would like to see it as a park as it is a very pleasant part of town	
A small supermarket here will not make much difference	
Inappropriate site for a large supermarket	
Site will only accommodate a supermarket the same size as the existing therefore offers little of an alternative	
Site is in the Conservation area	14
Development here will not benefit the town	
Spoil wildlife	2
Encroachment onto conservation area land would set a precedent for further development on conservation land, which will erode Faringdon charm	
Why build a new supermarket on a sensitive site which will be no bigger than the existing store	
Would spoil the area	1
Agree that the site is closer to the town centre but the site is not viable and it would be in direct competition with Budgens	
Land would be better used by the school	3
People will not walk even 200 yards	3
Old people who live on the eastern side of town will find it too far to walk	
Object to a supermarket here it is unnecessary	2
Could result in the closure of Budgens that would not be disastrous	2
Draw trade away from town centre and cause Budgens to close	3

Is further away from the new estate at Folly Farm	
Increased traffic near schools library and through the town.	22
Concerned access will interfere with school	2
Access is not suitable/has problems	4
Too close to the school	2
Vast majority of customers would have to travel across Faringdon to get to it	2
Increase traffic on roads not designed for it	2
Increase traffic on Gloucester Street which will not support it	3
Increase lorries through the town centre	
Lead to even more traffic chaos	
Would thrust the town back into the pre by-pass days when the town was a night mare to get through	
Increase traffic to unacceptable levels along Gravel Walk which serves 3 schools and has narrow pavements	
Residents in this part of town already have enough hassle with restricted parking	
Do not want creeping urbanisation.	
Site is too small for a supermarket	
Favour Tesco option - better in long term and greater prospect of actually happening.	
Not if it is in competition with Budgens.	
Do not agree with either site.	2
There is little room to improve junction onto Gloucester Street	
This is as remote as Park Road.	4
Site is hidden away and more suitable for residential use	
In conservation area, on a slope, next to schools, limited access...	
Building in a conservation area is irresponsible and an example of Council making up rules and then changing them	
Site is impractical	2
<b>Comments – Yes:</b>	
Subject to three hours free parking so that people will visit the town centre	2
Faringdon is large enough now to support a second supermarket and Budgens is established to maintain its position	
If a new supermarket has to be built this is the best site	
This would be a good second option if Budgens could not be redeveloped	3
Strongly support a supermarket here in conjunction with Budgens as the competition will be good	
The walk from here into town would be more attractive and interesting and therefore more likely to be used	
Extra car parking will benefit the town	2
A new supermarket here would benefit the town it would give price and store competition and bring in revenue especially from the villages	
Best site for access to the town centre	4
Waitrose or Marks and Spencer would be good	
<b>Other comments:</b>	

Have not seen any plans on traffic management or how people will be encouraged to walk into the town centre therefore prefer extended Budgens	
Concerned about road widening that would be needed at entrance to Gloucester Street	
If Gloucester Street car park is underused because of the walk then it would not help to extend it	
Supermarket would encourage people collecting children to use it and not go into the town centre	
Supermarket here would not be much larger than Budgens once improved	2
If you have a supermarket here and Budgens closes it should be turned into a car park	
If Faringdon House sold the land they may look more philanthropically on the town	
Better than Park road but not desirable	2
May be too ambitious and possibility too expensive	
Type of store will be important one like Waitrose would be better than Tesco and would give Budgens more chance to compete	
Suggest co-op is invited to come into the town suits Faringdon Fair Trade status and could bring their own bank	
No other stores should be allowed adjacent to it so that people still need to go into town	
When people do a supermarket shop they do not visit other shops as well so the point about this site is invalid	
Incredible to see such a vague and uncostered option	
If it has good free car parking it will draw in surrounding residents just as well as Park Road	
Site would no attract passing trade	
Have no problem with either of the two new options neither would detract from the town centre, both would provide new jobs , additional car parking and result in more expenditure staying in the town	
This is a possibility but Faringdon does not need two 1400sq m stores could Budgens be converted into a series of small specialist shops along with a flag ship store in Gloucester Street	
Access issues and service deliveries need to be addressed	
Whilst the best option for the town care must be taken to protect the children from the traffic	
Cannot see how a service road from Lechlade Road will not be detrimental to the school	3
New road on Lechlade will damage the appearance of the town from the north west	
Agree, but proper access road needs to be put in, not using Gloucester Street.	
Shoppers will not come into the town centre from here	
Are any supermarkets interested in this site?	2
No detailed plans available unlike Tesco	
Would like a Waitrose or Marks and Spencer here	
Will it effect car parking spaces	
Not enough car parking for people to stay and visit the town centre	

Explore building an easy footpath to the town centre.	
Run park and ride from out of town into centre to free up car parking spaces for shoppers	
Regret this site is not being aggressively being promoted, a scheme is not worked up work so the public can understand, not held promotion days like Tesco and Budgens	
<b>5. Do you have any other comments ?</b>	
<b>For Park Road:</b>	
Park Road may be the best site if it pulls in shoppers from the villages	
Support Park Road site( Tescos.)	19
Park Road site has best access	3
Park Road site would require less work	
Park rd supermarket will enhance the range of products available in Faringdon and attract people into the town	
Tesco will not stop people using the town centre	2
Tesco is inevitable to encourage economic and social development and further retail development on the nearby industrial zone, residents who can not afford Budgens and traditional shops will shop out side the town	
The fact that Tesco is not in the town centre makes no difference because cars are used for the weekly shop	
People could shop at a supermarket on Park road on the way home and still use Budgens as they do now	
A new supermarket on Park Road would improve its appearance and give Faringdon a decent place to shop without having to travel 7/10 miles	
Park Road development would give the main approach into Faringdon a face lift which would encourage others to follow suit	
No objection to a store on Park Road as it would be better for the towns infrastructure to cope with an access direct onto A420	
Tesco would attract passing trade and there is a green space behind that could be used for a small shopping centre	
Tesco would attract people into Faringdon from a wide area a proportion of which would use the town centre shops	2
Tescos will stop people driving elsewhere to shop	
Tesco will have ample free parking	2
Tesco is good location for new housing	2
Tescos would not bring traffic into the town centre that already struggles with traffic	3
A large Tescos would serve the local community and suck in trade from Lechlade, Wantage, Southmoor and Shrivenham but would be better placed east of park road or on the green space south of Willes Close with attractive routed created along Southampton Street with electric car buddy service as well as attractive walkway and cycle route.	
Tesco is about 10 min walk from anywhere in town	2
People will walk from Park Road to the town centre	
Park Road is preferred site convenient for car travel and would improve the appearance of the entrance to Faringdon	1
Park Road is the only option store location is convent to existing	

housing and will create 100 jobs no impact on traffic congestion no impact on green belt likely to be more financially viable	
Tescos will bring people into Faringdon	2
Supermarket on Park Road will create jobs	8
600 metres may be a concern for the town centre but people going in their cars elsewhere are unlikely to go into the town centre either	
Tesco could prevent shoppers from leaving Faringdon to shop and bring new shoppers into town with easy access.	
As a resident of the new Folly Park a new supermarket would be closer than Budgens were it is difficult to park and is expensive, competition would do Budgens good, shop at garage near A420 is expensive	
Park Road is obvious location 600 metres is not a problem	
Park Road site would not result in articulated lorries coming into Faringdon	
<b>Against Park Road:</b>	
Say no to Park Road supermarket (Tescos)	15
If Tescos is built on land used by the JDS it will destroy the town centre as all. The shops would lose out resulting in closures and lose of jobs, businesses will not be able to support local events	46
If supermarket was allowed along Park Road farmers market and Tuesday market will fold	
Town centre shops would be unable to compete with Tescos lower price	3
Budgens would be closed within 3 months if Tesco was allowed	
Tesco does on fit in with a fair trade town	
A Tesco in the town will set back the towns hope of achieving CO2 reductions as they are not able to source local low impact foods they suck money out of the local community resulting in the failure of small businesses within a ten mile radius	3
Do not want Tesco food where quality and origin is unknown	
Tesco will not provide a real alternative as the size is only just bigger than the present provision	
Do not bow out to financial giants such as Tesco's	
Tesco once in place would expand and increase their hold on the town	
Tesco have no sense of community just profit	
Once Tesco have destroyed the town there will be no way of getting it back	
Development on Park Road would lead to other shed retailers seeking to locate alongside reducing employment opportunities and leave the town centre empty and lifeless	
Supermarket on Park Road would make the road and A420 too congested	4
Large stores like Tescos encourage undesirable behaviour	
Park Road site would result in the loose of employment land lack of sites B1 and B8 uses will be made worse	3
Supermarket on Park Road will result in closure of Budgens	2
Park Road is to far for people with trolleys to walk if Budgens closes	
People will not walk from Park Road into the town	2

Tesco is less convenient to come into town without designated footpath	
If Tesco goes ahead they will build a larger store than suggested they are strong enough to force out competition until they have a monopoly resulting in Budgens and the other food shops in Faringdon closing	
Tesco never stick to their plans so before long would be selling a wide range of products	
No plans to link Tesco to the town as intervening businesses are privately owned	
Tescos has shown disregard to any community it has chosen to locate, does not offer value for money, food sourcing is immoral, local shops would not survive.	2
Park Road is too peripheral to the town centre so is less preferable than the town centre but better than the Gloucester Street option	
People will not walk from Park Road into town even if it was an attractive walk which it is not	
Paths from Park Road are unpleasant and dangerous	
Supermarket on Park Road will result in the loss of Costcutter in Folly View Road	
A supermarket on Park Road will divide the town	2
Tesco are planning to attract customers from the expansion of Swindon as well as from Highworth, Lechlade and Wantage none of who would shop in the centre of Faringdon reducing the income of businesses there	
A large supermarket on Park Road would spoil the rural character of this part of the Vale which has already suffered from McDonalds at Watchfield	
Park Road will bring shoppers and jobs to Faringdon driving to shop elsewhere is not a green situation	
Concerned about extra traffic on A420 and access from Park Road	
Would not benefit town centre or encourage new stores to open.	
<b>Comment on Park Road:</b>	
Do not agree that a new supermarket need is but Park Road is the best compromise as it has better access and size offer it to Budgens and then redevelop the Budgens site	
Should have 3 hour free parking	
If Tesco is built car parking in the town centre will need to be free	2
Tesco is closure than the healthy centre which people have to walk to or catch the community bus	
Will impact on the town centre unless there is a good route into town	
Tesco has a reputation for a savage treatment of small suppliers	
Free car park could be used by those visiting Faringdon in the evening and weekends	
Park Road site would include a well lit car park making people feel safe at night	
Community bus could stop at Tesco on the way to the health centre	
Tesco should make footpaths in to the town centre from Park Road more attractive	
Park Road site should be used for a leisure centre	
Free-up parking in Market Place.	

Leaflet did not mention the size of the Tesco store will be a lot bigger than Budgens that it will create 100 jobs and give more choice	
Tesco need to establish well lit and disabled friendly footpaths along existing routes to town centre.	
600 metres argument also applies to facilities such as the Day Hospital and medical centre and youth centre	2
Jobs created by Tescos will be low paid and employees would not be able to buy houses in Faringdon and managers will live outside Faringdon therefore profits will go to distant share holders and purchase of new sites at inflated prices and not to Faringdon	
If distance from the town centre to Park Road is a problem the store could be required to fund a second mini bus to operate as a shuttle	
Development on Park Road should be provide better cycle routes	
<b>Other comments:</b>	
Leaflet does not have enough information on financial estimates and is heavily biased towards Budgens	2
A more competitive supermarket will be good for the town.	
It does not matter where a major food store is located	
Any option should retain Faringdons Market Place and surrounds as a vibrant centre for locals and residents	
Tesco were only interested in coming to Faringdon when 400 houses had been granted consent without first improving the existing infrastructure especially the post office	2
It is not a question of Budgens - another supermarket in same location would serve.	
With shopping on line new supermarkets are not required	
Supermarkets sale processed foods which are not healthily and have a huge carbon footprint with imported foods	
Instead of a supermarket Faringdon needs more quality shops selling fresh products which would not detract from Budgens and the other shops	
Has any research been done on other small towns and the success or not of their town centre	
Passionate about buying locally, value a market town that still has character.	2
A new supermarket should not be considered on either Park Road or the Faringdon house site until the 1000 homes have been built	
Everyone should have a right to cheap food which the elderly and disadvantaged do not	
Wantage shows a classic example of a large supermarket suffocating the town.	9
Prefer Waitrose, Sainsbury's, M&S, Co-op.	2
Whether Budgens or not, a supermarket must remain in the town centre as this brings footfall. Even if this is Tesco, e.g. small Tesco express.	2
Best option is an expanded Budgens with more and possibly free car park would encourage those who drive out of Faringdon to shop in the town	
People who live out of town already shop at Tesco or Sainsbury's because they have cars.	

We already have 2 charity shops and closing stores - would this improve if Tesco came?	
I offered my shop to the Co-op, they felt Tesco coming to Faringdon was a done deal.	
It is the product range and value for money that will draw in customers so store should be the largest possible for a major retailer and with plenty of free parking this will benefit local residents which should be a priority over regenerating businesses, offshoot might be to draw more people into the town centre	
The council has allowed Faringdon to slowly die - too late to revive the town to meet needs of population.	
Distance from town centre is irrelevant both sites will have the same impact on the town centre	
There is extra land that can be incorporated into Budgens, e.g. Post office and Red Lion. If Budgens cannot afford this perhaps another (Tesco?) can.	
Faringdon needs more land for business to provide jobs locally - this will encourage shopping in the town.	
Bus stopping in Market Square is convenient for elderly people.	
Too many Market towns have died as a result of out of town supermarkets it has a huge downstream on the local economy	
The decision over where a supermarket should go should rest with people of Faringdon.	2
People do not factor in the cost of travel to a supermarket as it is overridden by wider choice and better prices	
To attract more shoppers Faringdon needs a large supermarket of 8000m <sup>2</sup>	
Need shopping provision to increase if residents are to carry out main shop in the town	
Although the Council do not know there are plans a foot to develop a 450 sq m local supermarket at the far end of Park Road	
Faringdon is well served with drive in supermarkets at Highworth, Wantage and Swindon	
People would still shop in Swindon etc.	
If a site could be found big enough to accommodate a supermarket big enough people would use it and people from the surrounding villages would have a reason to come into Faringdon	
More choice of shops would bring more people into our town	
Would be sad to see small shops close - they are what makes a small town special	2
If Budgens reduced prices and increased range a new supermarket would not be needed.	
Need cheaper shops	
Why not allow car parking along the whole of Gloucester st,	
New supermarket would make life easier	
Tuesday Market should be moved to a Saturday or an evening	

<p><u>Portwell Plan</u>  The future of Faringdon shopping should be planned in three phases  1)total redevelopment of the Portway including Budgens the car park and Catholic Church which would be the centre of Faringdon Market Place shopping experience phase2) can not happen without phase one and involves the redevelopment of the Faringdon House site with mixed small retail, residential and community phase 3) which happens only after one and two is allow a competitive food retailer for example Park Road</p>	3
Prefer The Lees area for redevelopment	
Need to increase footfall in the town either by expanding the existing store or two smaller foodstores in the town centre	
It is the duty of the town, district council and county council to act for the benefit of the people and not just the businesses	
Shrivenham parish council would like enhanced shopping in Faringdon	
Faringdon needs to be marketed as a centre with a heart where you get personal service and buy things that are different	
Faringdons role as a tourist centre should be developed a museum should be supported and a theatre these enterprises are far more likely to bring people into the town	2
Suggest maps of Faringdon showing where the car parks are is displayed at the entrance to the town	
30 minute only car parking should be allowed on the Davis side of London Road	
Leaflet misses a fundamental point that some shops in Faringdon are not prospering because they fail to offer an adequate service and are over priced	
Companies outside Faringdon contribute to local events	
Has research been carried out on who shops in Faringdon	
Faringdon needs more food shops	
Why only retail Faringdon needs manufacturing and council houses	
Three quarters of Faringdon did not know about the proposal	
You have shown which way you want this to go so commenting is probably a waste of time	
Decision should be based on the wishes of residents and not local businesses	
Leaflet does not mention employment which is one of the most important things we need in the town	
Faringdon deserves a better service from local district and county councils, the vale boundary does not stop at Abingdon	
Council do not appear to know Faringdon at all.	

<b>Wantage, General Comments</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
First stage of regeneration should be to clear drains, weed road sides, clear litter, and enforce these things. Should enhance what we already have.	2
Encourage tourists to Wantage (on route to White Horse).	1

Don't need new shops - there are un-let units.	1
Actively encourage high-quality retail outlets in market place. Aspire to be like Ludlow, Shropshire.	1
High quality outlets already exist in wider area (Q Gardens, Sheepdrove Organics, Old Farm Shop, Dews Meadows, Old Farmhouse Bakery) - if only these could sell from Wantage market place?	1
Parking - Maryfield has 6 spaces for 35 flats.	1
Do not move youth centre from Wantage to Grove - people will have to walk down a main road. Put it in a vacant shop?	1
Please do not build on Stockham Farm.	1
Wantage needs a large useful community hall.	1
Swimming pool is antiquated.	1
What is the scrapyard to be used for?	1

<b>Economy</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Agree/suggestions</b>	
Share council's concerns that forecast in the Employment Land Review is too high.	1
Land adjacent to Bellingers Garage north of Grove should be allocated for employment.	2
It is noted that the proposed increase in employment will occur on the land allocated in the Local Plan	1
Predicted employment at Harwell has been reduced and may not be achieved.	1
Housing and employment development should be managed to occur at the same time to ensure long distance commuting does not increase.	2
It is noted that the reduction in job expectations has not led to a reduction in housing requirements	1
Strategy does not acknowledge role of food chain and need for small holdings/allotments	1
Employment proposals in plan are supported as it is essential to supply jobs for new residents in the Didcot area.	1
<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b> Council should explain basis for downturn in job expectations. The core strategy should explain how the two key employment sites form part of the strategy for Science Vale UK, justify the scale of development and its relationship with housing and any possible requirement for the release of smaller sites to meet local need in line with SE Plan (RE3 and BE4).	1
<b>Disagree</b>	
Allocation of strategic employment site at Harwell Science & Innovation Campus for housing conflicts with the draft core strategy vision relating to access to a range of housing, jobs and services,	1

safety and enjoyment of life and natural heritage.	
The housing site at Harwell Science & Innovation Campus is within the Science Vale UK growth area. The Employment Land Review (2007) notes that the HSIC is an expanding employment centre & recommends that the site should remain as an employment allocation with a 'stand alone' policy designation and its capacity to provide up to 35 ha of employment land should be recognised.	2
The Harwell Science & Innovation Campus is one of only two suitable strategic employment sites in the district. There are no other known sites to meet the future strategic economic needs of the district.	1
The introduction of new housing on land identified for strategic enlargement of the Harwell Science & Innovation Campus conflicts directly with all previous strategic plans for the site and the conclusions of the Inspector at the previous inquiry about the relationship between enhanced employment opportunities at HSIC and the new housing at Didcot and Wantage.	1
Replacement employment land should be identified and allocated before existing allocations, such as the Harwell Science & Innovation Campus, can be disregarded.	1
Notion that housing at the Harwell Science & Innovation Campus site would support employment use is unrealistic. There is no analysis of the economic viability of the additional housing and whether the existence of employment facilities at the Harwell site would reduce commuting or where the new residents would work.	7
Brownfield land occupied by Crown Technologies is protected for employment but is unsuitable for other users and should be used for residential development	1
The proposed core strategy makes no reference to the potential for expanding Grove Technology Park as an alternative to development at Harwell or Milton Park	1

<b>Transport</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Agree</b>	
Support not safeguarding of the route for a Southern bypass for Abingdon	4
Support new slip roads at Lodge Hill on to the A34	2
The need for good cycle routes and cycle parking	1
Support the new route of the Harwell Field Link Road	2
That SCOTS says infrastructure is essential – this must be reflected in the Core Strategy	1
Support Rowstock Western Link, but this will need careful planning as it will cut across an ancient byway	2
The objective to provide a solution to the traffic congestion at Rowstock	1
Grove railway station needs to be reopened	1
Support Harwell Field Link provided the need is proven bases on	1

meeting the impact of traffic growth from developments in the SCOTS area	
Wantage Western Link Road and A34 Drayton slips are not being pursued	1
<b>Suggestions/Comment</b>	
Routeing of new roads in SCOTS package have not taken into consideration enough the effects on both Harwell and West Hagbourne. The proposed routes do not offer a satisfactory answer to problems of traffic flows affecting these villages.	3
The area west of Didcot already has a problem with existing inadequate roads and traffic flows increasing year on year. Any additions to the road infrastructure as set out in the SCOTS package must be in place from the earliest possible moment.	3
Unless the flow of traffic along the Wantage road (B4493) is changed, rat running through local villages will continue.	1
Build northern access road from A34 Chilton interchange rather than the Harwell relief road	2
More Improvement to local roads is needed in order to restrict further traffic needing to use the A34	1
Improve the access between Tesco's Abingdon and the A34. Then much of traffic through Drayton and Steventon would disappear.	2
Need to have new roads in place at an early stage to deal with existing traffic problems	2
The strategy needs to include a scheme to positively reduce traffic flow on the B4493 Wantage Road to protect Harwell and West Hagbourne, traffic calming alone is not the solution	3
Traffic problems in Abingdon need urgent attention	2
Need to improve bus routes in the Faringdon area	1
Greater funding of public transport is needed	2
Cycle link is required between Waitrose and Broad St Abingdon	1
Cars should be prohibited in using Little Lane Wantage	1
Install an additional lane at the Ock St Abingdon double mini roundabouts, from Drayton Rd to Marcham Rd	1
Infrastructure must be in place before any further development (not yet consented) is allowed to start	2
Extra congestion on A4130 will push traffic through village to get to the A34 at Chilton so, build a new A34 slip road at the B4493	1
Harwell Link Road should be built as a dual carriageway	1
The A4130 needs to be improved	1
If Grove station is opened a footbridge over the A338 will be needed	1
Note that Wantage Western Relief Road has not been proposed by the Vale through LTP3	1
The proposal for a link road from Challow to Mably Way should be re-instated.	1
Roundabout at Harwell SIC should link straight to the A34	1
The A34 must be improved	1
If proposals to improve access to villages along the A417 involve more traffic lights or roundabouts, this will have a significant impact on	1

congestion.	
The proposed solution for Rowstock needs to be supported by a clear cost and benefit analysis; and a clearer delivery strategy rather than relying on contributions from unspecified developers	1
The Rowstock Western Relief Road will mean that the existing houses at Rowstock will be completely surrounded by roads	1
Better to improve Featherbed Lane rather than proposed Rowstock bypass.	1
New bus services along the A417 will not go into the villages, this means that people will need to walk across the A417. this is not safe	1
Traffic needs to be diverted away from East and West Hagbourne and a co-ordinated approach with SODC is essential	1
Developments at Wantage and Grove must contribute to SCOTS strategic transport package	1
Alignment of Wantage Eastern Link Road needs careful consideration to ensue that it provides an attractive alternative to existing town centre routes	1
Development at NE Wantage is not on the strategic public transport routes and a local bus service may need to be provided to ensure that the area is served by PT	1
A controlled crossing is required to Tugwell playing fields	1
Consistent with the SCOTS report need to encourage cycling, the Science Vale Cycle Network sets out a series of routes to connect key destinations.	1
The Sainsbury's undercroft car parking should be improved / expanded to cater for parking from traffic from west Wantage.	1
<b>Disagree</b>	
That the idea of reopening the Drayton slip roads on to the A34 has been abandoned	2
Rowstock Western Link Road will do nothing for congestion on the A417	2
Concern that the SCOTS proposals will not protect Harwell and West Hagbourne	3
New roads do nothing to help access into Didcot	1
Concern that OCC proposals for a new Thames bridge at Newbridge will increase traffic through Kingstone Bagpuize, Marcham and Standlake	1
Disappointed that there is no mention of rail transport or reopening Grove station	2
The transport strategy relies too much on road solutions. Public transport should be the principal mode of travel to all new housing and employment sites. This is needed to meet carbon reduction standards	1
Disappointed that there are no proposals to improve the A338	1
Strongly object that there are no proposals to significantly improve the A417	1
Development proposals will cause grid-lock in Wantage, A417 is not able to cope with additional demand, SCOTS proposals are not sufficient.	1
A338 and A417 are unsuitable to take additional traffic, known pinch-	3

points already results in congestion, there needs to be small lengths of dual carriageway built	
If new roads are proposed for accommodate growth in SCOTS area, why are there no proposals for the A420 as a result of growth at Swindon. There needs to be a reference in Vale Core Strategy about traffic impact from growth at Swindon	2
A420 need major road improvement	1
Wantage Western Relief Road needs to be built	3
Rowstock Western Link Road will have a significant detrimental impact on the AONB	1
There should be no traffic calming through Harwell village	1
The 20mph speed limit on many town centre roads is leading to increased levels of pollution. This limit should be imposed around schools only.	1
Route of a southern by-pass for Abingdon should be safeguarded	1

<b>Transport &amp; Harwell Field Link Road</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Agree/suggestions</b>	
Support the Harwell Field Link Road and the Harwell Strategic Link Road. The junction of the latter with the A4130 needs to be designed carefully, especially to allow cyclists to cross easily. Express interest in being involved in the detailed planning of this area.	3
Support the Harwell Field Link Road however feel its southern termination should be at an expanded Fermi Avenue roundabout as placing it by the bend in the A4185 will lead to severe congestion	1
Strongly support Harwell Field Link. Without this proper infrastructure the development west of Didcot should not be allowed.	4
The Harwell Field Link is a better option than the Chilton option.	2
Important to keep reasonable traffic flows through Harwell village.	1
The provision of additional accesses onto the A34 at Chilton would be encouraged by more housing at Harwell Science & Innovation Campus. This would also reduce traffic congestion at Milton and Rowstock.	1
Old tracks such as the 'Ickneild Way' and the 'Holloway' should be preserved and development should make provision for reinstatement.	5
The land should be safeguarded for the Harwell Link Road on the basis of a sound evidence base which explores the extent to which it is required to meet general traffic growth/improve existing situation rather than accommodate traffic generated by unspecified development in the area	1
Additional north south routes should be provided as an alternative to the A34.	1
Cycle paths which will need to cross the Harwell Strategic Link Road, for example, the new route along the A4130 and the existing route along the B4493 should be designed to allow the cyclists to cross easily.	2

<b>Disagree</b>	
No development should start until commitment of funding for the various link roads is in place.	3
Council's Local Development Framework documents should state that the SCOTS recommended transport infrastructure is <i>essential</i> to deliver growth.	1
The Harwell Strategic Link Road is unnecessary. A new road alongside the A34 wastes prime farmland. Better to add third lane to A34 or new sliproads onto the A34 at Chilton or Kingwell.	6
Oxfordshire County Council has concern over the 'kink' in the alignment of the Harwell Strategic Link Road.	1
The Harwell Link Road won't alleviate traffic from Abingdon/Wantage as they will still use the old route	1
Important that the Harwell Strategic Link Road and the Harwell Field Link Road are constructed sequentially as putting in only part of the proposed route would have adverse consequences.	2
Concerned that the proposed Harwell Strategic and Field Link Roads will make the A417 significantly busier which will be unwelcome at Blewbury and Upton and will cause congestion at the new junction on the A417. These new roads are also unnecessary due to the existence of the existing A4185 road and the 'B' road from West Hagbourne to Chilton and there would be benefit in creating a southbound exit from the A34 at the Chilton junction.	1
Concerns that traffic from the south heading for Didcot (and vice versa) will still cause problems in West Hagbourne and in Didcot.	1
The proposed Harwell Strategic Link Road gives no indication of how the A34 would be crossed. To rely on the A417 would be a recipe for disaster.	1
Natural England and others have concerns about the new Harwell Field Link Road within the boundary of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Information needed on landscape assessments and mitigation proposals and the effects on the tranquillity of the area and its setting.	2
The Harwell Field Link Road appears to run straight through or close to the Kingswell hotel and Restaurant. This needs clarification. A new road less than 50m from the hotel would have a devastating effect on the business.	2
Will the Harwell Field Link Road require the destruction of property or trees.	1
The Harwell Field Link Road is inappropriate. Car use should be discouraged and bus services increased, thus making link road unnecessary.	1
Of interest that the strategic road west of Didcot is characterised as two separate roads.	1
The Rowstock Western Link will ruin this peaceful area of countryside and damage the 'Golden Mile' or 'Old Hungerford Way' trackway. Its purpose and route need careful consideration.	5
Rowstock link will have very little benefit as there will then be another junction coming onto the A4185	1
The extra small roads in the masterplan will not help relive congestion	1

as people will still use the faster main routes	

<b>Reservoir</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Agree/suggestions</b>	
<b>Thames Water</b> Support the proposal. Happy to discuss precise wording of the policy prior to the submission document. The word 'minimise' (effect on people etc) and 'optimise' (creation of wildlife) should be replaced with the concept of appropriate mitigation. To minimise any adverse impacts the recreational and tourism opportunities should to be qualified. The route of the pipeline serving the Swindon and Oxfordshire Water Resource Zone that runs to Farmoor and Beacon Hill should be shown on the map and the land safeguarded. The precise route of the Wilts and Berks Canal needs to be shown correctly (currently incorrect at the south of the site).	1
<b>Environment Agency</b> Support the proposed approach to safeguard land and the suggested criteria for permitting development	1
<b>Natural England</b> Agree on the need to minimise environmental impacts and maximise opportunities for environmental enhancement. There have also been previous comments made on the scope of the council's Environmental Impact Assessment.	1
<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b> Support the council's approach. A new Steventon-Hanney Road is important for future bus services from Wantage/Grove to Milton Park/Didcot and this should be recognised, along with cycle routes, if a more detailed policy develops. A feasible bus road could be provided from Steventon to Milton Park avoiding the Milton Interchange. Interested to know the reason for the inclusion of Abingdon Common within the red line.	1
<b>Sport England</b> The following additional objectives should be included if the plans are brought forward: - Promote sports use whilst taking account of nature conservation - Allow provision of ancillary facilities (e.g. boathouses) where need is shown - Consider appropriate management solutions to conflicts between sports and nature conservation and between different sports	1
Support the council's suggested approach	9
No objection to the reservoir – it could bring many opportunities	2
A better location would be the lakes at Lower Windrush	1
The reference to the replacement Hanney to Steventon Road should be more specific and specify a route south of the railway line from the Williams Roundabout to Milton Hill. This will benefit both the villages and employment prospects in Wantage and Grove.	2
The reservoir could be an opportunity to build a new link road (and	1

cycleway) from Milton/Steventon area towards Grove	
The reservoir could be an opportunity to improve the road from Abingdon to Wantage	1
Concerned that in Thames Water's draft plan an area has been included on the East Hanney side to accommodate the loss of the flood plain however the same has not been done on the Steventon side.	1
Wording from the Committee Report which referred to mitigating the wider environmental impact "including on the local and wider highway networks" should be included in the new policy	1
Recreational activities should include informal activities such as walking and cycling and safe access routes from all neighbouring villages	1
<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Steventon Parish Council</b>	1
Consideration must taken of the fact that Steventon will be the most affected village	
Need has not been shown	5
The council should vigorously oppose it and protect the rights of the Vale's residents	1
It would occupy a vast amount of land and it's impacts would be wide-ranging	1
It will replace valuable agricultural land	1
Water saving techniques such as replacing old pipes should be carried out first as this may remove the need for a reservoir	2
<b>Other</b>	
<b>Drayton Parish Council</b>	
The map implies that the dimensions have been agreed when it should only be schematic to show the location	1
The map should be changed as Thames Water have said that even if the need is proven the reservoir might be significantly smaller	1
The map seems to show the Wilts and Berks Canal running through the reservoir. A tow path for horse drawn barges should be provided.	1
Regardless whether the reservoir is constructed, the link (shown on the map as the Overflow Channel) from the Wilts and Berks Canal to the southern edge of Abingdon needs to be maintained to serve as both a canal and flood relief for the River Ock	1
If any works are required Thames Water must pay for it up front	1

<b>Environment</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
BOWT are concerned about lack of district wide biodiversity policy. Increased number of housing makes need for green infrastructure even more pertinent. Should carry out desktop study using data from TVERC and further Appropriate Assessment.	1
Planners need to appreciate scale of climate change.	1

Oxford Brookes University had no response to the request of removing Harcourt Hill campus from the Oxford Green Belt - does the council consider this appropriate and if so, when?	1
Need to ensure route of Wilts & Berks Canal is safeguarded.	1
North Wessex Downs AONB are concerned that development outside the AONB will affect its setting, particularly housing and roads in Wantage, Grove and Didcot.	1
Oxford Green Belt Network are concerned that there are no policies in the Core Strategy about the Green Belt.	1
Electricity should be obtained from Abingdon Weir. There has been an EU award for looking into using rural weirs for electricity. Learn from Goring example.	1
Oxfordshire County Council are concerned that the Core Strategy will not include policies on the Green Belt. However, national or regional policies should not be duplicated so the Core Strategy might just point to existing guidance.	1
Shrivenham Parish Council request that a green buffer zone and screen are established to preserve the rural character north of the proposed eastern Swindon expansion.	1

<b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>	
<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Number of views</b>
<b>Agree/Suggestion</b>	
Is there any implication for the Sustainability Appraisal from the High Court challenge to the South Oxfordshire Strategic Development Area?	1
A detailed ecological footprinting of Faringdon and surrounding area is needed including analysis of significant external inputs and outputs of resources and goods.	1
<b>Disagree</b>	
The Sustainability Statement (2009) gives only a limited explanation for the Harwell Science and Innovation Campus site's consideration for housing. There appears to have been no robust assessment of the HSIC site.	1
The Sustainability Statement (2009) gives no justification of why distributing development to a number of small sites on the edge of villages would not increase their sustainability.	1
The Sustainability Statement (2009) has not been updated to consider the additional options and the proposals put forward are not sound.	2
Declining oil supplies should be a factor	1
An environmental report as required by the regulations has not been submitted so there is insufficient information.	1
Consultation of issues and options should only occur after baseline information is collected.	1

<p><b>Faringdon Town Council</b>  Definition of sustainable should be “meeting present ecological, societal and economical needs without compromising these for future generations i.e. living within the innate carrying capacities defined by these factors”. Council has not published the targets and standards that it will be working to e.g. climate change, waste reduction and resource exploitation. Faringdon is distant from the two key employment sites and residents travel furthest to employment but there is a lack of viable employment land. To ensure sustainability the core strategy must support local employment. Development must be supplied with adequate walking/cycle links to prevent rise in short car journeys.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><b>Oxfordshire County Council</b>  Increased housing - Increased quality of life for vale residents should be indeterminate not positive. Cannot show positive effect on economy, vibrant communities or improving built environment from house building as it depends on many factors. New allocation - Cannot show positive effect on skills or economy from new housing. Should be indeterminate. Affordable homes – Access to high quality services is not relevant to affordable housing. Road impact natural environment and climate change should not be negative because housing is affordable. Affordable housing is no less likely to generate energy from renewables. Why is pollution factor negative? Gypsies and Travellers – traffic impact should be neutral as new sites may meet existing need. Effects on natural and built environment, sustainable use of land and climate change may not be negative. Economy – why are education and renewables factors negative? Abingdon retail – impacts on congestion and air quality will be negative. Reservoir – why are quality of life, economy, poverty, vibrant communities, health, climate change and water resource factors all positive?</p>	<p>1</p>