

Vale of White Horse Local Plan (Part 2) 2011-2031

Examination Hearings

Statement by Oxfordshire County Council

Matter 4

Abingdon and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area

Tuesday 24 July 2018 and Wednesday 25 July 2018

Questions:

4.1 Other than Dalton Barracks (Matter 5), are the housing allocations listed in Policy 8a the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts? Are the estimates of site capacity justified? Are the expected timescales for development realistic? Are the site development template requirements – both general and site specific – justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?

(a) North of East Hanney

(b) North East of East Hanney

(c) East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (in Fyfield and Tubney Parish)

(d) South East of Marcham

4.2 Are the proposals to safeguard land for (i) a Park and Ride site at Lodge Hill and (ii) a north bound bus lane along the A34 between Lodge Hill and Hinksey justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?

4.3 Are the proposals to safeguard land for a Park and Ride site at Cumnor justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?

4.4 Are the proposals to safeguard land for the Marcham by-pass justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?

4.5 Are the proposals to extend the area of safeguarded land for the Upper Thames Strategic Storage Reservoir justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?

Response

1. Question 4.1: The County Council has no additional comments to its Regulation 19 response in respect of the two East Hanney sites and the Marcham site. In respect of the two East Hanney sites we said (paragraph 50 of our Regulation 19 response) that the two proposed allocations for 50 and 80 houses at East Hanney are relatively well located for public transport and the primary school is being expanded to accommodate growth, therefore any County Council issues in respect of these two sites will be localised ones. In respect of the South-East Marcham site we made it clear that Marcham is not a favoured location (paragraphs 47 and 48 of our Regulation 19 response) but did not raise a particular objection given the limited number of 90 houses.
2. Question 4.1 cont: In respect of the Kingston Bagpuize site, the County Council is involved in ongoing discussions about the requirements, viability and timescale for development. While early delivery of this site is anticipated in the District Council's published housing trajectory, in the course of discussions on transport, the County

Council has advised that the trajectory is optimistic as it is likely to be necessary to have additional strategic transport infrastructure in place prior to development of this site.

3. Question 4.1 cont: The County Council sought specific amendments to the site development template for the Kingston Bagpuize site (Regulation 19 response issue 12). The specific amendments seek recognition of the need for the developer to provide measures to alleviate traffic flows through the centre of Kingston Bagpuize and make specific mention of Frilford Lights in respect of the need to contribute to infrastructure improvements. The VOWHDC has agreed with these and has proposed a modification (AM25) with the amendments. We support that proposal for a modification.
4. Question 4.2 (i). The proposal to safeguard land for a Park & Ride site at Lodge Hill is justified, it being in accordance with the Oxford Transport Strategy in LTP4 as stated in our Regulation 19 response (paragraph 54). No adverse impacts on the currently rural land are anticipated from the act of safeguarding the land.
5. Question 4.2 (ii). The proposal to safeguard land for a bus lane on the A34 between the Lodge Hill and Hinksey Hill interchanges is justified, it being in accordance with the Oxford Transport Strategy in LTP4 (as stated in our Regulation 19 response paragraph 52). The proposal does not rely on a Park & Ride site at Lodge Hill as it could be implemented separately to provide a rapid transit link between Abingdon and Oxford. The safeguarding only applies for the northbound direction, catering for the morning rush, as there is not the same level of congestion southbound. No adverse impacts on the land are anticipated from the act of safeguarding it. A detailed investigation has not been carried out but it is noted that the land adjoining the A34 is either wooded or open rural land and land within the current A34 highway boundary can also be used.
6. Question 4.3. The proposal to safeguard land for a Park & Ride site at Cumnor is justified, it being in accordance with the Oxford Transport Strategy in LTP4 (as stated in our Regulation 19 response paragraph 53). No adverse impacts on the currently rural land are anticipated from the act of safeguarding the land.
7. Question 4.4. The proposal to safeguard land for a Marcham by-pass is justified, it being necessary to ensure that alternative ways of addressing traffic in this location are not compromised given increasing levels of traffic, and the need to improve air quality (as stated in our Regulation 19 response paragraphs 57 to 59). The area proposed for safeguarding is largely floodplain and rural and no adverse impacts are anticipated from the act of safeguarding the land. The boundaries of the proposed

allocation for 90 houses in this location have been designed to avoid the proposed safeguarded area.

8. Oxfordshire County Council is seeking to attend the hearing should the Inspector have any queries to direct to the County Council in respect of the Matter 4 questions.