

# Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Schedule of Proposed Draft Main Modifications Representation Form

**Please return by 5pm on Monday 1 April 2019 to:** Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email it to [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

This form has two parts:

**Part A** – contact details

**Part B** – your comments

## Part A

Are you responding as an: (please tick)

☒

Agent

☐

Business or organisation

☐

Individual

A name and contact details are required for your comments to be considered.

### 1. Personal Details

### 2. Agent Details (if applicable)

Title



Full Name



Job Title (where relevant)



Organisation

(where relevant)



Address Line 1



Address Line 2



Address Line 3



Postal Town



Postcode



Telephone Number



Email Address

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

The Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Schedule of Proposed Draft Main Modifications includes a series of changes to the published Local Plan. These suggested modifications have been recommended by the Planning Inspector and are considered necessary for the plan to be found sound.

The documents below are therefore being consulted on for a period of six weeks:

- Schedule of Proposed Draft Main Modifications
- Schedule of Draft Maps and Figures
- Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum
- Habitats Regulations Assessment Statement re Proposed Draft Main Modifications
- Additional Air Quality Evidence
- Additional Transport Evidence

Please provide the relevant modification number or document to which your comment relates:

Proposed Modification Number / Document:

MM2/MM27/MM28/Additional Air Quality Evidence/Additional Transport Evidence/SA Report Addendum

Please provide your comments below:

### SUMMARY

These comments relate to the issue of whether LPP2 has taken appropriate account of air quality. It is considered that on the basis of the evidence the Council or the Inspector ought not to be persuaded that it has been, and should require the overall pattern of development in MM2 to be changed as a result of air quality considerations in the Marcham Air Quality Management Area, principally by removing the Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (allocated for 600 dwellings in LPP2 Core Policy 4a) and the Dalton Barracks (allocated for 1200 dwellings) allocations, and if supported by the evidence the North-West of Grove allocation (for 400 dwellings). If the pattern of development is not changed then the Site Development Templates for the LPP2 allocations in Core Policy 4a ought not to allow the occupation of the dwellings in planning applications that are made for these sites prior to the completion of the Marcham By-pass in the same way that MM27 and M28 do not allow the occupation of the dwellings at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Dalton Barracks prior to the completion of the upgrade to Frilford Junction.

### COMMENTS

Planning policies should sustain compliance with and contribute towards limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas. This is because the links between poor air quality and health are well established, for example in the WHO 'Ambient (outdoor) air quality and health' September 2016, and it is a factor in determining the pattern of development.

From the LPP2 hearing session into the proposed Marcham allocation for 90 dwellings the Council, and the Inspector, is well aware from Councillor Catherine Webber's contributions of the history of a by-pass to Marcham, stretching back almost a Century, and of the direct health impact from poor air quality in Marcham leading to the AQMA designation and the Council's Air Quality Action Plan that was formally

adopted in 2015 to address poor local air quality in Marcham.

Air quality is a consideration in the 2017 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the LPP2 and in the 2019 Sustainability Report Addendum (SAA) in support of the MM. In the SA “issues/uncertainties are highlighted in respect of: Pollution (given a risk of worsened air quality within the Marcham AQMA” and that “A proposed monitoring framework is presented within Appendices of LPP2, and links to Policy CP47a (Delivery and contingency). The plan monitoring framework should provide a good basis for monitoring the effects of LPP2. The ‘uncertain’ effects [highlighted through appraisal] serve to suggest that there might be a focus on monitoring indicators relating to air quality”, the SAA concluding in para. 5.1.2 that “This statement broadly holds true for ‘the submission plan as modified’.” The target for Development Policy 26: Air Quality is given in Appendix M of LPP2 as “To ensure all development supports improvements to air quality and meets the AQMA’s standards.” The action if monitoring shows that Development Policy 26 is not being delivered in accordance with Appendix M is to “Liaise with relevant stakeholders to determine challenges around the delivery of policy.”

Core Policy 47a: Delivery and Contingency states “As with Local Plan 2031 Part 1, if the development of the additional sites and Sub Area Strategies identified in Local Plan 2031 Part 2 is not taking place as envisaged, the Council, in conjunction with its partners, will investigate the reasons for the situation and will implement appropriate action which may include one or more of the following:

- seeking alternative sources of funding if a lack of infrastructure is delaying development or causing significant problems as a result of new development
- seeking to accelerate delivery on other permitted or allocated sites
- identifying alternative deliverable sites that are in general accordance with the spatial strategy of the Part 1 Plan, through the appropriate mechanisms; and if required
- undertaking a partial or full review of the Local Plan 2031, if investigation indicates that its strategy, either in whole or in part, is no longer appropriate.”

In paragraph 13 (ii) of the Inspector’s post hearing letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> October 2018, the Inspector requested further assessment of the potential cumulative impacts and effects on air quality, including within the Marcham AQMA which derives from elevated levels of nitrogen dioxide due to road traffic emissions. The Inspector advised that the evidence base in relation to air quality should be revisited with the implications of traffic generation from 1200 dwellings on the Dalton Barracks site and the other LPP2 allocations assessed comprehensively.

The 1200 dwellings on the Dalton Barracks site remain in Core Policy 4a: Meeting our Housing Needs, as do other LPP2 allocations at East Hanney (80 + 50), Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (600), Marcham (90) and North West of Grove (400). The Additional Air Quality Evidence, by SLR Consulting Ltd dated November 2018 (the SLR report), considers the potential cumulative impacts on air quality arising from these developments save for the 400 North West of Grove which is excluded from the SLR report “as it is not expected to come forward until towards the end of the plan period when the proposed highway mitigation, including improvements to Frilford Junction and the provision of a Marcham By pass are expected to have been delivered” (para. 1.3 of the SLR report).

In para.2.3.4 the SLR report concludes, in relation to the cumulative air quality impacts on the Marcham AQMA, that from the earlier RPS report the impact can be considered as “negligible” noting “that the future construction of a Marcham By pass would fundamentally alter the current road network. This major change in the road network would avoid the need for vehicles to travel through Marcham, passing by the AQMA, and therefore lead to a reduction in emissions. The VoWHDC consider that the construction of a Marcham By-pass would be expected to fully address any potential impacts associated with the Marcham AQMA. The VoWHDC are seeking to prioritise the delivery of this road during the plan period and currently consider that there is a high degree of confidence this

scheme will be delivered alongside the proposed developments at ‘Dalton Barracks’ and ‘East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor’.”

Whilst MM28 includes in the Site Development Template for both the sites at Dalton Barracks (1,200) and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (600) that: “THE OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS ON THE SITE WILL NOT BEGIN PRIOR TO THE COMPLETION OF THE UPGRADE TO FRILFORD JUNCTION UNLESS AN ALTERNATIVE PHASING PLAN IS AGREED WITH THE COUNTY COUNCIL”, there is no similar requirement not to occupy these dwellings prior to the completion of the Marcham By-pass.

The SLR and RPS reports do not consider the LPP2 allocation North West of Grove (400). Neither does the SLR nor the RPS report consider the cumulative impact of the relevant LPP1 allocations and known commitments that have yet to become operational (because the Inspector did not request this in his post hearing letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> October 2018 and the Council’s brief to SLR did not require the consideration of relevant LPP1 allocations and known commitments). Relevant LPP1 allocations and known commitments include for example 280 dwellings East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (a LPP1 allocation), 800 dwellings North of Abingdon-on-Thames (a LPP1 allocation), 200 dwellings North-West of Abingdon-on-Thames (a LPP1 allocation), 2500 dwellings at Grove Airfield (a LPP1 allocation) and 885 dwellings at Monks Farm (North Grove) (a LPP1 allocation), and the relevant part of the 13,387 known commitments identified in LPP2 Core Policy 4a. Just to remind, the 400 North West of Grove LPP2 allocation was excluded in the SLR report “as it is not expected to come forward until towards the end of the plan period when the proposed highway mitigation, including improvements to Frilford Junction and the provision of a Marcham By pass are expected to have been delivered” (para. 1.3 of the SLR report).

It is appreciated that the Inspector is considering the potential cumulative impacts and effects on air quality within the Marcham AQMA from the 1200 dwellings on the Dalton Barracks site and the other LPP2 allocations, and that the Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) modelling standards and guidance states that a detailed assessment of potential air quality impacts should be undertaken only if the change in 24-hour any link affected by a proposed development change in 24-hour Light Duty Vehicle flows of more than 100 AADT within or adjacent to an AQMA. It may not be that any of the relevant LPP1 allocations and known commitments exceed this threshold. However, this should be seen in the context of all the LPP2 allocations, including North West of Grove, together with the potential cumulative impacts from the relevant LPP1 allocations and known commitments that have yet to become operational.

The Additional Transport Evidence states in para. 5.2 that baseline traffic surveys were undertaken in January 2018 at the junctions listed in para. 5.1 (none are in the Marcham AQMA). The RPS report is based on automatic traffic counts undertaken for the Transport Assessment accompanying the Reg 19 response in relation to the Marcham (90) site that were undertaken from the 29<sup>th</sup> June to the 5<sup>th</sup> July 2016 at the ‘Gate Post’ and ‘Marcham sign’ on the A415 (para. 1.28 of the RPS report and para. 2.3.1 of the Transport Assessment refer).

The implications of traffic generation have not been assessed comprehensively, and do not consider the cumulative impact of the relevant LPP2 allocations, LPP1 allocations and known commitments that have yet to become operational and therefore do not show up in the baseline traffic surveys.

As stated in the Executive Summary to the SLR report “The conclusions from the RPS report and this Air Quality Report relating to relevant LPP2 sites on air quality are that these impacts can be considered to be ‘negligible’.” If the Inspector accepts this it will be the ‘starting point’ for the developers in making planning applications for the LPP2 allocated sites, and also the LPP1 allocated sites that have yet to be granted planning permission, in resisting any mitigation measures under Development Policy 26: Air Quality, including the Marcham By-pass.

## FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

In a Freedom of Information request made to the Vale of White Horse District Council (Council ref. EIR 18/820) in relation to: the Council's Hearing Note HEAR04.5 dated 22 August 2018 and the accompanying RPS report also dated 22 August 2018; and the additional evidence undertaken by SLR in their report, the Council's responding letter dated 16 January 2019 states "The Council's Environmental Health Team provided comments on all draft documents which were taken into account in finalising the documents. **All parties are satisfied with the finalised versions of the documents**" (my highlighting in bold and throughout this document). However, in the disk of correspondence included with the Council's responding letter an email dated 12/11/18 from the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO), Tim Williams, to the Council's Senior Planning Policy Officer, Ronan Leydon, on the draft brief to SLR, and which was agreed by the Council's Environmental Protection Team Leader (EHOTL), Simon Hill, the EHO states:

"With regard to Marcham, additional traffic will further add to congestion and to the air quality burden and maintain the need for an AQMA. In terms of mitigation, **the only feasible option** appears to be a by-pass to take traffic away from the properties vulnerable to traffic related air pollution".

By email dated 26/11/18 to Andrew Maxted, the Council's Planning Policy Project Lead, the EHOTL raises questions, which do not appear to have been answered, and states in relation to a confidential draft Air Quality Technical Note produced by SLR that:

"The infrastructure **mitigation (bypass, etc) needs to be made clearer** at emphasising the positive impacts on local AQ"; and that it

"should state that **there shall be an increase in nitrogen dioxide that shall have an adverse impact**, even if they are defined as 'negligible' under the guidance"; and that

"I don't want this document to weaken any case for such measures."

In a further email dated 27/11/18 to Andrew Maxted, the EHOTL states:

"The Environmental Protection Team would strongly support the building of a bypass road around Marcham which takes traffic away from the declared Air Quality Management Area in the village. Such a measure would also meet **one of the key actions specified in the council's Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) formally adopted in 2015 to address poor local air quality in Marcham.**"

The AQAP is one of the examination documents (NCA01) and includes "actions specifically for the Botley and Marcham AQMAs" (page 10), noting that in 2015 for Marcham **a reduction in emissions of 26% would be required to achieve the annual mean objective for NO2**. In relation to Marcham there are three specific measures identified: a 'Low emission zone feasibility study' which has not a feasible option; to 'Consider with OCC the feasibility of imposing a weight restriction limit on the A415 through Marcham to discourage HGVs and larger vehicles' which has also been found not to be feasible; and a 'Marcham by-pass'. In relation to the 'Marcham by-pass' the AQAP states it is:

"Not likely to be funded without significant development in the area."

By email dated 26/11/18 to SLR the Council's Planning Policy Officer commented on the air quality technical note stating that:

"For mitigation, it tells positive story, however can it be strengthened to come across more strongly? Can it also mention the policy commitment to deliver Frilford Lights before the delivery of Kingston Bagpuize and **securing funding for Marcham Bypass is at an advance stage?**"

In an email dated 26/11/2018 Kathryn Woolley of SLR advised the Council's Planning Policy Officer in relation to the exclusion of North West of Grove (400), and also Harwell Campus, from the SLR report stating **"I am not in agreement** that these should be excluded it was a decision made by yourselves so if you want to provided me with a full reason I will copy and paste in to the report as your stated reason for exclusion."

In the letter to the Programme Officer from the Council's Head of Planning, Adrian Duffield, dated 30 November 2018 it states:

**"The Council's Environmental Protection Team Leader has reviewed the Air Quality Report and is content that this additional information, along with the information already submitted, is sufficient and proportionate to inform the Local Plan 2031 Part 2."**

Nowhere in the Council's response to the Freedom of Information request ref. 18/820 (a copy of the Council's responding letter of the 16 January 2019 and the accompanying disk can be forwarded if required) is there anything from the Council's Environmental Protection Team Leader to the effect that he is content with the SLR report, nor that he considers it is sufficient and proportionate to inform the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. Rather, and to the contrary, I attach an exchange of emails on the SLR report between Andrew Maxted, the Council's Planning Policy Project Lead, Simon Hill, the Council's Environmental Protection Team Leader, and Tim Williams, the Council's Environmental Health Officer, between the 28 November 2018 and the 30 November 2018, the date of the Council's letter to the Inspector. In the exchange:

- (i) the paragraph in bold above appears to have been added to Adrian Duffield's letter prior to or on the 28 November without the Environmental Protection Team Leader having seen the Air Quality Report;
- (ii) whilst the Environmental Team Leader advised on the 28 November 2018 that he "would be interested in seeing the 'MOD' wording proposed for the Local Plan around the requirement for the Marcham bypass to be commenced before housing development in the area can take place", there appears to have been no reply to his enquiry;
- (iii) on the 30 November 2018, having considered the SLR report, the Environmental Health Officer and the Environmental Protection Team Leader advised the Planning Policy Project Lead "this report looks like **a rushed job, and makes overly positive assumptions in assessing a 'negligible' impact on air quality in Marcham and elsewhere**". The SLR report "states that it builds on the Cumulative Air Quality Impact Report, which was submitted to the planning enquiry (ref HEAR04.5). I did send an email to Ronan, to express my concerns over the optimism expressed in that report and that it may have under-predicted air quality impacts in the Marcham AQMA; and that **it should be treated with a great deal of caution. Likewise with this high level report.** It looks like the LPP2 proposed development, included in the assessment (which includes both Dalton Barracks and East of Kingston Bagpuize), is predicted to increase traffic through the AQMA in Marcham; **by 10.7%, based on existing AADT of 14000**, and additional traffic from development predicted of 1500 AADT. That is a lot more traffic to squeeze through the pinch point in Marcham and it is **hardly credible that this will not have a negative impact on air quality.** Unless there is a **massive improvement in traffic emissions; this additional traffic will neither be able to sustain nor improve the air quality situation in the AQMA.** The only way to significantly improve the local air quality in Marcham is to provide an alternative route for existing and additional traffic; away from the village; which would take the form of a by-pass. As you know we now have an outline planning application in for the land east of Kingston Bagpuize (P18/V2791/O), (which is forms part of the cumulative assessment included in the high level air quality note). **The air quality assessment for this site alone, indicates a substantial impact on air quality in the Marcham AQMA with the biggest impacts at the locations already most affected by poor air. In the light of this I would not be confident in agreeing the LPP2 report** which includes more sites and yet predicts no impact. **Which of the contradictory reports are we to believe; the detailed report or the the rushed one?** All other things being equal, I would not wish to see any additional new development traffic

- going through the Marcham AQMA, **until it can be demonstrated that a by-pass will be built. LPP2 allocation needs to be consistent with this and if that has the effect of temporarily sterilising development in the area, it will provide a greater focus for the construction and realisation of a by-pass**";
- (iv) subsequently on the 30 November 2018 the Environmental Protection Team Leader advised the Planning Policy Project Lead **"My key concern is that the detailed AQ assessment just infor the Kingston Baguize development highlight an air quality problem, but our higher level AQ report does not.** Tim raised historic concerns about the quality of the earlier RPS report about Marcham. Just concerned that if our high level states the impacts are negligible, can we object to any applications else coming on AQ grounds? I feel we will already have said it will be ok, so our hands will be tied. **I fully appreciate the difficult position you are in**, but do feel we need to revisit the issue about the bypass timing, because that's key"; and
- (v) the Planning Policy Project Lead's response to the Environmental Protection Team Leader later on the 30 November 2018 was that **"We really don't have any other option on this. Our instructions from Cabinet are very clear.** I don't think we are tying our hands with applications, because they will need to be informed by a detailed assessment and judged on a case by case basis. **Once the plan is adopted, we can refuse non compliant schemes on any case. Our policy D26 gives us a good basis to judge applications in detail. We are just stating that the current available evidence indicates that the councils own plan allocations are unlikely to lead to impacts."**

It is not considered appropriate that the Council rely on Development Policy 26: Air Quality when the Environmental Protection Team Leader considers the Council's hands will be tied by the RPS and SLR reports on which the Environmental Protection Officer and the Environmental Protection Team Leader have both raised significant concerns.

At the time of writing, planning application P18/V2791/O for the Kingston Baguize with Southmoor site has yet to be decided by the Council. It is for up to **700 homes (rather than the allocation in LPP2 of 600)**, and in addition an extra care development of up to 70 units, a local centre of up to 0.5ha with 8470sqm of commercial uses, and a primary school. The accompanying Air Quality Assessment October 2018 by M-EC Acoustic Air concludes that the impact from the increase in traffic flows generated by the development on the Marcham AQMA **will be 'substantial' with a 6% increase in NO2 levels** in 2023. The Air Quality Assessment October 2018 proposes mitigation in para. 8.17 for the Marcham AQMA, proposing "that a weight limit within the Marcham AQMA is implemented, either as part of the scheme, or via S106 air quality damage costs to be paid to the Council." This is not a feasible option and by email dated the 23 January 2019 the Council's Environmental Protection Officer, Tim Williams, put in a holding objection to the application on air quality grounds.

Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) objected to the planning application P18/V2791/O on the 24<sup>th</sup> December 2018 stating this is:

**"On the grounds that:**

This application for Land East of Kingston Baguize is premature, as **the application documents have not been able to demonstrate that it is possible to mitigate the harm in terms of congestion and air quality, and OCC has not yet been able to undertake the necessary studies to identify strategic schemes and calculate necessary contributions.**

**Contributions are required towards schemes including Frilford Lights and Marcham air quality mitigation,** however OCC requires time to undertake studies and calculate contributions.

There are unknowns as to what mitigation is required at Botley and Marcham interchanges, and further discussions are required with Highways England.

### Key issues:

- This application for Land East of Kingston Bagpuize is premature, as it is **not able to mitigate its harm in terms of congestion and air quality**, and OCC has not yet been able to undertake the necessary studies to identify strategic schemes and calculate necessary contributions.
- The housing trajectory status for this draft allocated site has now been put back by 4 years, meaning it is anticipated to start in 2024 instead of the originally stated 2020. Therefore, I require **the base line traffic flows to all be updated, so we are as informed as possible about the current conditions on the highway network.**
- The trip rates for the residential element of the site have been accepted and after some sensitivity testing, trips for the local centre have also been accepted. The developer must consider trip rates generating from the primary school.
- **Some committed development** can be removed from the future scenarios, as it is assumed their trips will be accounted for in new baseline surveys.
- Appendix C Traffic Analysis will have to be updated following **new baseline surveys and Dalton Barracks redistribution.**
- OCC requires a robust assessment of the trips through the village centre and therefore further justification is required regarding how these 40% and 70% figures were determined. Sensitivity tests of lower percentages may be required to investigate worst case scenarios.
- The developer must undertake their capacity assessment modelling for the base year 2019, 2027, 2031 and 2036.
- Due to the changes to the site trajectory, the Local Plan Inspector's comments, and current uncertainty regarding timelines for required strategic schemes, it does not seem appropriate to agree trigger points and phasing at this stage. It is expected that discussions will continue.
- The results of the Paramics microsimulation model report (TA Appendix K) have not been reviewed as the validation methods are not agreed.
- Any improvements to the Marcham Interchange junction will have to be reconsidered after new base line surveys and junction capacity modelling has been carried out, so improvement proposals are slightly premature and will have to be reviewed in light of further work. The developer will also be required to discuss proposals for the Botley junction with both Highways England and Oxfordshire County Council.
- **The Air Quality Action Level (AQAL) of pollutants is already regularly exceeded in Marcham** and therefore it is a designated Air Quality Management Zone (AQMZ). **Any mitigation measures to combat traffic flow through Marcham must consider the air quality issue and be thoroughly assessed for their feasibility and impact.**
- We require the laybys on the A420 to be dug up and the verges reinstated with full kerbing.
- The current layout of the proposed link road is not acceptable and further work must be done after a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken.
- No traffic calming mitigation package has been submitted for the A415 through Kingston Bagpuize village.
- We require £1,000 per dwelling (plus inflation) to improve bus services in the vicinity of the site.
- We welcome the addition of an improved crossing facility across the A420 that links up with Main Road, however, a toucan crossing is not suitable in this location, where vehicles are trying to merge in turn, as it may lead to rear shunt collisions.
- Further clarification and/or amendments are sought in regard to pedestrian and cycling connectivity.
- We require vehicle tracking drawings for all junctions into the site from the link road, demonstrating that an 11.6m refuse collection vehicle can manoeuvre in and out safely. The two roundabouts should also be tracked for an articulated HGV, to demonstrate the roundabout geometry is adequate.
- The Framework Travel Plan submitted as part of this application requires improvement."



On the Council's website at

<http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/java/support/Main.jsp?MODULE=ApplicationDetails&REF=P18/V2791/O>  
the target date for determining the application has been put back to the 1<sup>st</sup> November 2019.

**The Council should advise the Inspector:**

- (a) of “the ‘MOD’ wording proposed for the Local Plan around the requirement for the Marcham bypass to be commenced before housing development in the area can take place” that was requested by the Environmental Protection Team Leader on the 28 November 2018;
- (b) why there is such a long delay in the determination of P18/V2791/O when there is an objection from OCC on the grounds that it is not able to mitigate its harm in terms of air quality in the Marcham AQMA (and the Environmental Protection Officer has a holding objection);
- (c) why MM28 does not include in the Site Development Template for both the sites at Dalton Barracks (1,200) and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (600) that “THE OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS ON THE SITE WILL NOT BEGIN PRIOR TO THE COMPLETION OF THE MARCHAM BY-PASS UNLESS AN ALTERNATIVE PHASING PLAN IS AGREED WITH THE COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILS”;
- (d) whether OCC are undertaking the necessary studies to identify strategic schemes and calculate necessary contributions in relation to P18/V2791/O and if so when OCC will be able to calculate the contribution towards Marcham air quality mitigation;
- (e) of the amount and source of the funding for the Marcham By-pass that has been secured by the Council, the Council advising SLR on the 26/11/18 that “securing funding for Marcham Bypass is at an advance stage”. This should include how much has been secured through section 106 agreements to date both prior to and since the AQAP was adopted by the Council in 2015, the financial contributions expected from the Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and the Dalton Barracks sites, and the financial contributions expected from elsewhere (specifying their source);
- (f) the time-line to the completion of the Marcham By-pass; and
- (g) why the SLR report is reliable when: it excludes consideration of North West of Grove (400) at the Council's request when SLR considered it should be included; and it excludes LLP1 allocations and known commitments that have yet to become operational.

The Council should also provide the Inspector with the Environmental Protection Team Leader's formal response that he is content that the additional information, along with the information already submitted, is sufficient and proportionate to inform the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.

In the event the Inspector considers the occupation of the Kingston Bagpuize (600 in LPP2 or 700 in P18/V2791/O) and Dalton Barracks (1200) sites should not begin prior to the completion of the Marcham By-pass this **raises a further issue concerning the delivery of this critical infrastructure and the viability of the allocations ought to be the subject of further technical work.**

As the Council states in the SAA:

“The next step is for the Inspector to consider the representations raised as part of the consultation, alongside the SA Report Addendum, before deciding **whether he is in a position** to write his report on the Plan's soundness.”

Poor air quality is considered by the Government to be “the largest environmental risk to public health in the UK” (see: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/health-matters-air-pollution/health-matters-air-pollution> published on the 14 November 2018). Good planning is so important for the future of the communities in the Council's area, including Marcham.

In the Inspector's post hearing letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> October 2018, the Inspector requested further assessment of the potential cumulative impacts and effects on air quality, including within the Marcham AQMA. The

further assessment undertaken by SLR is not considered to be reliable. It does not take into account LPP1 allocations, known commitments nor the proposed LPP2 allocation at North-West of Grove that have yet to become operational and are not reflected in the traffic surveys that underpin both the RPS and the SLR reports. Whilst the letter to the Programme Officer from the Council's Head of Planning, Adrian Duffield, dated 30 November 2018 advises that the Council's Environmental Protection Team Leader has reviewed the Air Quality Report and is content that this additional information, along with the information already submitted, is sufficient and proportionate to inform the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, this appears not to be the case.

The traffic generation flows from relevant LPP1 allocated sites and known committed sites that were not operational at the time the baseline traffic surveys were undertaken have not been considered in either the RPS or the SLR reports, and neither has the LPP2 allocation at North-West Grove. The additional impact and effect on air quality in the Marcham AQMA arising from the LPP2 allocations ought to be considered in the context of the age of the baseline traffic surveys underpinning the RPS and SLR reports and the absence of the traffic generation flows from the relevant LPP1 allocated sites and known committed sites that were not operational at the time.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Council or the Inspector ought to be persuaded on the basis of current detailed evidence from the Council that the overall pattern of development should be changed as a result of air quality considerations.

In the event that the Council or the Inspector is not so persuaded, the Site Development Templates for both the allocated sites at Dalton Barracks (1,200) and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (600) should include: "THE OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS ON THE SITE WILL NOT BEGIN PRIOR TO THE COMPLETION OF THE MARCHAM BY-PASS UNLESS AN ALTERNATIVE PHASING PLAN IS AGREED WITH THE COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILS" as there is a need to ensure that these particular proposals, individually or in combination, do not result in unacceptable air quality in the Marcham AQMA.

The Council and the Inspector should also ensure that the evidence indicates that the infrastructure necessary to the development of these allocated sites, including both the Frilford Lights and Marcham By-pass, are achievable without compromising the viability of these sites, and are deliverable within the plan period.

It is not considered that MM3, MM27, MM28, the Additional Air Quality Evidence, Additional Transport Evidence, and the SA Report Addendum sufficiently address the potential cumulative impacts and effects on air quality, including within the Marcham AQMA, for the plan to be found sound.

On the basis of the detailed evidence the Inspector ought not to be in a position to find the Plan sound.

(Continue on page 4 if necessary)

Signature:

  
(*electronic*)

Date:

26<sup>th</sup> March 2019

### Sharing your personal details

Your name, contact details and comments will be shared with the Planning Inspector and a Programme Officer, who will act as a point of contact between the Council, Planning Inspector and respondents. This means that you will be contacted by the Programme Officer (and where necessary the Council) with updates on the Local Plan. This is required by Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

We have received assurance that the data passed to the Planning Inspector and Programme Officer will be kept securely and not used for any other purpose. They will retain the data up to six months after the plan has been adopted. Vale of White Horse District Council will hold the data for six years after the plan has been adopted.

Comments submitted by individuals will be published on our website alongside their name only. No other contact details will be published. Comments submitted by businesses and/or organisations will be published on our website, including contact details. If you would like to know more about how we use and store your data, please visit:

**[www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/dataprotection](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/dataprotection)**

### Future contact preferences

As explained above, in line with statutory regulations, you will be contacted by the Programme Officer (and where necessary the Council) with relevant updates on the Local Plan. Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire District Councils have a shared planning policy database. If you would like to be added to our database to receive updates on other planning policy consultations, please tick the relevant district box(es):

- I would like to be added to the database to receive planning policy updates for Vale of White Horse ☒
- I would also like to be added to the database to receive planning policy updates for South Oxfordshire ☒

**Alternative formats of this form are available on request.** Please email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk) or call 01235 422600 (Text phone users add 18001 before you dial).

**Please return this form by 5pm on Monday 1 April 2019 to:** Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email it to [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk).