

**Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2**

**Statement of Common Ground**

**Between**

**Vale of White Horse District Council**

**and**

**Oxfordshire County Council**

**May 2018**

**III. Local Plan Sites**

## Introduction

1. This statement has been prepared by Oxfordshire County Council (the County Council) and Vale of White Horse District Council (VOWH) to assist the Inspector during the examination of the Submitted VOWH Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites (referred to hereafter as the Part 2 plan). This statement focuses on the matters which are relevant to the County Council, particularly, those matters raised by the County Council in their response to the Publication (Regulation 19) plan.
2. This statement forms one of a series that cover the following matters:
  - I. Objectively Assessed Need and Unmet Housing Need
  - II. Transport and Safeguarding
  - III. Local Plan Sites
  - IV. Evidence
  - V. Misc
    - a. Education
    - b. Public Health
    - c. Minerals and Waste
    - d. Development Management Policies
    - e. Duty to Cooperate
3. Each statement includes the following sections:
  - a. Background
  - b. Key agreements or Agreed Common Ground
  - c. Proposed Changes
  - d. Signatures
4. This statement is provided without prejudice to matters that parties may wish to raise during the examination, separately, or through additional Statements of Common Ground.

## **Local Plan Sites**

### ***Harwell Campus***

5. Within the County Council's response to the Publication plan (Regulation 19), the County Council confirms that they have no in principle objection to development at Harwell Campus provided that the loss of land does not impact on the scale of forecast job growth and that the VOWH has published appropriate evidence indicating that the proposed loss of land will not lead to lower job growth. The County Council notes that there is a Statement of Common Ground with OxLEP and the Harwell Science and Innovation Campus Ltd and VOWH.
6. The County Council supports the proposal for a comprehensive development framework set out in CP15b. The County Council seeks clarification that the SPD is required before any planning applications for development can be determined. VOWH is content that the SPD will be available to inform any planning applications for residential development as it considers that this could not come forward ahead of adoption of the Part 2 plan. VOWH however suggests that some flexibility may be preferable to ensure any proposals for economic growth lodged in the short term that fall on the wider Strategic Employment site are not unduly restricted or delayed.
7. The County Council confirms that the comprehensive development framework approach should help to ensure the Innovation Village is integrated with the Campus and that transport impacts will be minimised through this approach. Furthermore, that the Campus already benefits from the recent opening of north-facing slips on the A34 at Chilton as well as other improvements to the transport network in Science Vale.
8. Whilst the County Council confirms that the necessary infrastructure requirements for this site are clearly set out within the Site Development Template, they also request further updates to the IDP (this is discussed further in Statement of Common Ground IV: Evidence).
9. The County Council proposes an Additional Modification to the Part 2 plan to confirm how the proposed allocation would contribute towards infrastructure delivery. VOWH agrees that an Additional Modification would provide additional clarity and this is included in the proposed Additional Modification Schedule (see '6' in table below).

### ***North West Grove***

10. The County Council's response to the Publication (Regulation 19) plan states that:

"An allocation of land North West of Grove logically helps to deliver the planned Grove Northern Link Road which, although not a strategic route, will be a main connector road through Grove Airfield, this site and Monks Farm. Development here can also support a business case for a rail station at Grove".

11. It is noted that the County Council considers that "a number of matters raised in our comments at Preferred Options have been addressed", and "the County Council does not have a specific concern with the change from 300 houses to 400 houses".

12. The County Council's main concern is the lack of mechanism within the plan for addressing development comprehensively through an SPD as there is for Dalton Barracks and Harwell Campus. The County Council states:

"Given the issues surrounding coordination of development at Monks Farm to the east and the need to consider this area together with a future potential Grove Station, it is considered that amendments should be made to the Plan". A modification is also proposed (see '7' in table below).

13. VOWH does not disagree with the importance of planning for this area of Grove comprehensively, indeed, the opportunity to plan for infrastructure and master-planning across the northern parts of the Grove Airfield allocation (Local Plan 2011) and Monks Farm (Local Plan 2031 Part 1) is part of the rationale for the allocation. This approach is also supported given the site is unlikely to deliver until later in the plan period (see '8' in table below).

### ***Dalton Barracks***

14. The County Council's response to the Publication (Regulation 19) plan states that:

"The County Council generally supports the proposed removal of land at Dalton Barracks from the Green Belt and its allocation for development. We note that the exceptional circumstances for removing the identified land from the Green Belt are set out in the Proposed Submission Plan."

15. The County Council seeks a modification to confirm the comprehensive development approach (see '9' in table below). VOWH is committed to planning for the site comprehensively, has commenced work on preparing an SPD for the site and is fully committed to work in partnership with the County Council and other stakeholders. VOWH is proposing a modification to address this matter, as set out in the Proposed Additional Modification Schedule (AM 5).
16. The other County Council comment relates to the longer-term planning for infrastructure (see '10' in table below).

### ***East of Kingston Bagpuize***

17. The County Council's response to the Publication (Regulation 19) plan states concerns relating to identifying and delivering appropriate infrastructure for this site. This includes two new roundabouts for accessing the A415 and A420, a high-quality link road and a new one form entry primary school.
18. VOWH is committed to working positively with the County Council, whose officers have attended site meetings alongside VOWH officers during the preparation of the Part 2 plan and so facilitating a collaborative approach. VOWH has updated the IDP, and is content the evidence is sufficiently robust to ensure the site is viable. VOWH is undertaking a work programme to review and update their approach to CIL to reflect the Part 2 plan in partnership with the County Council.

19. The County Council has requested an Additional Modification to the Development Site Template relating to this site which has been included in the Proposed Additional Modifications Schedule (see '11' and '12' in table below).

### ***South-East of Marcham***

20. The Preferred Options version of the Part 2 plan published in March 2017 proposed two development sites to the east of Marcham for 400 and 120 dwellings. Whilst it is anticipated that the majority of additional traffic would travel to the north, east or south and thus away from the village of Marcham and the AQMA, the scale of development was objected to by the County Council. The Publication version of the plan removed the proposed site for 400 dwellings and reduced the smaller site to 90 dwellings.
21. The County Council's response to the Publication (Regulation 19) plan confirms their "acceptance that this relatively small number of houses will have less of an impact on the AQMA compared to the Preferred Options allocations which we objected to in our May 2017 comments".
22. The County Council raises concerns that the longer-term aspiration to deliver a bypass to the south of Marcham is currently unfunded and unlikely to be delivered during the plan period and also notes the need to deliver a highway upgrade to the Frilford Lights junction.

### ***North of East Hanney and North East of East Hanney***

23. The County Council's response to the Publication (Regulation 19) plan states that the two proposed allocations 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". Minor inconsistencies are identified in the IDP which are being addressed.

### ***West of Harwell***

24. The Preferred Options version of the Part 2 plan included a proposed allocation to the West of Harwell Village for 100 dwellings. The County Council objected to this proposal for reasons associated with highways access. VOWH removed this proposal from the Publication version of the plan at the County Council's request.

### ***Key Agreements relating to local plan sites***

25. The County Council and VOWH agree to continue to work in partnership to plan for infrastructure delivery, where appropriate. The County Council and VOWH agree that the proposed site allocations set out in the Part 2 plan represent an appropriate strategy for the area.

**Summary of substantive points and proposed changes raised by Oxfordshire County Council in response to the Publication (Regulation 19) version of the VOWH Local Plan 2031: Part 2 and VOWH response.**

County Council Regulation 19 Comments	VOWH Response
<p>Soundness Issue 6. Revision of Core Policy 15b is required along the following lines:</p> <p>Proposals for development within the Campus must demonstrate how they <del>contribute towards a comprehensive approach to development</del> <b>COMPLY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SPD AND CONTRIBUTE TO INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE MANNER SET OUT IN THAT FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL REQUIRE ALL PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT TO CONTRIBUTE FAIRLY TOWARDS THE JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TRANSPORT, EDUCATION, OPEN SPACE AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE.</b></p>	<p>VOWH agree to the principle of additional modification.</p> <p>Additional Modification (AM8) proposed to amend Paragraph 2.115 as follows:</p> <p>It is essential that both housing and future employment development at Harwell Campus is brought forward in line with a comprehensive development framework <b>AND CONTRIBUTE TO INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE MANNER SET OUT IN THAT FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL REQUIRE ALL PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT TO CONTRIBUTE FAIRLY TOWARDS THE JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TRANSPORT, EDUCATION, OPEN SPACE AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE.</b> This is important not only to ensure that new development supports the vision for the Campus, but to ensure development is fully integrated with the Campus, reflects its location within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and is developed to ensure that any further strategic infrastructure improvements are delivered in parallel.</p>
<p>Soundness Issue 7. A new policy, along the lines of Core Policy 15b or 8b (which require Harwell Campus and Dalton Barracks Comprehensive Development Frameworks) should be included for North West Grove. This should ensure there is a comprehensive development framework for the whole site, which links in with neighbouring Monks Farm and Grove Airfield proposals, before any development commences.</p>	<p>VOWH note that this site is not expected to deliver until later in the plan period.</p> <p>However, VOWH has no objection to a comprehensive approach to planning for Grove.</p>
<p>Soundness Issue 8. The full capacity for development on North West Grove should be identified. This will need to be tested in additional</p>	<p>Evidence to support the Part 2 plan should be proportionate and consistent with the NPPF.</p>

<p>evidence unless there is some mechanism to restrict planning applications to approximately 400 houses.</p>	<p>VOWH considers the policy provides sufficient guidance and flexibility for planning beyond 2031.</p>
<p>Soundness Issue 9. Core Policy 8b should be amended along the following lines:</p> <p><del>'Proposals for development at Dalton Barracks must demonstrate how they contribute towards a comprehensive approach to development</del> COMPLY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SPD AND CONTRIBUTE TO INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE MANNER SET OUT IN THAT FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL REQUIRE ALL PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT TO CONTRIBUTE FAIRLY TOWARDS THE JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TRANSPORT, EDUCATION, OPEN SPACE AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE.</p>	<p>VOWH agree to the principle of additional modification.</p> <p>Additional Modification (AM5) proposed to amend Paragraph 2.64 as follows:</p> <p>It is therefore essential that development is brought forward in line with a comprehensive development framework in accordance with Core Policy 8b AND CONTRIBUTE TO INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE MANNER SET OUT IN THAT FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL REQUIRE ALL PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT TO CONTRIBUTE FAIRLY TOWARDS THE JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TRANSPORT, EDUCATION, OPEN SPACE AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE.</p>
<p>Soundness Issue 10. The full capacity for development on Dalton Barracks should be identified. This will need to be tested in additional evidence unless there is mechanism to restrict planning applications to approximately 1,200 homes.</p>	<p>VOWH consider the policy provides sufficient guidance and flexibility for planning beyond 2031.</p>
<p>Soundness Issue 11. In relation to site adjacent to Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor</p> <p>Further evidence is needed to be confident that the site is deliverable and that the costs of development are not being underestimated.</p>	<p>VOWH agrees.</p> <p>An update to the IDP was published alongside the Submission Plan, and the VOWH is committed to updating the IDP again prior to adoption of the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>VOWH is committed to a full review of the CIL charging schedule, in partnership with County Council, to reflect LPP2 and other updated evidence, where available.</p>
<p>Soundness Issue 12. Text in Appendix A: Site Development Templates - East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor to be amended as follows:</p> <p><del>'Consider potential options</del> <b>PROVIDE MEASURES</b> to alleviate traffic flows through the centre of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor'</p> <p>'contribute towards infrastructure improvement on the A420, A415</p>	<p>VOWH agrees to proposed Additional Modification.</p> <p>Additional Modification (AM25) proposed to amend the following requirements set out in the Site Development Template, in relation to access and highways as follows:</p> <p><del>'Consider potential options</del> <b>PROVIDE MEASURES</b> to alleviate traffic flows</p>

<p><b>(INCLUDING AT FRILFORD LIGHTS)</b> and any necessary mitigation measures identified through the Site Transport Assessment'</p>	<p>through the centre of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor' 'Contribute towards infrastructure improvement on the A420, A415 <b>(INCLUDING AT FRILFORD LIGHTS)</b> and any necessary mitigation measures identified through the Site Transport Assessment</p>
--	--

## **Signatures**

Signed on behalf of Vale of White Horse District Council

Adrian Duffield  
Head of Planning

Date 11/6/18

Signed on behalf of Oxfordshire County Council

Susan Halliwell  
Director for Planning & Place

Date 13 June 2018