

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2

Examination Hearings

**Written Statement by Vale of White Horse District
Council in relation to**

Matter 4: Abingdon and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area

June 2018

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**

Introduction

- 4.1.1 The Council's strategy and selection of sites are considered to fully accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and will enable the delivery of a sustainable pattern of development for the area.
- 4.1.2 The Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area contains the market town of Abingdon-on-Thames, the local service centre of Botley and the larger villages of Cumnor, Drayton, East Hanney, Kennington, Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, Marcham, Radley, Steventon and Wootton. The sub-area contains the largest range of services and facilities within the district, a good employment base and excellent public transport links to Oxford.¹
- 4.1.3 However, this sub-area is also relatively constrained as 46% is covered by the Oxford Green Belt and the area to the south of Abingdon-on-Thames is covered by Flood Zones 2 and 3 as shown on the Adopted Policies Map (**CSD06**)². The sub-area is also located near two sites of international biodiversity importance, Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Cothill Fen SAC and, also has known traffic congestion hotspots.
- 4.1.4 The Council has followed a comprehensive and iterative approach to site selection, which has been informed by technical evidence, informal and formal consultation with key stakeholders, including statutory bodies and infrastructure providers, and has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The Council's approach to site selection is set out in Topic Paper 2: Site Selection (**TOP02.1-TOP02.3**)³ and Addendum (**TOP02.4**)⁴. The process of site selection has also been informed by Sustainability Appraisal (SA – **CSD09**)⁵ and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA;

¹ **CSD01** Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites (Publication Version) (in particular paragraph 2.41)

² **CSD06** Draft Adopted Policies Map- Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area (Submission Version)

³ **TOP02.1-TOP02.3** Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites – Topic Paper 2: Site Selection and Appendices

⁴, **TOP02.4** Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites – Topic Paper 2: Site Selection – Addendum

⁵ **CSD09** Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Vale of White Horse District Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (Publication Version)

CSD08)⁶. Further information on how the Council has prepared the SA and HRA is set out in the response to questions 1.8 and 1.9 of the Matter 1 Statement.

- 4.1.5 The approach taken to the selection of sites is consistent with the approach that informed the Adopted Part 1 plan. The Inspector concluded in his Report (**ALP03**)⁷ at paragraph 75 that *“the strategic sites were identified through a robust, five stage selection process, which will contribute towards delivering this provision”*.
- 4.1.6 The Council has worked with external consultants, AECOM, throughout the site selection process to ensure reasonable site options were tested through SA (**CSD09**)⁸. The Part 2 plan and SA process have also taken into account the responses received from previous stages of public consultation. This has also included consideration of any alternative sites promoted through the plan-making process, such as formal stages of consultation.⁹
- 4.1.7 Following the initial stages of the site selection process (Stages 1 to 3), over 30 sites were taken forward for detailed evidence testing, informal consultation and subject to SA.
- 4.1.8 This stage was informed by a number of technical evidence studies that assessed each site’s impact or capacity to accommodate development, including factors such as landscape, transport, viability, flood risk and drainage and Green Belt. The SA included an assessment of the cumulative and individual impact of the sites.
- 4.1.9 The SA Report (**CSD09**) has established reasonable alternatives (both small and large site options) within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. This is set out in Table A of Appendix IV and Table A of Appendix V of the SA Report to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan¹⁰.
- 4.1.10 The SA appraised the reasonable alternatives against the Sustainability Objectives, including factors such as movement, health, economy, natural environment and landscape. A summary of the appraisal findings identified through the assessment of reasonable alternatives is set out in the SA Report to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan, in particular Table B of Appendix V and Table B of Appendix IV¹¹
- 4.1.11 The assessment of reasonable alternatives through the SA process and a robust and comprehensive site selection process has resulted in five sites being allocated within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.

⁶ **CSD08** Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2

⁷ **ALP03** Inspector’s Report on the examination into Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (in particular paragraph 75)

⁸ **CSD09** Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Vale of White Horse District Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (Publication Version)

⁹ **CSD02** Regulation 22 Consultation Statement

¹⁰ **CSD09** Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Vale of White Horse District Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (Publication Version) (in particular Table A of Appendix IV, Pages 85-87 and Table A of Appendix V, Page 103)

¹¹ **CSD09** Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Vale of White Horse District Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (Publication Version) (in particular Table B of Appendix IV, Page 100-101 and Table B of Appendix V, Page 103-109)

Site constraints

- 4.1.12 The proposed allocations within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area are relatively unconstrained and are not located within the Oxford Green Belt, with the exception of the proposed allocation for 1,200 homes at Dalton Barracks. This site is discussed further in the Council's written statement to Matter 5: Dalton Barracks.
- 4.1.13 The proposed allocation to the east of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is relatively unconstrained with good accessibility to services and facilities and excellent public transport connectivity to Oxford and Swindon.
- 4.1.14 The proposed allocations to the North and North-East of East Hanney are relatively unconstrained. Part of the allocation to the North of East Hanney is located within an area of flood risk. The Environment Agency has confirmed their acceptance of this site, as evidenced in the Statement of Common Ground (**SCG15**)¹². The site promoter has also prepared evidence which confirms that the site can deliver without the need to encroach on the area designated as Flood Zone 2¹³.
- 4.1.15 Oxfordshire County Council and Highways England supported the reduction in the number of homes allocated to the South-East of Marcham and the removal of a previously proposed draft allocation to the North-East of Marcham following public consultation on the Preferred Options version of the Part 2 plan¹⁴, as smaller-scale development would have a lesser impact on the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and local highways.
- 4.1.16 Based on the evidence including consideration of the SA (**CSD09**)¹⁵, in particular Table B of Appendix V and Table B of Appendix IV of the report, the Council considers that the site allocations set out in the Part 2 plan represent an appropriate strategy for meeting sustainable development, having considered a range of alternatives.

Infrastructure requirements

- 4.1.17 As discussed previously in this statement, the Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and informal consultation with key stakeholders and infrastructure providers. The Council undertook several

¹² **SCG15** Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency

¹³ West Waddy ADP on behalf of Pye Homes response to Publication Version of the Part 2 plan (in particular page 16), available at:
http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/java/support/dynamic_serve.jsp?ID=877397201&CODE=CE84F1EFDFE1279544007C13645FB230

¹⁴ **LPP05** Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites (Preferred Options); Highways England response to Publication Version of the Part 2 plan, available at:
http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/java/support/dynamic_serve.jsp?ID=877397178&CODE=721F1DA4DE081262470A671E7FDD0604; and Oxfordshire County Council response to Publication Version of the Part 2 plan, available at:
http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/java/support/dynamic_serve.jsp?ID=877397487&CODE=49D48543FCB52989FCAE44E203F57D7D

¹⁵ **CSD09** Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Vale of White Horse District Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (Publication Version)

rounds of engagement during the preparation of the Part 2 plan. In particular, an initial round of informal consultation was undertaken on a short list of site options. The Council circulated draft Site Development Templates and invited comments on these. This process ensured the key infrastructure requirements for each of the site options were identified.

- 4.1.18 This initial process provided an opportunity for stakeholders to identify and inform the Council of any sites they considered were not deliverable. The key issues raised through technical evidence and rounds of engagement are summarised in Appendix B of the Site Selection Topic Paper (**TOP02.3**)¹⁶.
- 4.1.19 Furthermore, specific points raised through public consultation, including from statutory bodies and infrastructure providers, are addressed through updates to the Site Development Templates. This is documented in Section 5 of the Council's Regulation 22 Consultation Statement (**CSD02**)¹⁷.
- 4.1.20 The site allocations in the Part 2 plan are also supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP; **CSD10**) which sets out a range of infrastructure requirements for each proposed site allocation in the Part 2 plan. The IDP was updated and published alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan¹⁸. It is expected that the IDP will be further updated as part of a review of the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
- 4.1.21 The proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (within Fyfield and Tubney Parish) will deliver a new link road through the site, two new roundabouts to provide access from the A420 and the A415 and contributions towards public transport improvements. The site will deliver a new local centre, a new one form entry primary school, including nursery provision, as well as providing contributions towards additional secondary school provision which would benefit the existing and new community. The site will also provide contributions towards improvements to the existing healthcare and other community facilities in the area.
- 4.1.22 The proposed allocations to the North of East Hanney, North-East of East Hanney and South-East of Marcham will contribute towards highway and public transport improvements, enhancement of school capacity, including primary and secondary and existing healthcare and other community facilities in the area.
- 4.1.23 These site-specific requirements are stated in their respective Site Development Templates set out in Appendix A of the Part 2 plan (**CSD01.1**)¹⁹, which are supported by the site promoters in Statements of Common Ground.²⁰

¹⁶ **TOP02.3** Topic Paper 2: Site Selection, Appendix B (Publication Version)

¹⁷ **CSD02** Regulation 22 Consultation Statement, Section 5

¹⁸ **CSD10** Vale of White Horse District Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (Submission Version)

¹⁹ **CSD01.1** Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites Appendices (Publication Version)

²⁰ **SCG04** Statement of Common Ground with Linden Homes on North-East of East Hanney, **SCG07** Statement of Common Ground with Savills and Lioncourt Strategic Land Ltd on East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, **SCG11** Statement of Common Ground with Turley and Catesby Land Promotions on South-East of Marcham and **SCG13** Statement of Common Ground with West Waddy ADP and Pye Homes Ltd on North of East Hanney

Potential impacts

- 4.1.24 Stage 4 of the site selection process included detailed evidence testing and SA of over 30 sites. The testing was based on a number of technical evidence studies that assessed sites impact or capacity to accommodate the development and considered any mitigation and/or compensation measures that were likely to be required.
- 4.1.25 The Council has published a series of technical studies including a Landscape Capacity Study (**NAT07**; **NAT07.1**)²¹ and Addendum (**NAT07.2**)²², Evaluation of Transport Impact (**TRA06-TRA06.2**; **TRA06.3**)²³, Water Cycle Study (**WWF02.1**)²⁴, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (**WWF03.2**)²⁵, Viability Update (**INF02**)²⁶ and Statement (**INF03**)²⁷ and a Green Belt Study (**NAT03**)²⁸.
- 4.1.26 The key issues raised through this detailed evidence testing, SA and engagement, for each of the sites, are summarised in Appendix B of the Site Selection Topic Paper (**TOP02.3**)²⁹.

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

- 4.1.27 The proposed allocation to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (within Fyfield and Tubney Parish) is a relatively unconstrained site with minimal landscape impact as identified in the Landscape Capacity Study. Whilst the site is located adjacent to the Conservation Area, the Council is satisfied that the potential impacts can be successfully mitigated through master-planning, design and landscaping as reflected in the site specific requirements set out in the Site Development Templates (**CSD01.1**)³⁰ Furthermore, Historic England has not raised an objection to this site..
- 4.1.28 A more detailed summary of the potential impacts relating to this site is set out on Pages 45-47 of Appendix B of the Site Selection Topic Paper (**TOP02.3**)³¹.

²¹ **NAT07** Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan Part 2 Landscape Capacity Study; **NAT07.1** Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan Part 2 Landscape Capacity Study, Appendix 1

²² **NAT07.2** Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan Part 2 Landscape Capacity Study Regulation 19 Addendum

²³ **TRA06** Evaluation of Transport Impacts- Stage 1- Part 1; **TRA06.1** Evaluation of Transport Impacts-Stage 1-Part 2; **TRA06.2** Evaluation of Transport Impacts-Stage 1-Part 3; **TRA06.3** Evaluation of Transport Impacts-Stage 2

²⁴ **WWF02.1** Vale of White Horse Draft Water Cycle Addendum Update-February 2018

²⁵ **WWF03.2** Vale of White Horse Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Update-February 2018

²⁶ **INF02** Viability Update

²⁷ **INF03** Viability Statement (Publication Version)

²⁸ **NAT03** Green Belt Study of Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Appendices

²⁹ **TOP02.3** Topic Paper 2: Site Selection, Appendix B (Publication Version)

³⁰ **CSD01.1** Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites Appendices (Publication Version)

³¹ **TOP02.3** Topic Paper 2: Site Selection, Appendix B (Publication Version)

North of East Hanney and North-East of East Hanney

- 4.1.29 The proposed allocations to the North and North-East of East Hanney are relatively unconstrained with minimal landscape impacts as identified in the Landscape Capacity Study. Development to the north and north-east of the village would be well contained from the wider landscape and fit with the existing settlement pattern. The site to the North of East Hanney abuts the Conservation Area, but does not contribute significantly to its setting. The Council highlight that no objections were raised by Historic England to these sites.
- 4.1.30 A more detailed summary of the potential impacts relating to the site North of East Hanney is set out on Pages 27-28 of Appendix B of the Site Selection Topic Paper (**TOP02.3**)³².
- 4.1.31 A more detailed summary of the potential impacts relating to the site North-East of East Hanney is set out on Pages 29-30 of Appendix B of the Site Selection Topic Paper (**TOP02.3**)³³.

South-East of Marcham

- 4.1.32 The proposed allocation to the South-East of Marcham would be consistent with the existing settlement pattern of Marcham. The site is located adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Marcham. This matter is discussed further in paragraph 4.1.15 above.
- 4.1.33 A more detailed summary of the potential impacts relating to this site is set out on Pages 55-56 of Appendix B of the Site Selection Topic Paper (**TOP02.3**)³⁴.
- 4.1.34 The Council is satisfied that the potential impacts from the proposed Part 2 additional site allocations can be appropriately mitigated through master planning, design and landscaping and supported by the general and site-specific requirements set out in the Site Development Templates. Support for the Site Development Templates has been received from infrastructure and service providers, statutory bodies including Natural England, Historic England, Environment Agency and Oxfordshire County Council and the site promoters. This support is evidenced in the respective Statement of Common Grounds which confirms their support for the sites³⁵.

³² **TOP02.3** Topic Paper 2: Site Selection, Appendix B (Publication Version)

³³ **TOP02.3** Topic Paper 2: Site Selection, Appendix B (Publication Version)

³⁴ **TOP02.3** Topic Paper 2: Site Selection, Appendix B (Publication Version)

³⁵ **SCG03** Statement of Common Ground with Historic England, **SCG14** Statement of Common Ground with Natural England and **SCG15** Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency

Are the estimates of site capacity justified?

- 4.1.35 The site capacity estimates are justified. The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, informed by technical evidence and collaborative working with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Topic Paper 2: Site Selection (**TOP02.1-TOP02.3**)³⁶.
- 4.1.36 A Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA; **HOU02.2**)³⁷ was produced by the Council in accordance with national policy and guidance. In considering site capacity at a high level within the assessment, a gross density of 25 dwellings per hectare (dph) was applied to each site. This allows sufficient flexibility to adapt to local circumstances³⁸, including the provision of necessary infrastructure and public open space, and results in an estimated net density of 35dph.
- 4.1.37 The Council highlight the site selection process, including the approach to estimating site capacity, is consistent with the approach used to inform the site allocations in the Adopted Part 1 plan.³⁹
- 4.1.38 The Site Development Templates set out in Appendix A of the Part 2 plan (**CSD01.1**)⁴⁰ provide sufficient flexibility to deliver a total quantum of development on each site, subject to appropriate master planning, in accordance with Core Policy 38 of the adopted Part 1 plan (**ALP02**)⁴¹ and further assessment, including wider infrastructure requirements to support development at each site.

Are the expected timescales for development realistic?

- 4.1.39 The additional site allocations proposed in the Part 2 plan are all demonstrably deliverable over the plan period and this is supported in Statements of Common Ground with all site promoters, which confirm site deliverability over the plan period to 2031. The following Statements of Common Ground are particularly relevant: **SCG04**⁴², **SCG07**⁴³, **SCG11**⁴⁴ and **SCG13**⁴⁵.

³⁶ **TOP02.1** Topic Paper 2 Site Selection (Publication Version); **TOP02.2** Topic Paper 2 Site Selection, Appendix A (Publication Version); **TOP02.3** Topic Paper 2 Site Selection, Appendix B (Publication Version)

³⁷ **HOU02.2** HELAA Report (Publication Version)

³⁸ CLG (2012) The National Planning Policy Framework (in particular paragraph 10), available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

³⁹ **ALP03** Inspector's Report on the examination into Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (in particular Paragraph 75)

⁴⁰ **CSD01.1** Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites Appendices (Publication Version)

⁴¹ **ALP02** Local Plan 2031 Part 1: Strategic Sites and Policies

⁴² **SCG04** Statement of Common Ground with Linden Homes on North-East of East Hanney

⁴³ **SCG07** Statement of Common Ground with Savills and Lioncourt Strategic Land Ltd on East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor

⁴⁴ **SCG11** Statement of Common Ground with Turley and Catesby Land Promotions on South-East of Marcham

⁴⁵ **SCG13** Statement of Common Ground with West Waddy ADP and Pye Homes Ltd on North of East Hanney

- 4.1.40 The Council's Site Selection Topic Paper (**TOP02.1-TOP02.3**)⁴⁶ and Addendum (**TOP02.4**)⁴⁷, the Local Plan Viability Update (**INF02**)⁴⁸ and Statement (**INF03**)⁴⁹ and the Council's Housing Trajectory (**HOU3.1**)⁵⁰ each provide evidence to support the Council's position, in particular the deliverability of the proposed additional site allocations.
- 4.1.41 Indicative timescales for the delivery of the additional site allocations within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area are set out in Table 2 of the Housing Trajectory Update (**HOU3.1**)⁵¹. The projected trajectory for these site allocations have been closely informed by discussions between the site promoters and Development Management Officers to ensure that the Housing Trajectory is realistic as possible.
- 4.1.42 The Council consider that identifying smaller site allocations will contribute significantly to supporting housing delivery, which is recognised as a key aim of the National Planning Policy Framework⁵².
- 4.1.43 The Council's statement on Matter 8 provides further detail to help the Inspector understand the deliverability of the proposed allocations in the Part 2 plan.

Are the site development template requirements – both general and site specific – justified, consistent with national policy and would they would be effective?

- 4.1.44 The Council consider the Site Development Templates as set out in Appendix A of the Part 2 plan (**CSD01.1**)⁵³ are justified, consistent with national policy and effective.
- 4.1.45 The Site Development Templates set out how each site should be planned to ensure that the site-specific constraints are adequately addressed and set out clear requirements relating to matters such as infrastructure provision, urban design, green infrastructure, biodiversity and flood risk and drainage. The general and site-specific requirements provide further detail on the form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate, and take into account and respond to local circumstances within different areas to achieve sustainable development, consistent with national policy⁵⁴.

⁴⁶ **TOP02.1** Topic Paper 2 Site Selection (Publication Version); **TOP02.2** Topic Paper 2 Site Selection, Appendix A (Publication Version); **TOP02.3** Topic Paper 2 Site Selection, Appendix B (Publication Version)

⁴⁷ **TOP02.4** Topic Paper 2 Site Selection- Addendum

⁴⁸ **INF02** Viability Update

⁴⁹ **INF03** Viability Statement (Publication Version)

⁵⁰ **HOU03.1** Housing Trajectory Update

⁵¹ **HOU03.1** Housing Trajectory Update

⁵² CLG (2012) The National Planning Policy Framework (in particular Paragraph 47), available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

⁵³ **CSD01.1** Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites Appendices (Publication Version)

⁵⁴ CLG (2012) The National Planning Policy Framework (in particular paragraph 10 and 175), available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

- 4.1.46 The approach taken to produce the General Requirements as set out in the Site Development Templates (**CSD01.1**)⁵⁵ is consistent with the approach that informed the adopted Part 1 plan. The Inspector presiding over the Examination of the Part 1 plan concluded that the site development templates were based on evidence from relevant providers and considered it unnecessary for additional infrastructure/services to be referenced in the Plan⁵⁶.
- 4.1.47 The Site Development Templates have been developed based on formal and informal engagement with, neighbouring authorities, key stakeholders and infrastructure providers, including Oxfordshire County Council, Thames Water, Highways England and the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The feedback received from the key stages of informal consultation has assisted in refining the site-specific requirements for each site allocation. Furthermore, specific points raised through public consultation, including from statutory bodies and infrastructure providers, are addressed through updates to the Site Development Templates. This is documented in Section 5 of the Council's Regulation 22 Statement (**CSD02**)⁵⁷.
- 4.1.48 The Part 2 plan allocations are also supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (**CSD10**)⁵⁸ which is consistent with the requirements set out in the Site Development Templates and demonstrates that the proposed allocations can deliver the infrastructure necessary to support development in a timely manner.
- 4.1.49 A Local Plan Viability Update (**INF02**)⁵⁹ was prepared by independent consultants HDH Planning & Development Ltd which concluded that all the additional site allocations were fully viable and that the cumulative impact of proposed policies in the Plan did not put implementation of the Plan at risk.
- 4.1.50 The Council highlight support from statutory and prescribed bodies, and infrastructure providers for the Site Development Templates, including from Oxfordshire County Council (relating to matters including highways, education and health), the Oxfordshire CCG/ NHS England, Historic England, Natural England, Thames Water and Environment Agency. This support is documented within their respective Statement of Common Ground with the Council to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan⁶⁰.

⁵⁵ **CSD01.1** Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites Appendices (Publication Version)

⁵⁶ **ALP03** Inspector's Report on the examination into Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (in particular paragraph 149)

⁵⁷ **CSD02** Regulation 22 Consultation Statement (including Appendices 1 and 2) (in particular Section 5)

⁵⁸ **CSD10** Vale of White Horse Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) of the Vale of White Horse District Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (Submission Version)

⁵⁹ **INF02** Viability Update

⁶⁰ **SCG03** Statement of Common Ground with Historic England; **SCG10** Statement of Common Ground with Thames Water; **SCG14** Statement of Common Ground with Natural England; **SCG15** Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency and **SCG20.2** Statement of Common Ground with Oxfordshire County Council, 3: Local Plan Sites

- 4.1.51 The Council also highlight support for the Site Development Templates from site promoters, as evidenced in their respective Statements of Common Ground.⁶¹
- 4.1.52 The Council has proposed a number of additional modifications to the Site Development Templates in response to issues raised following public consultation on the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan, including from infrastructure providers and statutory bodies.
- 4.1.53 The additional modifications are set out in the Schedule of Proposed Additional Modifications (**CSD03**) published alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan⁶². The additional modifications proposed to the Site Development Templates are **AM21** to **AM26**.

⁶¹ **SCG04** Statement of Common Ground with Linden Homes on North-East of East Hanney; **SCG07** Statement of Common Ground with Savills and Lioncourt Strategic Land Ltd on East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor; **SCG11** Statement of Common Ground with Turley and Catesby Land Promotions on South-East of Marcham and **SCG13** Statement of Common Ground with West Waddy ADP and Pye Homes Ltd on North of East Hanney

⁶² **CSD03** Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites (Publication Version), Schedule of Proposed Additional Modifications

- 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?**
- 4.2.1 The following paragraphs (4.2.1 to 4.2.7) respond to the individual points set out in the questions above.
- 4.2.2 The Council consider the proposals to safeguard land within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area for highways improvements as set out in Core Policy 12a are justified.
- 4.2.3 The Council has worked positively and collaboratively with Oxfordshire County Council, as the lead Highway Authority, and other key stakeholders to prepare technical evidence to ensure that highways and transport matters are adequately addressed and planned for. In particular, the Council has worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council to identify land to be safeguarded for future transport schemes within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area, as set out in Core Policy 12a of the Part 2 plan, which is complementary to Core Policy 12 of the Adopted Part 1 plan (**ALP02**)⁶³.
- 4.2.4 The Council highlight that, with one exception, schemes have been safeguarded in the Part 2 plan at the request of Oxfordshire County Council in support of current and emerging evidence prepared by the County Council. This includes the suite of documents supporting Oxfordshire's Local Transport Plan (**TRA01**)⁶⁴ including the Science Vale Transport Strategy (**TRA01.8.2**)⁶⁵, the Oxford Transport Strategy (**TRA01.8.1**)⁶⁶ and the Bus & Rapid Transit Strategy (**TRA01.2**)⁶⁷. The exception to this is the safeguarding for a bus/ cycle link between Dalton Barracks and the proposed Park & Ride at Lodge Hill, which is discussed in further detail in the Council's Matter 5 statement.
- 4.2.5 The Council will continue to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council and other key partners, such as Highways England, in planning for infrastructure (**SCG02; SCG20.1**)⁶⁸.
- 4.2.6 The Council note that Core Policy 12a seeks to ensure that land is appropriately safeguarded for transport schemes, so that proposals for development do not harm

⁶³ **ALP02** Local Plan 2031 Part 1: Strategic Sites and Policies

⁶⁴ **TRA01** Connecting Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2015-2031

⁶⁵ **TRA01.8.2** Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031, Volume 8 Part ii, Section 4, Science Vale Transport Strategy, Pages 35-76

⁶⁶ **TRA01.8.1** Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031, Volume 8 Part i, Oxford Transport Strategy,

⁶⁷ **TRA01.2** Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031, Volume 2, Bus and Rapid Transit Strategy

⁶⁸ **SCG02** Statement of Common Ground with Highways England; **SCG20.1** Statement of Common Ground with Oxfordshire County Council, 2: Transport and Safeguarding

their delivery. The Council would highlight that the policy does not show the precise alignment for each transport scheme as this will be informed by detailed design work as the schemes progress.

- 4.2.7 Any future proposals will need to comply with the policies of the Local Plan 2031 as a whole, including the requirements set out in Core Policy 12 of the Part 1 plan. This policy ensures that the schemes are subject to a thorough assessment of their potential adverse impacts, including full environmental and archaeological assessments working in association with the relevant statutory bodies.
- 4.2.8 The Council has proposed an additional modification (**AM10; CSD03**) to the supporting text of the Part 2 plan to reflect comments made by the Environment Agency relating to land safeguarded for a proposed Marcham Bypass. The proposed modification ensures that the impacts of schemes are subject to a full environmental assessment and a sequential and exception test where schemes are located in areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3⁶⁹.

⁶⁹ **SCG15** Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency, Appendix 1; **CSD03** Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional Sites (Publication Version), Schedule of Proposed Additional Modifications

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?

- 4.5.1 The Council consider the proposal to extend the area of safeguarded land for the Upper Thames Strategic Storage Reservoir as set out in Core Policy 14a is justified.
- 4.5.2 Core Policy 14 of the adopted Part 1 plan safeguarded land for a possible reservoir and ancillary works between the settlements of Drayton, East Hanney and Steventon. Thames Water commented at Regulation 19 consultation for the Part 1 plan that the area of safeguarding should be expanded in light of further evidence. Although, the Inspector concluded at paragraph 109 that there was not currently the evidence to determine whether or not the extended safeguarded area was soundly based⁷⁰, he recommended a modification to the Part 1 plan which stated that the *“possible revisions to the safeguarded area will be considered as part of the preparation of the Part 2 plan”*⁷¹.
- 4.5.3 The Council has worked closely with Thames Water to ensure sustainable planning is achieved across administrative boundaries, including planning for future water supply for the Part 2 plan. The policy has also been subject to informal consultation with key stakeholders at key stages of the Part 2 plan’s preparation. Specific points raised through public consultation have been addressed through updates to the policy⁷².
- 4.5.4 Thames Water has recently published their draft Water Resources Management Plan, which has identified a shortfall of water in London and the wider South-East Region⁷³. Following an assessment of water resource options, Thames Water has identified a reservoir at Abingdon as a preferred option to supply water to London and the South-East, to be delivered in early 2040s.
- 4.5.5 Core Policy 14 of the Part 1 plan also safeguarded land for a possible reservoir to the north of Longworth. The Council understands that this site no longer needs to be safeguarded as evidenced in a Fine Screening Report published by Thames Water as part of the draft WRMP⁷⁴, as reflected within the submitted plan (**CSD01**)⁷⁵.
- 4.5.6 A Statement of Common Ground between the Council and Thames Water (**SCG10**)⁷⁶ was published alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan which confirms that Core Policy 14a provides an appropriate update to the adopted policy.

⁷⁰ **ALP03** Inspector’s Report on the examination into Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (in particular paragraph 109)

⁷¹ **ALP03** Inspector’s Report on the examination into Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (in particular paragraph 109)

⁷² **CSD02** Regulation 22 Consultation Statement (in particular page 50-52)

⁷³ Thames Water (2018) Draft Water Resources Management Plan 2019, available at: <https://corporate.thameswater.co.uk/About-us/Our-strategies-and-plans/Water-resources/Our-draft-Water-Resources-Management-Plan-2019>

⁷⁴ Thames Water Utilities Ltd (2018) Thames Water WRMP19 Resource Options -Fine Screening Report Update, available at: <https://corporate.thameswater.co.uk/-/media/Site-Content/Thames-Water/Corporate/AboutUs/Our-strategies-and-plans/Water-resources/Document-library/Thames-Water-reports/Fine-Screening-Report-Update-February-2018.pdf>

⁷⁵ **CSD01** Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Detailed Policies and Additional Sites (Publication Version) (in particular paragraph 2.87)

⁷⁶ **SCG10** Statement of Common Ground with Thames Water

- 4.5.7 The Council highlight that the principle for a future reservoir at Abingdon is a separate matter for Thames Water as part of the process of preparing their Water Resources Management Plan⁷⁷. The Council understands that Thames Water will submit the draft Plan for approval in late 2018, before the Secretary of State decides whether to hold a Public Inquiry.
- 4.5.8 Core Policy 14a of the Part 2 plan merely safeguards land for the possible future provision of reservoir between the settlements of Drayton, East Hanney and Steventon. The requirements in the Part 1 plan policy ensure future proposals for a reservoir consider matters such as transport, infrastructure and landscape. Any future proposals would also need to comply with the policies of the Local Plan 2031 and national policy as a whole.

⁷⁷ Water Industry Act 1991, Section 37, available at:
<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1991/56/section/37>