

South East Vale Sub Area Strategy

Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area

General Comments

Category	Summary	Council Response
Allocation for Larger and Smaller Villages	<p>• We are of the view that East Hendred may present an opportunity for significant development, which would have the potential to ‘take’ all of the Part 2 allocation of 56 dwellings• There is understood to be demand for housing more widely across the district including in existing sustainable locations like East Hendred• The countryside setting of East Hendred and its Conservation Area would be affected by large scale development between Harwell and East Hendred. • It would increase pressure for continuous development between Didcot and East Hendred. • Raising the number of homes to be allocated in Part 2 would spread development pressure across the district and reduce risk of market saturation in any one area. • Relying only on very large allocations for the South East Vale could be said to be putting all one’s eggs in one basket. • Allocating in Part 1 for more housing to be provided in Part 2 for the larger and smaller villages will allow communities to avoid stagnation. • Allocating only say 5 dwellings 1 for East Hendred will not account for grow that all given the 20 year period of the plan and likely diminished household sizes over that time. • Sustainable villages such as East Hendred are well placed to contribute to meeting housing need for the area, and would be enhanced through development. • However the tightly planned form of East Hendred and the other villages means there are limited opportunities for infill development (as currently defined)• Well located to take advantage of the Local Plan’s vision of sustainable economic development that is identified by Science Vale and significant employment potential of Harwell Campus and Milton Park• People living here would not need to own a car to access vital day to day services, including employment, schools and shops and others.</p>	No sites are available for development at East Hendred which are either deemed suitable for development or are large enough to accommodate strategic growth.

Category	Summary	Council Response
Allocation for Open Countryside	<p>A number of comments relate to allocations in open countryside. Specific points raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of acknowledgement within the Policies that would help support the future housing needs of the Larger Village of Blewbury • Blewbury is one of two Larger Villages located within the South East Vale Sub-Area which does not have a strategic housing allocation • It is considered that Blewbury should be required to accommodate some of this additional housing need through the Local Plan Part Two. • This approach will help promote the village as a thriving community and ensure that the vitality and sustainability of its local services will be supported. • Core Policy 15 fails to recognise the important role that development at the lowest order settlements (those ranked below the current four tiers of the settlement hierarchy) have played in the past in maintaining the supply of housing in the Vale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No sites are available for development at Blewbury which are either deemed suitable for development or are large enough to accommodate strategic growth. • The plan approach to the settlement Hierarchy is consistent with the NPPF where it is considered unsustainable to allocate development to the open countryside unless consistent with the exception policies of the local plan.
Alternative Site - Blewbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land West of Woodway Road, Blewbury (Location Plan enclosed) for residential development. • Blewbury offers a range of services and facilities to its residents and regular bus services provide access to Didcot and its higher order services and facilities, as well as Didcot Parkway. Didcot Parkway provides access to a range of locations including London. • Sustainable settlement, where new residential development can be accommodated to meet local housing needs and help maintain its vitality and the sustainability of its local services. • The Site at Woodway Road is located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Blewbury and within walking distance of its local facilities and public transport offer. • The Site is therefore considered to offer potential to accommodate sustainable development in accordance with both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the emerging Local Plan. 	<p>No sites are available for development at Blewbury which are either deemed suitable for development or are large enough to accommodate strategic growth.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
Alternative Site - East Challow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate land on unprotected landscapes, including 200 dwellings on this land at East Challow. • making the plan sound insofar as this new allocation would be both justified and consistent with national policy. 	No sites are available for development at East Challow which are either deemed suitable for development or are large enough to accommodate strategic growth.
Alternative Site - Rowstock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rowstock does not have the facilities of a village suitable for large scale development and should be deleted from the list of Small Villages. 	No development is proposed at Rowstock and no reserve sites are identified through Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
Alternative Site - Steventon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Land at Milton Heights to the East of Steventon House Hotel is approximately 5.8 hectares in size and has the potential to deliver circa 200 dwellings. 	Whilst strategic development at Milton Heights is proposed within the plan, development on the land in question was not deemed suitable following detailed investigation. See Site Assessment Topic Paper.
Coalescence with Villages	<p>The village and parish of Harwell have been particularly affected by existing Vale of White Horse and SODC plans for the expansion of Didcot. If the Plan goes ahead, 45% of Parish land that is currently farmland or open countryside will be built over. About 80% of the Parish boundary will have buildings on one or both sides, compared with 20% now. Much of the farmland in question is best and most versatile agricultural land. Appleford and Sutton Courtenay have similar problems. We are also concerned at the potential coalescence or near coalescence and loss of the green gap between Great Coxwell and Faringdon as a result of the housing development proposed in the Plan. The loss or erosion of this green gap would not only damage the open countryside, but the independent existence of an ancient Small Village with a Conservation Area, listed buildings and the nationally important Great Barn. The proposals map should be extended to provide protection to Harwell Village and Great Coxwell. Site Template for Valley Park should be strengthened to prevent the coalescence of Didcot with its surrounding villages, and extended to provide a rural gap alongside the B4493 between Didcot and Harwell. The Plan has no effective mechanisms to deliver the aim stated in 5.57. This aim is ignored in paras 5.81-5.84 which discuss the proximity of Harwell (and other villages) to Didcot Nor does the</p>	Proposed development to the west of Harwell Village does not threaten coalescence with nearby villages. Development at Valley Park will not lead to coalescence, partly because the development is on the far side of the A34 to the village and partly because a buffer will be incorporated into the Valley Park proposals as set out in the development template.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>Plan have an effective mechanism to deliver CP 44. The saved proposals map shows the whole area of Valley Park, and a buffer area west of the A34 and east of the village. In need of revision because it indicates that no development should take place on the land now allocated to Valley Park. There is nothing specific anywhere in the Plan which defines unambiguously what constitutes 'maintenance of distinctive character/separate identity for Harwell village'. To make Section 5.57 and Core Policy 44 of the Local Plan sound, the Plan must identify a rural gap right around Harwell Village where development will not be permitted. This particularly applies to the approach to Harwell from the east, but is not confined to this direction. All of this area to the east of the A34 is now earmarked for development in the Plan to 2031, becoming what will be known as Valley Park. This threatens the retention of Harwell Village's separate identity. The proposals map does not reflect the impact of this impending speculative development on open land surrounding the village and does not adequately protect Harwell Village's rural character and separate identity from further erosion in all directions.</p>	
CP 15 - Crab Hill Support	<p>There is some slippage in the proposed timescale for land at Crab Hill, north east of Wantage and south east of Grove. However, the allocation is still expected to be delivered during the life-time of the Plan.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed and is noted.</p>
CP 15 - General	<p>Objects to the proposed large scale residential developments near Didcot.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. The council considers that the spatial strategy of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 is the most sustainable solution for the district for the plan period.</p>
CP15 - Air Quality	<p>There is the potential of car pollutants from the A34 impacting on the health of residents of the new development at Valley Park and other sites near the A34.</p>	<p>Any development will need to have regard to Core Policy 43: Natural Resources, where (vi) states "having regard to air quality and any Air Quality Management Areas". Investigation of potential noise and air pollution impacts from the A34 forms part of the site template for Valley Park (See Appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part).</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
CP15 - Alternative Site Crown Packaging	We support the allocation of strategic sites and contend that Crown's site has suitable credentials to be put forward for a strategic residential allocation able to deliver at least 250 homes, and this will also help VWHC meet its housing needs	The availability of this site has only become known to the Council recently. However, this site is an important location for employment in Wantage and Grove and the Council will resist the loss of this land for this use. Current designation is appropriate, Change of use of existing employment land and premises is feasible through Core Policy 29. No change considered necessary.
CP15 - Alternative Sites - Oxford Garden City	There has been a lack of serious consideration of the Oxford Garden City proposal.	Oxford Garden City dealt with through site selection process. Concerns remain outstanding.
CP15 - Alternative Sites - Stockham Farm	Dandara Ltd demands from the VoWH to undertake a review of the Local Plan settlement boundaries.	Permitted development at Stockham Farm already forms part of our housing trajectory and contributes to the objectively assessed need for the district. Settlement boundaries for Grove/Wantage have been amended within the proposed Adopted Policies Map.
CP15 - Alternative Sites Challow	A modification is sought to CP4 to include two sites owned by the Community St Mary the Virgin (the CSMV) north and south of Challow Road, Wantage.CP13/Green Belt See Summary for LPPub2288	The sites do not meet the criteria to inform the site selection process and thus are not considered to be strategic in nature for the purposes of Local Plan 2031 Part 1
CP15 - General Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representations made on behalf Minscombe Properties and May Properties Ltd. 	Point noted.
CP15 _ Alternative Site North West Grove	The proposed saving of the previous Grove Airfield allocation (Local Plan policy H5) is essential to ensure that the policy position in respect of the Gove Airfield development is preserved, whilst the development is brought forward. The Council's strategy relies on the completion of this development and its policy status (as a commitment) should be unambiguous within the Plan.	Saved policy H5 "Strategic housing site west of Grove" remains and will continue to apply to this site.
CP15 -Alternative Sites - Garden City	1 Failure to consider unmet Need2 Allocations in Green Belt and AONB when alternatives are available3 Artificial Ring Fence preventing Garden City proposal coming forward	Core Policy 2 sets out the district council's commitment to assisting Oxford City in addressing un-met need. A proposal for a Garden City within the Vale was put forward at an earlier stage of consultation and has been assessed as part of development the local plan. .

Category	Summary	Council Response
Distribution of Growth within South East Vale Sub Area	Proposals in Fig 4.2 have not been justified and are not consistent with National Planning Policy. Site 9 Milton Heights, Sites 12 & 13 North and East of Harwell, and other sites which would not be required if the Inspector accepted that the Council had not chosen the most appropriate strategy	Proposals have been rigorously assessed through the SA process. The spatial strategy is considered to be fully consistent with the NPPF.
Distribution of Growth within South East Vale Sub Area and working with Neighbouring Authorities	Total housing provision for the Science Vale, across South Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse, may be as high as 18,150 + 3,540 = 21,690 homes. Science Vale ambitiously speculating to create up to 16,000 jobs, then it would appear that with up to more than 20,000 houses being built in the general area, that there is more than an adequate provision of housing to support the predicted economic growth. Option they are considering is to allocate 60% of the new additional housing target to the Didcot area. Seem reasonable to remove 1,000 of the 1,400 houses allocated to the North Wessex Downs AONB and relocate them elsewhere, without it being detrimental to the economic growth plans of the Science Vale. Wider distribution of growth (and spending power) could be more beneficial in supporting the rural areas more. Not been made clear as housing provision straddling boundaries is often not provided in documented evidence.	The council considers that it has maintained ongoing dialogue with neighbouring authorities and have consulted with them at various stages, either by means of formal consultation or through duty to cooperate meetings or other evidence base work (such as the Growth Board, previously SPIP). The council considers that its spatial strategy and growth envisaged for the South East Vale sub area is the most sustainable approach to deliver housing and economic growth for the district up to 2031.
General Infrastructure	More housing should be built in centres such as Oxford, Didcot and Witney, where there are plenty of facilities, shops and transport links already. - Brown field inner city sites should be given priority for building new houses, so people can walk or cycle to work. Villages are not suitable because the inhabitants mostly have to go out of the village daily to reach their jobs or education. - Strongly objects to the building plan put forward for 120 houses in Blewbury on the grounds that: - The site is in or very near an area of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. - The village has not enough places in the primary school and had to have a new classroom this year. - Raw sewage was in a village road last winter because the sewage system could not cope. - The Cleve, the village pond, often fills with silt when there is	The council is not allocating a strategic housing allocation at Blewbury in Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	building work and the wild life is much damaged. •- This village has limited services such as shops and jobs, so more homes mean more people own and drive cars, burning more fossil fuel.....	
Growth in Didcot	What are the limits of the expansion to our town? Are we just to go on sprawling and sprawling? Core Policy be added to the local plan of VOWH defining these limits at least in their area; but if possible also in conjunction - and transparently - with South Oxfordshire.	The VOWH are planning for growth within their own district and are working closely with neighbouring authorities to address any unmet need should it be identified. The distribution of housing within SODC will be considered through a separate local plan process for South Oxfordshire. South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse District Council are working on preparing a joint development plan document to ensure that growth between the two districts is delivered cohesively and in a timely manner.
Highways Agency - Transport Infrastructure	It is recognised that a large proportion of Local Plan growth (both housing and jobs) will be located with the Science Vale Area (Core Policy 13 – Spatial Strategy South East Vale Sub-Area). Proposals will be supported by a delivery focused Area Action Plan (AAP) prepared jointly with South Oxfordshire District Council and Oxfordshire County Council. The HA look forward to involvement with development of the AAP. An assessment of the potential impact of proposals on improvements already identified at the Milton Interchange and Chilton junction needs to be undertaken to ensure growth can be accommodated without impacting on the continued safe and efficient operation of the A34. The deliverability of an identified transport package on the A34 will need to be fully assessed to ensure the AAP is sound. The Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study (November 2014) highlights a number of challenges to delivery of this growth, we welcome early discussions. Although at this stage it is unclear how proposals will be delivered, it is understood this will be set out in the Science Vale AAP and supporting detailed transport package.	Comment is noted. The council will continue to engage constructively with the Highways Agency and Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the strategic infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner alongside the planned growth in the district.
Housing Delivery and Trajectory	Proposed pre-allocation of housing numbers to fund infrastructure plans contradicts paragraph 5.60 • will not match employment	Housing growth in the South East Vale Sub Area has been informed by detailed evidence including work by the

Category	Summary	Council Response
	growth as delivery will be at the mercy of the housing market. Since there is no accurate and clear year by year job forecast available, it is premature to allocate It is clear that the housing allocation within the North Wessex Downs AONB is NOT linked to the growth of employment at the Harwell Oxford Campus as stated,	consultants GL Hearn to derive a housing target for the area to ensure sustainable growth is achieved alongside planned employment growth and an assessment of housing delivery to inform the housing trajectory and the IDP, which seeks to balance growth with infrastructure delivery.
Housing Target for South East Vale Sub Area	Requirement of 12,450 houses to be built during the full plan leaves no houses with development sites needed to be allocated in the near future. However CP15 states that a further 200 houses still need to be identified.	CP15 states that further allocations will come forward through Local Plan 2031 Part 2 or where allocated in Neighbourhood Development Plans.
Local Development Orders	Question the proposed use of Local Development Orders (LDOs) to speed up delivery on sites, including potentially the Harwell Oxford Campus within the AONB and the effect this will have on the setting.	Local Development Orders currently only relate to development within the Enterprise Zone land at Milton Park, and is for employment growth only. No LDOs are planned for the strategic housing growth in the district.
Local Plan Part 2 Allocations	It is considered that Core Policy 15 should be reviewed to be more explicit in identifying broad locations for the additional 220 dwellings to be allocated within the Local Plan Part Two.	The plan seeks to deliver strategic growth as required by the NPPF and ensure the full OAN is met along with achieving and maintaining a 5YHLS. The plan retains flexibility for how it allocates small and non-strategic housing (that are not relied upon for 5YHLS purposes) in accordance with the NPPF. Such sites may come forward ahead of Local Plan 2031 Part 2 by means of emerging Neighbourhood Development Plans in the sub area.
Oxford City - Supporting Text	Paragraph 5.50 refers to the Strategic Economic Plan and Oxford City Deal; recognition of these is welcomed. However in order to be effective this paragraph should also recognise Oxford as a key economic driver for Science Vale and Oxfordshire as a whole. The City Council objects on this basis.	This matter is adequately addressed through reference to the Strategic Economic Plan.
Oxfordshire County Council Comments	References to SVUK (Science Vale UK) are included in the Appendix E and elsewhere in the documents. The UK part has now been dropped and the documents should reflect that. • Figure 5.6b (the cycling map) on page 78 of the Local Plan must come with a caveat: "Subject to consultation by OCC as part of LTP4 (early 2015)". • The Didcot-Harwell Public Transport Study is out of date and needs updating.	The Vale of White Horse District Council are working with Oxfordshire County Council towards a Statement of Common Ground. Figure 5.6b may be updated depending on the outcomes of and progress made on Local Transport Plan 4. The evidence base is up to date at the point of submission. New

Category	Summary	Council Response
	Please state in our response that it is out of date and it will be re-submitted to them.	evidence will be published on the council website should it become available in the future.
South East Sub Area Boundary	Objection to this policy on the basis that East Challow has been omitted from the South East Vale sub area. As a consequence Core Policy 15 is unjustified. Representations to this effect have been set out in more detail in relation to Core Policy 3.	Objection is noted. Although East Challow is in close proximity to Wantage and Science Vale, it is considered inappropriate as a settlement for growth as part of Science Vale. Its character, appearance and role as a larger village relates more closely with the characteristics of the Western Vale sub area, rather than an area of growth within Science Vale.

Harwell Campus Sites

Category	Summary	Council Response
Alternative Site Harwell Campus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site presents an obvious opportunity for strategic development. • The site would cause least harm to the AONB and offer excellent connectivity and sustainable development credentials. • On balance, the benefits of developing this site outweigh disadvantages • People living here would not need to own a car to access many services. In future further services will be added. • The site is well positioned to be considered sustainable in future transport terms, given the promotion of Science Vale. • Developing this area would help provide balanced communities who would benefit from local employment opportunities. • There is a programme of infrastructure improvement this site could utilise, including a full junction at Chilton on the A34. • There would be minimal impact on the landscape compared with alternative sites close to the Campus. • Including Hendred Estate land within the allocated area would make it possible to achieve peripheral enhancement. This could add to the existing woodland belts in a way that would take longer to achieve on the land East of Harwell Campus. • An ecology report on the land owned by Hendred Estate, by Eco consult (attached) concludes that there is no known feature of ecological or other such important environmental importance that would preclude development of the site. • Woodland and trees near habitats would be largely unaffected but could be enhanced by new planting and other measures. . 	<p>The council considers that there are exceptional circumstances in place to justify growth in this location. Please refer to TOP03 Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper for process leading to the allocation of land for strategic growth around Harwell Campus. The council expect this to be a matter for discussion at the examination in public.</p>
Alternative Site Role of Blewbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land West of Woodway Road, Blewbury should be considered as a suitable site for up to 149 dwellings. • The emerging Plan fails to assist in addressing the imbalance in the economically inactive population of Blewbury. • The Plan should address the population imbalance of Blewbury, and vitality of its services by acknowledging the need for its sustainable growth. Without this, Blewbury’s local services may decline as comparable settlements grow and Blewbury is left behind. • The Plan acknowledges the AONB is a constraint, but does not preclude development within the AONB which should therefore not 	<p>The site in question does not meet the site selection criteria to justify its consideration as a strategic site for the purposes of allocating in Local Plan 2031 Part 1. Refer to Strategic Site Selection Topic Paper for further details.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>be used as a reason for not considering Blewbury. • Core Policy 4 should be more explicit regarding where the additional 220 dwellings should be allocated • A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) concludes the site would not compromise the special qualities of the AONB as described in the NW Downs AONB Management Plan. • The site is within the settlement fringe and neither remote nor tranquil. • Development would not cause any changes to the scarp or impact on the sense of openness or tranquillity.</p>	
Appendix A	Appendix A: Site development templates References to the allocations to the East of Harwell Campus and North West of Harwell Campus should be removed.	Noted.
Coalescence	The Plan does not offer protection to the ancient village of Harwell from coalescence with Didcot. There is no clear boundary map within which building will not be permitted. Although there are words, these cannot offer clear interpretation. A map should be provided.	The A34 offers a clearly defined boundary to the west of Didcot. This is covered by saved policy NE10 which addresses urban fringes and countryside gaps. The relevant Site Development Templates in Appendix A of the Plan address coalescence.
CP 15 - Harwell Campus Heritage Assets	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the principle to “Retain the historic field pattern within the site.....”	Comment is noted. No change considered necessary as the retention of the historic field pattern forms part of the site template (see Appendix A of Local Plan 2031 Part 1, p.37)
CP15 - Harwell Campus - Development Template	Amend the North of Harwell Development Template (Appendix A). Respondent requests various specific amendments (listed in their response), including different housing figures. Delete the East of Harwell Development Template at Appendix A.	The council continues to support the allocations set out in the submission version of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1. Consequently, it does not consider these changes appropriate.
Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan proposes “major development” within the nationally protected North Wessex Downs AONB. This would harm the recognised special qualities of the AONB. The scale of housing allocations and the implications of the Housing Supply Ring Fence Area are unprecedented within the family of protected landscapes including AONBs and National Parks. • The conservation and enhancement of the AONB is in the national public interest. The Plan does not comply with national guidance and law that specifically seeks the conservation and enhancement of nationally protected 	Harwell Campus is unique with national and international significance and potential in high technology sectors, supported by Enterprise Zone status recently extended to 2018. It has significant economic and employment growth potential, as identified in Economic Forecasting to inform the Oxfordshire SEP and SHMA (ECO02). To achieve this potential sufficient housing is required in appropriate and sustainable locations. Together this presents exceptional circumstances that justify development in AONB in accordance with NPPF para 115-116, having assessed all

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>landscapes. The exceptional circumstances tests of the NPPF paragraph 116 are not met. • The Landscape Study does not consider the options for AONB avoidance. • There are alternatives which avoid the need for allocations within the AONB. Options to meet strategic housing need exist elsewhere, including accommodating some housing within the existing Harwell Campus boundary without the need for substantial loss of greenfield. • As there is no existing settlement at Harwell Campus there is no need to provide space for a settlement to grow. • Comments previously made in our April 2014 response remain valid. • Should the Plan proceed to submission, the AONB Unit will make detailed submissions to the Hearings process objecting to the proposed level of housing in this AONB.</p>	<p>reasonable alternative sites. All potentially reasonable alternative sites have been robustly assessed as set out in the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper 3 (TOP03) which demonstrates consideration of the AONB. The selection of sites have been informed by Landscape Studies (NAT04.1-04.12) in particular the East Harwell Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (NAT04.1). The outcomes of which have been reflected in the size and capacity of the allocations and within the Site Development Templates in Appendix A of the Plan.</p>
Education Provision	<p>Harwell (200 homes) • School planning in this area needs to be based on a broader survey of both housing development and school growth potential, across the surrounding area, including Harwell Campus and Chilton. • The Local Plan proposal could exceed the existing village school's capacity. • Contributions would be required towards the cost of expanding primary school provision serving the area, and towards new secondary and SEN provision in Didcot. • Contributions towards the cost of secondary school capacity would be required at the rate of £3,699 per home. The rate applies to extension of existing schools. As new schools are to be built the appropriate new school building rate of cost should be applied. East Harwell (850) & NW Harwell (550) • A new 2 form entry primary school will be required. • The school site would need to be 2.22ha and meet OCC's requirements. • Contributions would be required towards the cost of new secondary and SEN provision in Didcot. • The cost of a 2 form entry school is currently assessed as £8,334,000. • Contributions towards the cost of secondary school capacity would be required at the rate of £3,699 per home. The rate applies to extension of existing schools; as new schools are to be built the appropriate new school building rate of cost should be applied.</p>	<p>Comment is noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure the timely provision of educational facilities alongside the planned growth.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
Figure 5.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update figure 5.4 to reflect the fact that Harwell Campus will become a Local Service Centre, not a Larger Village The map shows Chilton far removed from the East Harwell Campus site. This is misleading and unsound. 	Harwell Campus does not contain the level of services or facilities to be categorised as a Local Service Centre. It is envisaged that existing and future facilities will be equivalent to the settlement classification of a larger village.
Flooding	No development should take place within Flood Zone 3 or 2 - In accordance objectives of the SFRA and Sequential and Exceptions Test	Accepted. Flood Zones 3 and 2 are intrinsic reasons for deeming sites unsuitable at the earliest stages of testing.
Highway Infrastructure	<p>E harwell (850)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development can be expected to generate 5100 veh trips per day, 500+ trips in peak hour. Access (es) could be taken from A4185 Newbury Road. Strategic access to A34 south would be via Chilton Interchange As a result of the development, pressure would be created at Rowstock and along the A4185. Contributions would be expected towards the Science Vale strategic transport infrastructure package Public Transport contributions would be required. <p>N Harwell (550) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As above The development can be expected to generate 3300 veh trips per day, 330 trips in peak hour. A Public Bridleway (BW) and a Road Used as Public Footpath (RUPP) run along the south and west boundaries of the site and could be affected. 	Noted.
Natural England - Impact on AONB	<p>Natural England's principal concerns are the likely impact on the landscape character, special qualities and natural/scenic beauty of the North Wessex Downs (NWD) Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and people using The Ridgeway National Trail (NT) and surrounding public rights of way network. Natural England advises that the allocation of housing sites 12 and 13 at the Harwell Campus site (totalling 1,400 dwellings) will adversely affect the special qualities of the AONB, given the proposed development sites can be viewed from numerous locations along the Ridgeway National Trail. Policies relating to these sites are unsound in that they are not justified as being the most suitable locations for development when considered against reasonable alternatives. North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2014 – 2019 describes this area as characterised by some of the most emblematic features of the North Wessex Downs.</p>	Harwell Campus is unique with national and international significance and potential in high technology sectors, supported by Enterprise Zone status recently extended to 2018. It has significant economic and employment growth potential, as identified in Economic Forecasting to inform the Oxfordshire SEP and SHMA (ECO02). To achieve this potential sufficient housing is required in appropriate and sustainable locations. Together this presents exceptional circumstances that justify development in AONB in accordance with NPPF para 115-116, having assessed all reasonable alternative sites. All potentially reasonable alternative sites have been robustly assessed as set out in the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper 3 (TOP03) which demonstrates consideration of the AONB. The selection of sites have been informed by Landscape Studies (NAT04.1-04.12) in particular the

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>The key issues for the Plan period will be ensuring that development beyond the boundary does not visually damage these critical scarp landscapes; management of users of the Ridgeway to maximise enjoyment and minimise conflicts; and maintenance and, where possible, extension of the chalk grassland habitats. The allocations, with the existing Harwell Research facility, would bring the urban influence of Didcot to the foot of the down. This, combined with the new development planned for the south of Didcot, would form a new feature in the existing landscape of a scale to change landscape character in a way contrary to the purpose of the AONB designation. The scale of the allocation site and repeated sighting of the development would adversely affect and limit enjoyment of the recreational opportunity offered by the National Trail and extensive network of public rights of way which pass through the site and surrounding landscape. Mitigation of the landscape and visual impacts will be unable to reduce the impact of the allocations to acceptable levels due to the prominent sloping nature of the site, scale of development proposed leading to unacceptable landscape and visual impacts as seen from key viewpoints e.g. 1, 4, 5 and 6 in the Harwell Campus Landscape Study and the Ridgeway NT. The landscape and visual appraisal (para 1.1.1) (also described as a landscape and visual impact assessment report and landscape study), considered the visual impact of the allocations, not landscape impact. We disagree with the Landscape Study conclusion that while there would be a change of character this would not constitute significant harm to the wider AONB landscape, and do not see how such changes would be compatible with the AONB management Plan 2014 – 2019. No attempt has been made to consider how the allocation sites would affect the special qualities of the NWD AONB in part of the designation. Harwell Campus is an employment site, not an existing community. Should these allocations be adopted, we are concerned that their presence will result in consequential development in future</p>	<p>East Harwell Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (NAT04.1). The outcomes of which have been reflected in the size and capacity of the allocations and within the Site Development Templates in Appendix A of the Plan. The Council agree a Statement of Common Ground prior to the examination of the plan will be useful.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>plan periods. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Council to discuss our concerns and look for areas of common ground prior to the examination of the plan.</p>	
<p>Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB</p>	<p>Around 470 respondents object to development of the Harwell sites. Key issues raised are summarised below. Heritage considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would harm the landscape and historic environment in relation to important views, natural features, tranquillity, noise and light pollution. This area is characterised by some of the most emblematic features of the North Wessex Downs: the Ridgeway, the oldest road in England, runs along the top of the scarp; Uffington White Horse; Avebury on the open Downs Plain, part of Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site. The historic & nationally important Ridgeway National Path lies to the south. • Chilton has been in existence since before the Domesday survey. • There is a Listed building along the boundary of the site. • Open landscape with views to far horizons are a key component of character are reflected in the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. • The Ridgeway will be directly affected by the visual impact of the development. <p>Landscape, AONB & Green Belt considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocations in the Green Belt and AONB will undermine the rural character of the Vale. • The Plan does not comply with the European Landscape Convention, placing too much weight on economic growth at the expense of potential damage to the landscape. • The sites falls entirely within the AONB and the proposals do not comply with the Local Plan CP34 and paragraph 5.108. • Little regard has been given to the environmental impact of proposed developments within NWD AONB with respect to light, noise, pollution and change of character through urbanisation. • Allocating 1,400 houses in NWD AONB when there are viable alternatives is unsound and conflicts with the NPPF, CROW Act 2000 Section 85, and Core policy 44. There has been a failure to consider reasonable alternatives. • The CRoW Act 2000 requires Vale of White Horse DC to "conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Area of 	<p>Harwell Campus is unique with national and international significance and potential in high technology sectors, supported by Enterprise Zone status recently extended to 2018. It has significant economic and employment growth potential, as identified in Economic Forecasting to inform the Oxfordshire SEP and SHMA (ECO02). To achieve this potential sufficient housing is required in appropriate and sustainable locations. Together this presents exceptional circumstances that justify development in AONB in accordance with NPPF para 115-116, having assessed all reasonable alternative sites. All potentially reasonable alternative sites have been robustly assessed as set out in the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper 3 (TOP03) which demonstrates consideration of the AONB. The selection of sites have been informed by Landscape Studies (NAT04.1-04.12) in particular the East Harwell Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (NAT04.1). The outcomes of which have been reflected in the size and capacity of the allocations and within the Site Development Templates in Appendix A of the Plan.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>Outstanding Natural Beauty". The proposals fail to protect this sensitive landscape. • The NPPF places AONBs in the highest category of landscape protection. Vale officers appear unaware of the status of AONBs. AONB boundaries cannot be adjusted by Local Authorities. • There is a lack of justification for an unprecedented level of housing within the AONB - the largest housing allocation on any greenfield site in any AONB or National Park in the UK. • Unmet housing need does not outweigh harm to the green belt and AONB or constitute 'very special circumstances' for removing land from the Green Belt and AONB given that there are sustainable alternatives. This approach conflicts with the NPPF and PPG. • Allocating sites in AONB does not comply with The NPPF p116 which states that permission should be refused. • Developing the site would irreversibly destroy a protected, irreplaceable landscape. This is unjustified, especially when no accurate job forecast is available. • The presence of Harwell Campus should not be used to justify development outside its boundaries since the campus pre-dates the setting up of the AONB. • It is premature to allocate unprecedented levels of housing to greenfield sites within the AONB. • It is premature to proceed with strategic housing allocations within North Wessex Downs AONB until (a) there is a proven track record of economic growth in the area (b) issues surrounding capacity on the A34 have been addressed and (c) it has been proven that housing must be located here with a full analysis as required by the NPPF paragraphs 115-116. • There is potential for major development to intrude onto open downland, including masts, pylons, major wind turbine developments, mineral extraction and waste management, threatening the sense of remoteness and tranquillity. • Light spillage from development in and around the AONB is of concern. • The proposals would adversely affect views from public vantage points. • Skyline impact is a serious constraint. • Impacts – landscape, noise, visual, pollution – cannot be mitigated satisfactorily. • The proposals are incompatible with the AONB Management Plan. • Development at</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>Harwell Campus was discounted previously because of its AONB sensitivity. • Development would set a precedent leading to further building in the AONB. • The housing allocation within AONB is NOT linked to employment growth at Harwell Campus • No houses should be built in the open fields. • Developing E Harwell will have significant, irreversible negative landscape Impacts. • SA 8: Sites chosen are not the least harmful development options. • There will be an impact on the dark night skies within the North Wessex Downs. • The characteristics of The Icknield Way will change from open landscape to urban. • Sites proposed for development have a distinct character forming a transition between the high downs and the clay lowlands of the Vale. • NH site forms open landscape between the Harwell Campus, Harwell village and Didcot. • AONB is a sparsely populated landscape with a population density of 72 people p sqkm. • It is hard to assess the true extent of urban sprawl into the AONB. • The proposals will result in unsympathetic incremental expansion of settlements detracting from the surrounding countryside. • The resulting “settlement” would potentially have one of the largest populations of any settlement within the AONB and place Harwell Campus with the third largest population in the AONB. The planned Campus housing would be the largest urbanised area within the AONB. • Building on site 13 will increase pressure for further development and lead to Chiltern, Rowstock, Milton Heights, Milton Village and Sutton Courtenay, Appleton, the Heybournes and Upton being subsumed in a greater Didcot. •The Downland villages have a recognised style which will be changed for ever. • Development of E.Harwell will be out of scale with developments in the surrounding villages. • The Plan does not define how the distinctive character and separate identity of places will be objectively assessed and maintained. • Vale has given greater consideration to preserving the Green Belt than the AONB. • Sites and houses have been reduced for the Green Belt but not AONB. • Vale has incorrectly stated that Green Belt has greater weight</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>than AONB. • Request that the Inspector removes Local Plan site allocations in the Green Belt and AONB. • Developing this site would result in the loss of Best, Most Versatile Land. • The site is a Greenfield site which contains 140ha of Grade 2 Agricultural Land. • Grade 2 land is the best quality in the borough and should be given the greatest protection from development. • The future use of redundant brownfield sites within the AONB i.e. airfields and military sites. • 2000 houses allocated into the AONB (74% of West Berks is in the AONB) most have already been delivered into existing settlements, brownfield etc. • The landscape focus for site selection is too narrow, given that all 8 land parcels analysed score medium to high on AONB sensitivity, and leads to a disjointed pattern of development in conflict with other objectives of national guidance. • The landscape of the Harwell South site is compromised by its neighbour, the Campus to the north and this provides an opportunity to provide a form of development, where the layout and relationship with the Campus is one critical aspect of development and with the Ridgeway and elevated parts of the AONB is a second critical aspect. Chilton • Chilton has already expanded with no development of infrastructure. • Use of out-of-date maps and aerial photos and omission of Chilton Fields site is unacceptable. • 425 of 850 houses proposed for East Harwell Campus would be in Chilton parish. There has been no assessment of cumulative impacts of the proposed developments and coalescence with Chilton. The Chilton Field Development (2014) increased the size of Chilton by ~80% with the completion of 275 new houses and an additional 200 being built at Harwell with outline permission for 125 north of the H campus. These allocations are not shown on the Local Plan maps of Chilton and Harwell Oxford Campus. • The diagrammatic map shows Chilton far removed from the East Harwell Campus site. • Proposals for Chilton and H Campus are in conflict with Core Policy 42. • There has been a lack of consultation with village residents and Harwell Campus. • The plan to expand Chilton Village within the North</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>Wessex Downs AONB, does not comply with Paragraph 4.7, making the plan unsound. Harwell Campus• Harwell Campus needs supporting physical infrastructure. • Harwell Campus is an employment site, not an existing community. • There are two centres at the Campus: the employment and the school. There are few shops, services or associated facilities around the HC site. • Harwell Campus will become a Local Service Centre not a Larger Village. • The number of projected new jobs at Harwell Campus is over-estimated • The Harwell office employs circa 100 most of whom already work on the Campus. • Less than 10% of responding households have anyone working on the Harwell Campus. • The number of projected new jobs at Harwell Campus is overestimated. • Job growth figures are unclear. According to the SQW/ Cambridge Econometrics report 3,500 net new jobs have the potential to be created at Harwell Oxford Campus up to 2031 whereas the Plan states that at least 5,400 net new jobs will be created. • 95% of employees at the Campus do not live in Harwell or Chilton villages. • The Plan presupposes HC employees will occupy the new homes. This may not happen. • Evidence suggests that the majority of future employees at Harwell Oxford Campus will commute rather than live on the doorstep. Housing within the AONB is more expensive than like-for-like housing elsewhere. • The argument that new houses in the AONB are sustainable because everyone who will live in them will work at the new Harwell Business Campus and walk to work, is unrealistic. • I am in the minority of people who work on the campus and live locally. There is a serious mismatch in the availability of jobs at the campus and nearby housing. • Developing on the edge of Harwell Oxford Campus will not address the needs of Campus employees. Due to high the cost of housing, many will be unable to afford to live there. Employees will commute from Swindon, Newbury, Reading and Oxford. • Carry out an assessment of housing affordability for future employees for each proposed site. • Either campus employers take a substantial financial stake in the new homes or</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>developers need to agree covenants restricting sales to Campus employees or offer homes at a substantial discount to Campus employees. • Those working at Harwell Campus often have transient employment placements given the international nature of the work. Short term employees are more likely to rent than buy. • The only people who can link housing provision is the Harwell Oxford Campus. There has been a lack of consultation with the Campus on housing requirements or evidence that this has been done. • The Campus is of international importance and national economic significance as a world-class centre for science. Enclosing the UK's premier science and technology campus within housing estates will not create a world class impression of British science. The European Space Agency headquarters are in Paris, not Harwell. • Distinguish between the total number of jobs and net number of new jobs. • Job numbers in the Plan are inconsistent and should not be used to phase housing delivery. • The strategy for the Campus has not been published. Science Vale Strategy is not yet complete. • To date Harwell-Oxford campus has never provided speculative space. Alternative Sites • Has consideration been given to the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area? • There are viable alternative sites close to the Harwell Oxford Campus, outside the AONB. Allocating 1400 houses in AONB without considering four alternative sites conflicts with the NPPF. • 77 % of the Vale of White Horse is NOT within the North Wessex Downs AONB. • If they are necessary, new houses should be tacked on to other existing developments. • A wider distribution of growth could be more beneficial in supporting the rural areas. • Thames Reservoir may not be needed beyond 2019. • Build on the former Area South Drivesite adjacent to Chilton school, between Chiltern and the A34, and between Chiltern and the dismantled railway. This would help make village services viable. • Valley Park, Didcot A Power Station, North West Grove, and Rowstock have no significant constraints. There is ample scope for development at Valley</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>Park and Didcot A which can take the 1,400 figure. • Land for the North Harwell Campus development, as specified in the above document, is far smaller than the final site proposed for development on page 36. • 32 acres shown on the attached drawing is a potential allocation as an alternative. • Development of the site South of NW Harwell would be beneficial alongside the proposed allocation. • Rowstock is considered unsuitable due “issues of coalescence” yet there are no neighbouring villages. • Proposed allocation boundaries: Hendred Estate would be able to make additional land available for landscape mitigation to ensure a high quality, low impact development. • Drayton, Steventon and E Hanney examined three small areas with for at most 165 houses. • An alternative site is suggested between Drayton, Steventon and Hanney. • ‘Oxford Garden City’ would site 12,000 – 15,000 houses between East Hanney and Steventon. • 32 acres as an urban extension to Wantage would be justified. • Identify Blewbury as a location for additional housing. The Plan does not address the imbalance in Blewbury's economically inactive population. As a consequence, local services may decline as other settlements grow. The LVIA concludes that Blewbury does not comprise the special qualities as a site situated within settlement fringe, as it is neither remote nor tranquil. • Options in Pewsey and Marlborough can be accommodated mostly on brownfield sites. • This site has added benefit of assisting in the delivery of the desirable western relief road. • A principle embraced by Vale in the past, e.g. Crab Hill to facilitate Eastern relief road. • The provision of a Western relief road to Wantage would be beneficial to the road network • South Oxfordshire is allocating a further 3,540 houses to the Didcot area to support the “Science Vale” • Land parcel 2 for site 19 is different from the land allocated by Vale for development. Road Network • The site is adjacent to the A34 which is already congested. Development and employment growth at the Campus would increase traffic, air, noise and light pollution, and amenity effects for residents near the road. • The traffic management</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>scheme is insufficiently robust to deal with anticipated congestion. No explicit mechanism has been given for the delivery of infrastructure. • Residents are concerned about exiting the village at peak times. • The A34 has been identified as a barrier to growth for the Science Vale. • Concentrating housing alongside the A34 makes significant problems inevitable. • Strategic access to A34 south would be via Chilton Interchange which may require upgrade. • New road building, new road signage and new street lighting will be required. • Two new slip roads onto the A34 will add two new roundabouts to the one existing. • Satisfactory site access (es) could be taken from A4185 Newbury Road. • The only access Chilton residents have to their village is from access roads adjoining the A4185 at the Chilton Interchange. • A Public Bridleway (BW) and a Road Used as Public Footpath (RUPP) could be affected. • The developer must contribute to the cost of funding any additional vehicle requirement. • East Harwell Campus could be expected to generate 5100 vehicle trips per day, 500+ trips in peak hour. • Development of the site should contribute towards the Science Vale strategic transport infrastructure package. • NH Campus could be expected to generate 3300 vehicle trips per day, 330 trips in peak hour. • There is pressure for new developments at the junctions of the M4 and A34. Water, Drainage, Flooding • Drainage and Water Supply Infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity. • A water supply strategy would be required from the developer. • It may take up to 3 years required to deliver the infrastructure, alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. • No development should take place within Flood Zone 3 or 2 to comply with the SFRA, Sequential and Exceptions Test. • There are concerns regarding Waste Water sewage treatment. It will be necessary to undertake investigations into the impact of the development. This takes 12 weeks to complete. • Upgrade to our assets will be required and need to allow up to three years lead in time for this. • In some circumstances it may be necessary</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>for developers to fund measures/studies. • The developer would be required to provide a drainage strategy. Public Amenities • The proposal could exceed the existing village school capacity. • Contributions towards the cost of Secondary school capacity would be required: £3,699 p/home. • Primary education contributions (via S106) need to be re-calculated. • E Harwell allocation is shown as paying the same contribution as NW Harwell, yet E Harwell is providing a new school. • Land can be made available for informal open space and on-site school provision to serve the development. • Chilton will treble in size by 2020: one shop, one bank and one school is inadequate. • The proposal does not include associated infrastructure of schools, shops, doctors etc. • Public and travel planning contributions would be required. • NH Campus will benefit from existing and proposed bus services serving Harwell Campus. • The developer of this site should contribute to some form of bus-way to link with the South VP. Other Impacts and Considerations • Increased levels of pollution have a significant impact on public health. There are potential noise and air impacts locally. Development will result in a loss of tranquillity. • EIA Directive requires consideration of interactions between potential environmental impacts. Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England & Wales) Regulations 2011 requires a description of the likely significant effects of a development including cumulative effects. EC Directive 85/337/EEC, as amended by Directive 97/11/EC, requires consideration of direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative impacts. • The Inspector is requested to enable a modification to plan to identify the land for 200 dwellings. • No strategic housing allocations are identified in Smaller Villages within the South East Vale. • New large free-standing houses as replacement dwellings in open countryside and insensitive farm diversification activities and associated signage. • I attended this meeting and was appalled by the absence of democracy. • Conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>important considerations in all areas. • LVIA has several errors, mainly resulting from the use of out-of-date maps. • Impact on Visual Receptors (Users) of the Ridgeway National Trail is considered very high sensitivity. • Public rights of way which pass through the site will be affected. • Additional 220 dwellings identified within the SE Vale through the Local Plan Part2. • The conclusion of the Hankinson Duckett Associates report is misleading and inaccurate. • Acceptance of the SHMA figures as targets has led to the inappropriate allocation of sites. Request lower housing figures be used in the Local Plan. • Hankinson Duckett Associates Report on NH Campus is significantly smaller than the land allocated for development in the Local Plan 2031 • Why is it not possible to provide employment development elsewhere as facilities exist? • Reports refer to whether the associated parcels also have an impact on the skyline. • The proposed pre-allocation of housing numbers to fund infrastructure plans contradicts paragraph 5.60 of the Local Plan and will not match employment growth as delivery will be at the mercy of the housing market. • The Plan will not deliver the infrastructure making it unsound. Housing should be allocated in towns or adjacent to towns with existing infrastructure to be sustainable rather than in rural areas without infrastructure. • Rowstock does not have the facilities of a village suitable for large scale development. • The plan recognises that proposed development is in an AONB and that this should be protected yet states that employment and housing in this area should grow. The two strategies are in conflict.</p>	
Public Transport	<p>N Harwell and E Harwell sites • Considerable thought must be given to the spatial layout of the site. • Roads served by bus routes should be designed to an adequate standard. • The developer should contribute to the cost of some form of bus-way to link with the southern end of the Valley Park site, ensuring that a direct, efficient, attractive bus service can be provided to Didcot. • The developer must contribute to</p>	Noted.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	the cost of funding any additional vehicle requirement needed to serve the residential site, along with service enhancements required.	
Support for Development at Harwell Campus	<p>14 respondents supported development of the Harwell sites. Their comments are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The situation will need to be kept under review as the site progresses and cost estimates and values are refined. We therefore welcome the flexibility afforded in draft Core Policies 7 and 24. • Primary education contributions (via S106) need re-calculating. East Harwell allocation is shown as paying the same financial contribution as North West of Harwell Campus, yet East Harwell is also providing land for the new school. The ‘gifting’ of the land needs to be factored into the financial contribution sought from the East Harwell scheme (and the sums in the IDP re-calculated). • In terms of development capacity we are confident the site can accommodate at least 850 dwellings without conflicting with the Site Development Templates, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, proposed draft Core Policy 38 (Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites) or the draft Housing Density Policy (Core Policy 23). • Owners Mr and Mrs C F Lay and Mr and Mrs N G Lay) of a majority of the land at East Harwell support development of 850 homes and will be in a position to confirm preferred their developer partner shortly. • We consider the Spatial Strategy and Sub-Area Strategy to be a sustainable development option that can deliver integrated housing growth and economic development. • We recognise the importance of landscape masterplanning and urban design in this location and support the Council’s aspirations. • We are committed to ensuing development positively contributes to the wider objectives of Science Vale and look forward to working with the Council and other stakeholders to deliver an exceptional scheme. • We support the Council’s proposal to allocate land at East Harwell for about 850 dwellings – based upon the Landscape Study evidence. • Proposed development could be accommodated on the least sensitive land around Harwell Campus (with scope to deliver appropriate 	Support is welcomed and is noted.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>landscape mitigation). • Land can be made available for informal open space and on-site school provision to serve the development, in accordance with the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The County Council considers the exceptional circumstance - the need to support employment growth at Harwell Campus, an internationally renowned centre for science and technology – justifying a housing allocation within the AONB to be acceptable. • Ptarmigan Land supports the principle of development on land East of Harwell Campus and the allocation of 850 homes on this site. Client seeks an expanded development opportunity by way of an amended policy within the draft Local Plan, requiring a future masterplan. We believe that this spatial strategy does not make adequate provision to support the level of planned employment growth in the area. • We recognise the importance of landscape masterplanning and urban design in this location and support the Council’s aspirations to deliver exemplary modern design with a unique design response. • Land North and North West of Harwell is suitable for housing development as it is mainly brownfield within the existing campus, with capacity for additional housing without compromising the Campus’ primary focus on employment-generating development. It will cause less harm to the AONB than development on adjacent greenfield land east of the A4185. The Partnership confirms the site is available immediately. • Recognition of the economic potential of the Harwell Campus and the need to support economic growth through increasing housing delivery is welcomed by the Partnership. Planning for housing growth should also be driven by a recognition of the Campus’s role in relation to national objectives for science investment. Locating housing growth alongside the employment centre will add to the attractiveness of the Campus as a place to work. • The type of housing is important if it is to optimise its contribution to the Science Vale labour requirements. Work being carried out by the Partnership will establish the types of housing that will best support the science investment. • English</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	Heritage supports the vision for Harwell Campus. Given the level of development proposed (1400 homes) there is a need for the Vision to recognise the resulting form of development and in effect the creation of a new community.	
Water Supply	Water supply and sewerage capacity issues as per previous repower have concerns regarding Water Supply Capability and Waste Water Services in relation to this site. Water supply infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. A water supply strategy would be required from the developer to determine the exact impact on our infrastructure and the significance of the infrastructure to support the development. In the likely event of an upgrade to our assets being required, it could take up to 3 years to deliver the infrastructure, alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. Sewage treatment capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations into the impact of the development and completion of this, on average, takes 12 weeks. In the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be necessary. In this case we ask that the following paragraph is included in the Development Plan. "Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure." Drainage Infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity ahead of the development. In the first instance a drainage strategy would be required from the developer to determine the impact on our infrastructure and the significance of the infrastructure to support the development. Should an upgrade to our assets be required, up to three years lead in time may be necessary,	A Water Cycle Study has been prepared in cooperation with Thames Water to inform plan preparation. Criteria have been added to the Development Site Templates to ensure appropriate evidence and water related infrastructure is provided to support the delivery of acceptable and sustainable development.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. We are likely to request a Grampian planning condition to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation of the development.</p>	

Milton Heights, West of Harwell and Valley Park Sites

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
Coalescence of Villages	Milton and Harwell Sites	A number of comments refer to the coalescence of development with villages. Specific comments include:• There is nothing specific in the plan that defines the 'maintenance of the distinctive character' of the separate identity for Harwell village and encroachment.• The plan does not include an effective mechanism to deliver CP 44 in relation to Harwell Village.	The proposed development to the West of Harwell does not lead to coalescence with any nearby villages or threaten the character of the existing village of Harwell. Development at Valley Park, on the far side of the A34 to Harwell village, should contain landscape buffers to the west of the site to help protect the identity of Harwell Village, as specified in the Development Site Templates.
Coalescence with nearby villages	Valley Park Sites	These proposals will cause coalescence between Didcot and Harwell Village, and Milton Heights and Didcot. The Proposed safeguarding of land off the Harwell Link Road for the Southern Didcot Perimeter Road (Appendix E) would lead to coalescence between Didcot and both East and West Hagbourne. This future coalescence leads to a loss of social identity which would follow a rapid urban extension to an urban extension to Didcot Town. The Valley Parks are neither Harwell, nor Didcot, but isolated and lacking focus. However some of the land designated as protected by NE10 has been allocated to the Valley Park site (2550 homes planned). The proposed plan effectively leads to coalescence of Harwell village with Valley Park/Great Western Park/Didcot destroying the village character. It also does great damage to the important concepts noted in the NPPF section 80 (first 4 bullets) for the residents of our 1000 year old Harwell village. The Plan should identify a rural gap around Harwell Village where no development will be permitted and commitment to a green corridor along the B4493 between the A34 and Zulu Farm.	Masterplanning of the proposed development sites should incorporate appropriate buffers to protect the identity of nearby villages as identified within the Development Site Template
CP 15 - Harwell Village Heritage Assets	West of Harwell	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the	Comment is noted. No change considered necessary as the retention of the historic field pattern forms part of the

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		principle to “Retain the historic field pattern within the site.....”	site template (see Appendix A of Local Plan 2031 Part 1, p.34)
Delivery of Education Infrastructure - Valley Park and North West Valley Park	Valley Park Sites	<p>2550 homes and North West of Valley Park: 800 homes</p> <p>Given the scale of this development area, school provision requirements would need to be confirmed following full assessment based on actual planned housing mix and build timescales. However, based on the pupil generation rates used above, this scale of development generates primary pupils broadly equivalent to approximately 4.5 forms of entry. This scale of provision could be delivered through two new schools, one 2 form entry and one 2.5-3 form entry. However, to minimise travel to school distances, it may be preferable to plan for three schools, two 2 form entry and one 1 form entry, to provide a better spatial distribution of provision. Should housing numbers in this development area increase, three school sites would provide for more flexibility and future-proofing. Pages 28 and 31 of the Local Plan Appendix A states that two new 2 form entry primary schools will be required for Valley Park and North-West Valley Park, one of which may need to be 3 form entry at least during peak years. Page 39 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that two new schools will be needed, one 2 form entry and one 2.5 form entry. The provision of two new primary schools, one of which will be 2.5-3 form entry at peak, is in line with the pupil generation expected as a result of the Local Plan housing numbers. However, if higher housing numbers are approved, this level of provision would not be sufficient, and three primary school sites would be required, one of which should be within North West Valley Park. A new secondary school is already planned to open in Didcot in 2017 to meet the needs of the Great Western Park and Valley Park developments. It will be</p>	Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage constructively with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the required infrastructure, services and facilities are provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		<p>collocated with a University Technical College, which will serve a wider area. A site for another new secondary school is included in masterplanning for the North East Didcot development, pending confirmation of total housing planned numbers in this area. The scale of additional housing proposed by VOWH would confirm the need for another new secondary school in the area. Page 40 of the IDP states that contributions towards the cost of secondary school capacity would be required at the rate of £3,699 per home. This rate applies to extension of existing schools; as new schools are to be built the appropriate new school building rate of cost should be applied. Due to the scale of development and consequent population growth in and around Didcot, a new Special Education Needs school is planned, to be located on Valley Park. Pages 28 and 31 of the Local Plan Appendix A and page 40 of the IDP support this provision.</p>	
Development at Valley Park	Valley Park Sites	<p>A response from the owner of the North West Valley Park site identifies the opportunity for the development to be highly sustainable, linked with excellent public transport connections and so to provide opportunities for a car free environment.</p>	Support is welcomed and is noted.
Education Provision	West of Harwell	<p>Harwell (200 homes) • School planning in this area needs to be based on a broader survey of both housing development and school growth potential, across the surrounding area, including Harwell Campus and Chilton. • The Local Plan proposal could exceed the existing village school's capacity. • Contributions would be required towards the cost of expanding primary school provision serving the area, and towards new secondary and SEN provision in Didcot. • Contributions towards the cost of secondary school capacity would be required at the rate of £3,699 per home. The rate</p>	<p>Comment is noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure the timely provision of educational facilities alongside the planned growth.</p>

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		<p>applies to extension of existing schools. As new schools are to be built the appropriate new school building rate of cost should be applied. East Harwell (850) & NW Harwell (550) • A new 2 form entry primary school will be required. • The school site would need to be 2.22ha and meet OCC's requirements. • Contributions would be required towards the cost of new secondary and SEN provision in Didcot. • The cost of a 2 form entry school is currently assessed as £8,334,000. • Contributions towards the cost of secondary school capacity would be required at the rate of £3,699 per home. The rate applies to extension of existing schools; as new schools are to be built the appropriate new school building rate of cost should be applied.</p>	
Highway Infrastructure - North West Valley Park	North West of Valley Park	<p>This site is located on and would be directly accessed from A4130 which is a good quality link road between Didcot and A34 Trunk Road. The LP includes proposals for the improvement of this link road to dual carriageway standard. Access for this site should therefore be satisfactorily achievable. However, capacity problems could be created at Milton Interchange and on the close approaches to Didcot and mitigation measures would be required. • It is assumed that linkage would be provided between this site and the main Valley Park site and the Great Western Park site. The cumulative impact of this site together with the other development utilising the A4130 link would be substantial. • It is likely that this large site would have impacts on public rights of way. PT contributions would be required. SV UK contributions would be required. This review relates to the extensions of the site to the northwest and south for an additional 400 dwellings. • Northwest - Access should be possible onto A4130 or through Valley Park. PROW may be affected. • South - Access should be secured via proposed</p>	Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage constructively with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the required infrastructure, services and facilities are provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		Harwell Link Road Section 1 (B4493 – A417). • This is now a further increase of 400 dwellings, but their location is not known. However, the increase does not fundamentally change comments made previously.	
Highway Infrastructure - North West Valley Park	Valley Park, Harwell and Milton Parishes east of the A34 adjoining Didcot Town	Valley Park, adjoining Didcot (2550 dwellings) The previous site for Valley Park (2150 dwellings) has been previously commented upon. This review relates to the extensions of the site to the northwest and south for an additional 400 dwellings. • Northwest - Access should be possible onto A4130 or through Valley Park. PROW may be affected. • South - Access should be secured via proposed Harwell Link Road Section 1 (B4493 – A417). • This is now a further increase of 400 dwellings, but their location is not known. However, the increase does not fundamentally change comments made previously.	Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage constructively with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the required infrastructure, services and facilities are provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth.
Highway Infrastructure - Valley Park	Valley Park Sites	Transport Strategy Strategic Sites and Policies Appendices • Valley Park – Should match advice given via Position Statement • Appendix A P27 – States “Provide the proposed Harwell Link Road (Core Policy 17).” –A developer may be giving the land but Oxfordshire County Council is delivering and has secured money for it. The text implies they are doing more than in reality and this should this be made clearer. • The Harwell Link Road has a strategic function, as identified in the evidence base, which is why it is included in the SV scheme package. It is not merely an internal/adjacent local access road to serve Valley Park (having been identified as necessary before) but is required to make the site deliverable, with the need for strategic access points along it (exact wording needs consideration...) • Appendix A P27 column 2 – update ref to read A4130 capacity enhancements, instead of duelling (which may be required)	The Council is working closely with OCC to develop transport evidence to inform the Local Plan. This includes the ETI that has tested and confirmed the duelling of the A4130 is needed. Cooperative working with OCC also confirms that the developer should fund the link road as stated in the plan.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
Infrastructure Delivery	Milton and Harwell Sites	Milton Parish Council note the reduction in proposed houses at Milton Heights but continue to be concerned about the lack of local infrastructure to support these dwellings especially the need for the expansion of the village school and relief of the A34 interchange. Other comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision should be made for a shop within the plan. • There is currently a lack of burial space • The road system will not cope whilst the proposed building is taking place 	The site is located in close proximity to a wide range of facilities and services and will benefit from significant proposals for new infrastructure, including for highways and public transport, to be directed to the Science Vale area more generally. An upgrade to the A34 Milton Interchange is currently underway.
Infrastructure Delivery	West of Harwell	A number of comments relate to the delivery of infrastructure associated with proposed development in Wantage and Grove. Comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the NPPF requires that all developments shall have infrastructure plans developed in parallel with developments. The Vale's local plan proposes ANOTHER 5,500 houses in Wantage/Grove with no local transport infrastructure to support employment in Science area. • Other infrastructure to support any level of development (shops, schools, healthcare) remains an issue. The market town of Wantage is to be treasured. It is a very appealing town of historical interest. The local council has worked to encourage local retailers and this is commended. However, it is insufficient to accommodate the number of houses suggested in the local area and if it was expanded its appeal and its historical character compromised • The Wantage and Grove Campaign Group represents the view of approximately 1,000 individuals in the Wantage and Grove area and its aims are: We are not against any development in Wantage and Grove but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Developments should be proportionate and sustainable > The infrastructure should enhance and improve quality of life for its residents. 	Significant infrastructure, including highway proposals, are set out within the plan and accompanying IDP. No further action.
Milton Heights - Transport Comments	Valley Park, Harwell and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no CP's on the Rights of Way. • Milton Heights map marking Footpath 10 will become totally unusable if the 	Points noted. In Appendix A of the Plan, there is a Site Development Template for this development which sets

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
	Milton Parishes east of the A34 adjoining Didcot Town	A4130 is doubled in width. • Therefore an underpass is needed for the safe travel of pedestrians and cyclists.' • A CP is needed for the 'Safeguarding Agricultural Land'	out a number of transport requirements including footways, and crossing points. CP43 adequately addresses agricultural land.
OCC - Highway Infrastructure - West of Harwell	West of Harwell	West of Harwell (Site for up to 200 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 1000 veh trips per day, 100 trips in peak hour. • Satisfactory site access could be taken from Grove Road. Grove Road has a width restriction and, together with its junction with A4130, would need to be improved. • Strategic access to A34 north would be via A4185 to Milton Interchange. • Strategic access to A34 south and Harwell would be via Rowstock and A4185 to Chilton Interchange. Strategic access to Wantage would also be via Rowstock, and A417. Hence substantial pressure would be created at Rowstock and along A4185. • Local mitigation (e.g. footways, crossing points, junction improvements, traffic management, etc.) would be required. PT contributions would be required	Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage constructively with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the required infrastructure, services and facilities are provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth.
OCC - Public Transport - West of Harwell	West of Harwell	West of Harwell This site is located about 400 metres from the High Street bus stops in the centre of Harwell village. However, the walking route along Grove Road does not have a footpath currently, and the developer would be required to provide a safe walking route to the bus stops. The developer would contribute to improved frequency and hours of service on the strategic bus route between Wantage, Harwell and Didcot	Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage constructively with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the required infrastructure, services and facilities are provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth.
OCC - Scale of Development at Milton Heights	Milton and Harwell Sites	Site Specific Comments 27.Milton Heights - The county council objected to the previous allocation of 1400 dwellings at this site. Due to the insistence that some housing would be allocated here, an allocation of 400 was deemed acceptable in principle as it will allow the primary school to expand to 1 Form of Entry. However, the county council is	Milton Heights is considered to be a highly sustainable location being close to large areas of existing employment and where significant future expansion is planned. The area will benefit from substantial infrastructure improvements including to highways and public transport

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		yet to be convinced that the transport impacts of 400 dwellings can be mitigated.	and also benefits from a good range of nearby services and facilities
Scale of Development at Harwell Village	Milton and Harwell Sites	A number of comments related to development proposals at Harwell Village. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although all villages need to grow and develop, we are in danger of losing our identity completely. • 20 or more houses can be coped with, but when these developments reach the hundreds the whole structure of the village is compromised. • Harwell's population of some 2300 people in 1000 dwellings, is set to quadruple with the extensive plans outlined in the Local Plan. • Villages and rural communities are being swamped and are in imminent danger of losing their village character, while the countryside, far from being safeguarded is under threat • Living as we do on the border of VWHDC and South Oxfordshire means that we are surrounded by these huge building projects; • Proposed dev in LP of 200 houses + Taylor Wimpey estate (66 houses) + Blenheim Hill (Bloor Homes 80+) + Reading Road (45 houses) + Great Western Estate (2000+ houses) + several thousand more at Valley Park. • I am opposed to any development which impacts the rural nature, outlook and surroundings of the village and fully support the views of the Keep Harwell Rural campaign. • Scale of development relative the scale of existing buildings and its limited services is unsustainable development, which will adversely have an urbanising effect on open countryside. 	Harwell Village is considered a highly sustainable location for development. The village has a good range of services and facilities, has good public transport (with improvements already proposed) and where it will benefit from substantial proposals for improved infrastructure (including for highways) across the wider Science Vale area.
Scale of Development at Milton Heights	Milton and Harwell Sites	A number of comments related to development proposals at Milton Heights. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milton Heights is close to the geographic centre of this area and therefore in our view is suitable for further expansion, and expansion of the scale envisaged • Indeed Milton Heights does not have any landscape or other special nationally recognised landscape 	Milton Heights is considered to be a highly sustainable location being close to large areas of existing employment and where significant future expansion is planned. The area will benefit from substantial infrastructure improvements including to highways and public transport

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		<p>designation. There are no particular heritage features such as listed buildings or Conservation Areas which might be affected by large scale development. • The benefits of developing this particular site would clearly outweigh any possible disadvantages, given the pressing need for additional housing to meet assessed needs. • We support the policy but these comments should not be taken as undermining another suggestion that there should be 1,400 homes on this site. • An area with many established jobs and where new jobs could quickly be grown to complement what exists at present to drive a sustainable local community. • It is notable that the draft allocation is double that typically being proposed for much larger and more sustainable villages • The Scale of development is tantamount to a new settlement in view of the relationship with the existing settlement, • Cumulative impacts of traffic from this proposed development and others like it, elsewhere in the County and beyond we regard this as entirely unacceptable • It is far from clear that local bus service could be efficiently diverted to serve the area</p>	<p>and also benefits from a good range of nearby services and facilities.</p>
Scale of Growth at Didcot	Valley Park, Harwell and Milton Parishes east of the A34 adjoining Didcot Town	<p>• The proposed 'Valley Park' and 'North West Valley Park' developments to the west of Didcot are excessive when existing and recent local developments are taken into account. • Didcot has expanded immensely over recent years, with new housing built to the west at 'Great Western Park', the North with the 'Ladygrove Estate', and possibly also with the proposed development of 'North East Didcot' (in South Oxfordshire District).</p>	<p>The Council consider that land to the west of Didcot, located within the VoWH is a highly sustainable location for development and suitable for the allocations as proposed, which are based on a comprehensive suite of evidence documents. The site selection process is set out in more detail within the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p>
Scale of Valley Park Allocation	Valley Park Sites	<p>The housing supply table should state the following number of dwellings for Valley Park, within the South East Vale Sub-Area: "At least 2,550" There should be an acknowledgement that significantly more than 2,550 dwellings can be achieved</p>	<p>There is no evidence to demonstrate that additional development can be accommodated on the sites in question up to 2031. The proposed allocation is based on detailed evidence, including the Estimated Transport</p>

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		on this site. The scale of growth on the Valley Park site as set out in the plan is challenged. It is suggested that the site can deliver more than 2,550 dwellings and that this should be reflected in the plan.	Impacts Study (ETI) and Housing Delivery, both of which demonstrate that market capacity and highway capacity and significant constraints to additional development at these sites.
Scale of Valley Park Allocation	Valley Park, Harwell and Milton Parishes east of the A34 adjoining Didcot Town	Valley Park – The scale of growth potentially coming forward through applications at Valley Park needs to be fully considered. The Plan allocates 2,550 dwellings; however, developers are working on a scheme for 4,450 dwellings. The Vale will need to be able to demonstrate that the site can absorb higher levels of housing and further work needs to be done to understand if it can be mitigated with appropriate infrastructure and services being provided. The Plan will also need to consider if allocating higher numbers here would necessitate lower numbers elsewhere in the Plan. If it is demonstrated a higher number can be delivered within the Plan period then the county council would strongly suggest less sustainable sites are removed from the plan.	There is no evidence to demonstrate that additional development can be accommodated on the sites in question up to 2031. The proposed allocation is based on detailed evidence, including the Estimated Transport Impacts Study (ETI) and Housing Delivery, both of which demonstrate that market capacity and highway capacity and significant constraints to additional development at these sites.
Support for Development at Harwell Village	West of Harwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting the inclusion of this site because of its suitability for residential development which will contribute towards the Vale's housing land supply • The site at the West of Harwell is free of any insurmountable technical constraints • Realistically developable within the early years of the plan. • acknowledges the need for highway improvement works and has appointed transport consultants who are liaising directly with Oxfordshire County Council in this regard • Taylor Wimpey have informed us that they are willing to undertake the necessary highways works along Grove Road • A hydrology strategy will be produced in support of any application • The allocation is in conformity with 'a presumption in favour of sustainable development.' • sustainable location: edge of existing settlement, 	Support is welcomed and is noted.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		minimising need for vehicles as Harwell has many community facilities and services.	
Thames Water - Water Capacity - Valley Park	North West of Valley Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewage treatment capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support this development • necessary to undertake investigations and completion of this takes 12 weeks. • upgrade to assets could take up to three • paragraph is included in the Development Plan. "Developers will be required ..." • Drainage Infrastructure is likely to be required • drainage strategy would be required from the developer • developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. • request a Grampian planning condition 	Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to liaise closely with Thames Water to ensure that water provision and infrastructure can be provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth. Site template contains information relating to necessary upgrades in line with feedback from previous consultations.
Traffic Congestion	Milton and Harwell Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harwell site unsound due to infrastructure restrictions • Grove Road will not be able to cope with the level of traffic. • Narrow with sections where 2 vehicles cannot pass side by side. • access to this school can no way support any more traffic than it does at present. access to this school needs urgently reviewing • Buses also regularly mount the pavement causing damage and endangering people • Proper survey over time not wandering up there in the middle of the day. • Should be 20mph speed limit • Co-ordination is needed at Milton Interchange traffic lights and the mini-junction and pedestrian crossing inside the park, to relieve congestion off the A34. • An A34 south-bound slip is needed coming across the old Milton Village Football Club field into a new mini-roundabout at that Milton Village junction (see map) • This will alleviate the amount of traffic trying to converge from the two lanes, from the A34 and Milton Interchange, while reducing the amount of the A34 build up. • Several park and rides hubs could also be introduced around Grove, Harwell Campus, Milton Park and Culham. With a regular bus service at reasonable cost, more people 	The plan has been informed by detailed assessment of transport impacts, including close working with the Highways Authority. Substantial proposals are made for new highway infrastructure which have been shown to appropriately mitigate any impacts.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		would use the service. • Mine and a lot of locals are concerned with many businesses going out of business, loss of jobs due to not getting to work on time, unhappy customers and delivery schedules not met.	
Traffic Congestion	Valley Park Sites	A number of issues are raised concerning highway infrastructure associated with the Valley Park site. • Road to the station from the A34 needs duelling ALL the way • A34 needs an extra lane both sides from Chilton to the Oxford Ring Road south•A34 needs an extra lane both sides from Chilton to the Oxford Ring Road south• The station car waiting area needs doubling	Significant infrastructure is proposed, including highway infrastructure, as informed by detailed investigation and working with the Highways Authority

East of Sutton Courtenay

Category	Summary	Council Response
Alternative Site	North of Appleford Road, Sutton Courtenay, is considered to be a suitable alternative site. The SHLAA conducted by the District Council in 2014 highlighted the suitability of the site for housing development also noting that the site is available, achievable and deliverable. The site is not within any protected area of landscape	Noted. This site was not considered to meet the initial site filters in place to support a strategic site allocation capable of accommodating around 200 dwellings. Other constraints exist which limit the site further.
Alternative Site - North of Appleford Road Sutton Courtenay	Support is outlined for CP3 and 4, identifying Sutton Courtenay as a Larger Village, and the councils approach to splitting the district into three sub-areas. There are discrepancies in the plan and its categorisation of Sutton Courtenay (Within CP4 as part of South East Vale Sub-Area/ CP8 as part of Abingdon and Oxford Sub-Area). It is suggested that the village sits more with the Abingdon/ Oxford Sub-Area. An alternative site is available to the north of Appleford Road in Sutton Courtenay. It is suggested that the Planning Inspector should be satisfied that all alternatives have been considered and the allocation of Green Belt and AONB sites is justified, when other sustainable sites are available.	Drafting error. Agree to be consistent and correct (and corresponding changes to CP's 8 and 15 to reflect Sutton Courtenay within the South East Vale sub area).
English Heritage - Conservation Area	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the principle to “sensitively design development to minimise any impact on the setting of the Sutton Courtenay Conservation Area.....”	Noted. This is accommodated in the site development template for this site.
Objection to Development at Sutton Courtenay	An objection to development at Sutton Courtenay outlines a number of issues, including:• The plan has failed to fully comprehend the negative impact that the traffic, drainage and character loss of the village • Site will be accessed by a very small road, Frilsham Street and Hobby Horse Lane. This road is reduced to one lane in places and cannot be widened. The extra traffic on this road will dramatically reduce road safety within the village. • The increase in house numbers and destruction of valuable green space in the village will be detrimental to character of the village. • It is questioned whether building extra houses will actually provide more affordable housing. It	Sutton Courtenay is considered a highly sustainable location for development. The village has a good range of services and facilities, has good public transport (with improvements already proposed) and where it will benefit from substantial proposals for improved infrastructure (including for highways) across the wider Science Vale area.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>is suggested that the houses built in the villages are still going to be sold at premium market rates. • The council should exhaust all brown field and redevelopment opportunities.</p>	
OCC - Education - Sutton Courtenay	<p>East Sutton Courtenay: 220 homes Sutton Courtenay Primary School will need to expand to 1 form entry to meet the needs of already permitted development. The Local Plan proposal could exceed the school's capacity at 1 form entry, without making viable further expansion. However, school planning in this area needs to take into account nearby schools and villages, as much of the existing village of Milton is closer to Sutton Courtenay School than its current designated school, St Blaise, and some of the development planned for Sutton Courtenay is easily accessible to Culham Primary School. Primary education provision for this proposed housing would therefore be based on a broader survey of both housing development and school growth potential, including any new schools resulting from larger scale developments, across the surrounding area. Initial school site expansion analysis indicates that the current school site area is below that recommended for a 1.5 form entry or larger school, which compromises the ability of the school to expand. Acquisition of additional site area for the school would facilitate its expansion, should that be required. Expansion of secondary school and SEN school capacity serving the area will also be required. Page 22 of the Local Plan Appendix A and page 36 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan support this requirement for educational provision. In both cases Didcot is specified in the context of secondary education; Sutton Courtenay is currently part of the Abingdon partnership of schools. Some children attend secondary schools in Didcot, and the provision of new schools in Didcot may mean more children from the village choose schools in Didcot. As such, expansion of secondary education provision to serve this development site may be delivered in either Abingdon or Didcot.</p>	<p>Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage constructively with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the required infrastructure, services and facilities are provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
OCC - Highways - Sutton Courtenay	<p>East Sutton Courtenay (220 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 1300 veh trips per day, 130 trips in peak hour. • Site access would be taken from Hobbyhorse Lane. The Lane is a farm access standard only and leads westwards to the nPower site at Didcot, but with no strategic access available to Didcot. Eastwards towards the village, Hobbyhorse Lane leads via Frilsham Street to High Street. Frilsham Street is narrow and would not be suitable to cater for the increased volume of traffic. The site, therefore, has no apparent means of satisfactory access. • Strategic access to Abingdon and A34 north would be through Abingdon via A415 or B4017. Both of these routes are heavily congested during peak times. • Contributions should be secured towards future strategic infrastructure improvement for Abingdon. PT contributions would be required.</p>	<p>Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage constructively with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the required infrastructure, services and facilities are provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth.</p>
OCC - Public Transport - Sutton Courtenay	<p>East Sutton Courtenay This site is located over 400 metres from bus stops at High Street garage on the x1 bus route from Harwell and Didcot to Abingdon and Oxford. To reduce this distance, the developer should fund the relocation of these bus stops closer to the junction of the High Street with Frilsham Street, along with improved infrastructure such as shelters. Improved footways would also be required along Frilsham Street and Hobbyhorse Lane. The developer would also contribute to the cost of an enhanced frequency of bus service between Didcot and Abingdon via Sutton Courtenay</p>	<p>Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage constructively with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the required infrastructure, services and facilities are provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth.</p>
Support for Development at Sutton Courtenay	<p>Support is outlined for the proposed allocation at Sutton Courtenay The allocation can be delivered within the context of Appendix A, subject to minor modifications, the site is considered to be deliverable & is not overly reliant on provision of infrastructure. Support is outlined for the Council seeking to protect villages from unallocated development.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed and is noted.</p>
Sutton Courtenay - Flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site flood on a regularly basis. 	<p>The site lies outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is recognised in the site templates that part of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
Sutton Courtenay - Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development borders an active landfill site which regularly floods. • The development would be an overburden for the local infrastructure. • Development is in close proximity of a major sewerage site, which the EA proved unable to control in regard to foul odours. 	<p>The site is in close proximity to the significant employment area of Milton Park. Contributions are required for the improvement to the existing infrastructure, services and facilities in the area. These are set out in the site template.</p>
Thames Water - Water Capacity - Sutton Courtenay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewage treatment capacity will be unable to support the demand of the development. • 12 week investigation in needed. • 3 years lead time for an upgrade. • The development plan must ensure developers will guarantee there is enough waste water capacity to serve both the existing and new customers. • Drainage strategy will be required by the developer before development can commence. • A Grampian planning condition will be requested to ensure infrastructure is in place before development commences. 	<p>Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to liaise closely with Thames Water to ensure that water provision and infrastructure can be provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth. Site template contains information relating to necessary upgrades in line with feedback from previous consultations.</p>

Crab Hill and Monks Farm Sites

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
Alternative Site - South of Downsview Road	Wantage and Grove Sites	An alternative site is put forward at land south of Downsview Road as available, deliverable and a sustainable location for development. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not Green Belt or AONB • There are no ecological constraints. • Development could help fund restoration of Wilts and Berks Canal (between East Challow and Wantage) • The separation of EChallow and Wantage would be maintained. • The land is well related to existing areas of employment. • Wantage: wide range of services and facilities – no reliance upon private vehicles • SEVale sub: Significant centres of employment. Accessible via a range of transport modes. • This site could potentially deliver up to 645 new homes. • It is not anticipated that the entire site should come forward for development as it is important that a physical gap remains between East Challow and Wantage. • Remainder of the land area can be secured as green infrastructure to retain an appropriate sense of separation 	. The Council have considered a comprehensive set of potential development, informed, in part, by the Council SHLAA. The details of this process are set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper.
Biodiversity	Monks Farm	The biological value of the Letcombe Brook is outlined, which is in proximity of proposed development at Monks Farm. Comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chalk streams are globally rare habitats and cannot be recreated or offset elsewhere • Ecological assets should not be subject to unacceptable levels of disturbance from people and their pets. • Associated protected species such as water vole and otter cannot be supported elsewhere as they are reliant on water. • The Government have made a commitment to halt the loss of biodiversity and deliver net gains where possible. • (NPPF) aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible should be respected. 	There is an Environmental Buffer included in the Development Template that is considered to be sufficient. No further action.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
CP 15 - Crab Hill - National Policy	Crab Hill	Allocating large areas for housing development without significant employment growth in Wantage and Grove is contrary to this Government Policy.	Wantage and Grove are within Science Vale, where significant employment growth is planned up to 2031. In addition to the sites at Harwell Campus and Milton Park, six hectares of land is allocated for employment at Monks Farm, while a further five and a half hectares is available at Grove Technology Park. Other land may be considered suitable for employment uses through the emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan for Wantage.
CP 15 - Crab Hill Support	Crab Hill	The likelihood is that the start date for land at Crab Hill will slip to 2016. However, this still means that allocation of 1,500 homes will be completed during the life-time of the Plan.	Support is welcomed and is noted.
CP 15 - Development Boundary Wantage and Grove	Wantage and Grove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development boundary around Wantage and Grove is illogical, inconsistent and will lead to numerous anomalies in the future which will be misleading and confusing. • The boundaries are drawn as two separate entities yet meet at one point, while also excluding both technology parks and areas with no allocation at all. It would be preferable to create one boundary. 	Points noted. The Council considers the current boundaries are appropriate.
CP15 - Alternative Site Crown Packaging	Wantage and Grove Sites	<p>The potential of the Crown Packaging site for re-development for residential use is outlined. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sites consists of 7.2 ha, situated to the northwest of Wantage, and south of Grove along Downsview Road. • The sites are split between two separate parcels • The sites are surrounded by consented residential development • The sites are located close to Grove Technology Park • In accordance with the settlement hierarchy, further residential development in Wantage would be appropriate to recognise its Market Town status in the settlement hierarchy • The continued identification of the Crown Downsview Road sites as strategic employment sites are not consistent with national policy, effective or justified • The sites could serve to maintain the settlement hierarchy as the smaller villages have significantly more new development attributed to them than the main towns • The sites provides an excellent opportunity for a residential allocation which can deliver at least 250 homes. • The sites consist of brownfield land in a 	This site is an important location for employment in Wantage and Grove and the Council will resist the loss of this land for this use. Current designation is appropriate... No change considered necessary.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		sustainable location• Crown Packaging have an urgent need to relocate to a smaller more efficient facility within the local area which will enable them to retain their highly skilled jobs within the Vale• There is a surplus of employment land within the District and market signals indicate the sites are highly unlikely to be re-let or sold for employment use• It is critical the strategic employment designation is removed	
Crab Hill Development Template	Crab Hill	Lands Improvement Holdings Limited (LIH) supports the general principle set out in the Crab Hill, Wantage Site Development Template (Local Plan Appendix A).• Dev density should be lower towards.... approach might be appropriate in certain parts of the site but to require lower densities around the outer limits of the whole site is too prescriptive. • requirement to “remediate any contamination...” no such requirements in the draft conditions issued by the Council (P13/V01764/0)	The Development Templates provides high level parameters to inform the Site Masterplan. No further action.
English Heritage - Heritage Assets - Crab Hill	Crab Hill, Wantage	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but the identified site would complete the envelopment of Wantage Charlton Conservation Area, which has its roots as a rural hamlet, in modern housing. The area still retains the character of a village centre when viewed from within. An additional requirement should therefore be added to the Site Development Template that the scale and extent of development around the historic centre should be limited.	Agree with English Heritage's suggestion to recognise the heritage value of this historic core of the Charlton Conservation Area.
English Heritage - Heritage Assets - Monks Farm	Monks Farm, Grove	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the requirement for a Heritage Statement to be submitted to show how the listed buildings at Monks Farm and Grove Wick Farm have been sensitively considered. Monks Farm is a good rural group with a farmhouse, barn and cottages, and surrounding this group with housing and a link road can only, in our view, seriously harm the setting of these buildings. It is critical therefore that, if this allocation is taken forward, the impact on setting is mitigated as much as possible through limiting the scale of the surrounding	Agree with English Heritage's suggestion to recognise the heritage value of this historic route.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		development and sensitive design. The route way (Cow Lane) which runs through the allocated site, is at least post-medieval in date, appearing on Rocque’s map of Berkshire in 1761. This historic feature should be retained and respected within any development scheme. An additional requirement should be added to the Site Development Template requiring the retention of and respect for this historic route.	
English Heritage - Supporting Text	Wantage and Grove Sites	English Heritage welcomes the statement in the vision for the South East Vale Sub-Area that the town centre in Wantage will have been protected and enhanced, although we would prefer “conserved and enhanced” as terminology more consistent with the NPPF. We also welcome the statement that “The countryside and villages will have retained their distinctive character”.	Amendment provided in DLP11 Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications.
Housing Growth at Monks Farm	Monks Farm	The site promoters for the Monks Farm site state that they are pleased that the District Council is now at such an advanced stage of production of the Local Plan Part 1. It accords with the principles of the NPPF in that it will boost significantly the supply of housing in the District. Other comments include:• Request that the Council considers increasing the housing numbers in the allocation to 825 new dwellings. • With regard to providing a new primary school. The expansion of land adjacent to the existing school (Grove Church of England Primary School) site is possible. Discussions have taken place with Oxfordshire County Council who confirm that this approach would be suitable. Therefore, a new primary school will no longer be required within the main development area, and additional land is therefore available within the allocation for a further 75 houses approximately. • Bringing forward this site will significantly boost the supply of housing in the District. • The allocation could be increased to 825 units together with 6ha of employment. • Gallagher-Gleeson intends to consult widely on their intention of submitting an outline planning application by the Summer of 2015. Gallagher Estates welcomes the continued support of land	The Site Development Template identifies the site capacity as ‘around’ 750 dwellings precisely to allow for ‘some’ flexibility of the exact number of units to be delivered. This level of detail can be addressed through detailed site master planning.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		<p>to the north of Grove. The consented schemes representing early phases of the north Grove allocation (listed above) have already secured access that enables further phases to come forward. The junction has been designed in such a way that it can be upgraded to serve the wider north Grove allocation and the Grove airfield site, and the first part of the Grove North Link Road (GNLR) has been designed to the standards required by the Highways Authority for the completed strategic road. Williams supports the identification and inclusion of that land at Monks Farm (North Grove) as a strategic allocation for at least 750 new homes. However, it is submitted that its capacity may well be greater once a detailed assessment has been undertaken. We would encourage the LPA not to resist any increase in delivery. There are relatively few environmental and/or technical constraints on the delivery of Monks Farm (North Grove). It is submitted the land could be brought forward early in the identified Plan period. The site could reasonably be built out within 10 years from adoption of the LP 2031. Williams supports in principle Core Policy 15 (Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area) subject to there being recognition within the policy that non Class B uses would be capable of delivering new job and economic growth opportunities on the Monks Farm (North Grove) allocation.</p>	
Housing Growth in Wantage and Grove	Wantage and Grove Sites	<p>A number of issues are raised with the operation of the NPPF, that it is not preventing unsustainable development, and that there is insufficient protection to England's town centres. The high housing densities set out in the plan are not conducive to appropriate communal living and the fact that the North Grove Link Road will not be delivered until after 1,500 houses (in a 2,500 scheme) are built is out of line with the Government NPPF Select Committee Inquiry findings.</p> <p>Comments also that there are too many housing projects for the</p>	<p>Comments are noted with respect to the levels of speculative development that have emerged in the area in recent years. The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 accommodates all permitted development schemes and contribute towards the objectively assessed need for the district. Wantage and Grove are two of the most sustainable settlements in the district and offer a significant range of services and facilities. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that infrastructure is provided in a timely manner alongside planned growth.</p>

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		Wantage area, and that figures are too high. Comments also wish to see more self-build schemes in the area.	
Infrastructure Delivery	Monks Farm, Grove	<p>A number of comments relate to the delivery of infrastructure associated with proposed development in Wantage and Grove. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the NPPF requires that all developments shall have infrastructure plans developed in parallel with developments. The Vale's local plan proposes ANOTHER 5,500 houses in Wantage/Grove with no local transport infrastructure to support employment in Science area. • Other infrastructure to support any level of development (shops, schools, healthcare) remains an issue. The market town of Wantage is to be treasured. It is a very appealing town of historical interest. The local council has worked to encourage local retailers and this is commended. However, it is insufficient to accommodate the number of houses suggested in the local area and if it was expanded its appeal and its historical character compromised • The Wantage and Grove Campaign Group represents the view of approximately 1,000 individuals in the Wantage and Grove area and its aims are: We are not against any development in Wantage and Grove but: > Developments should be proportionate and sustainable > The infrastructure should enhance and improve quality of life for its residents. 	Significant infrastructure, including highway proposals, are set out within the plan and accompanying IDP. No further action.
Infrastructure Delivery	Wantage and Grove Sites	<p>A number of comments relate to the delivery of infrastructure associated with proposed development in Wantage and Grove. Comments include: • It is stated that the NPPF requires that all developments shall have infrastructure plans developed in parallel with developments. The Vale's local plan proposes ANOTHER 5,500 houses in Wantage/Grove with no local transport infrastructure to support employment in Science area.</p>	Significant infrastructure, including highway proposals, are set out within the plan and accompanying IDP. No further action.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other infrastructure to support any level of development (shops, schools, healthcare) remains an issue. The market town of Wantage is to be treasured. It is a very appealing town of historical interest. The local council has worked to encourage local retailers and this is commended. However, it is insufficient to accommodate the number of houses suggested in the local area and if it was expanded its appeal and its historical character compromised The Wantage and Grove Campaign Group represents the view of approximately 1,000 individuals in the Wantage and Grove area and its aims are: We are not against any development in Wantage and Grove but: > Developments should be proportionate and sustainable > The infrastructure should enhance and improve quality of life for its residents. 	
OCC - Crab Hill and Monks Farm Development	Monks Farm, Grove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The county council has no comments to make on these sites as they are live applications. 	Comment is noted.
OCC - Eastern Wantage Link Road Comments	Crab Hill, Wantage	Crab Hill, Wantage - This site must provide a spine road through the residential development, suitable for bus operation. The developer must also provide bus stops along the spine road, and in addition, stops on the A417. The development must contribute to the cost of providing direct bus links to Harwell, Milton Park, Didcot, Abingdon and Oxford.	This matter is addressed in the Development Template. No further action.
OCC - Grove Airfield Planning Application	Grove Airfield	Grove Airfield: 2500 homes This development is subject to current S106 negotiations, and is required to provide two new primary schools and a secondary school, and contribute towards expansion of SEN provision. Pages 46-7 of the IDP support this provision, but only includes one primary school; this should be two.	Noted. Highlight amendment to IDP
OCC - Infrastructure Delivery - Monks Farm	Monks Farm, Grove	North Grove Monks Farm: 750 homes Parts of this development are subject to extant S106 agreements or current S106 negotiations. In total, the development is required to provide the equivalent of a 1 form entry primary school, which may be through expansion of an existing school; contribution towards	Comment is noted.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		new provision on Grove Airfield; or a new 1 form entry school on-site. The development is also required to contribute towards the new secondary school planned for Grove Airfield, and towards expansion of SEN provision. Page 45 of the IDP supports this provision. Page 44 of the Local Plan Appendix A states that primary provision will be through extension of Grove CE Primary School; this has not yet been confirmed.	
OCC General Comments - Crab Hill and Monks Farm	Crab Hill, Wantage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments to make on these sites as they are live applications. 	Noted.
OCC - Infrastructure Delivery- Crab Hill	Crab Hill, Wantage	Crab Hill Wantage: 1500 homes This development is subject to current S106 negotiations, and is required to provide a new 2 form entry primary school, and contribute towards the new secondary school planned for Grove Airfield, and towards expansion of SEN provision. Page 42 of the Local Plan Appendix A and pages 43-44 of the IDP support this provision.	Comment is noted.
OCC Public Transport Comments - Monks Farm	Monks Farm, Grove	Monks Farm, Grove This site must contribute to the cost of providing improved bus links from Grove to Oxford, Abingdon, Didcot, Milton Park, Wantage and Harwell, with each link operating at least twice per hour. The site must provide good walking routes to bus stops on routes passing through Grove (including eventual routes through Grove Airfield). The spatial arrangement of residential development sites in Grove is less than ideal for bus routeing. The current proposal is to route buses along Oxford Lane, Grove Green and Denchworth Road. This is to avoid the withdrawal of bus services from the existing Grove settlement, which would be unacceptable. The requested strategic bus links will be insufficiently strong to operate in two variants (both via the Grove Northern Relief Road /Grove Airfield and also via the current Grove settlement, so the Oxford Lane, Grove Green, Denchworth Road bus routeing has been chosen as	These matters are addressed in the Development Template. No further action considered necessary.

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		a compromise that can provide reasonable access to all parts of Grove.	
Planning Application Stockham Farm	Wantage and Grove Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stockham Farm development Phase 3 should not go ahead. • Exit on to Denchworth Road which is saturated every day • Protrudes into the green space behind Wantage and Grove just as phase 2 will. 	Comment noted. Development of Stockham Farm is speculative and does not form part of the strategic site allocations in the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
Social Infrastructure - Monks Farm	Monks Farm, Grove	We note that there is no indicative contribution towards the Social (“soft”) aspects of development Healthy and Sustainable Communities. We note also that the plan indicates the proposed development commencing in 2017/18 and continuing to at least 2028/29. It would therefore be in the same timescales as the Grove Airfield and Crab Hill developments, both close by, as well as the proposed strategic development of Land east of the A338 at East Hanney. What approach is anticipated for the proposed Monks Farm Development for delivering the Social aspects of developing a Healthy and Sustainable Community?	Provision for significant infrastructure is set out within the plan and accompanying IDP. No further action.
Thames Water - Water Supply - Crab Hill	Crab Hill	Crab Hill: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water supply network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand. • Necessary for us to undertake investigations and completion of this will take several weeks. • Up to three years lead in time will be necessary. • To be included: “Developers will be required to demonstrate...” • Sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand • Drainage Infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity • Drainage strategy would be required from the developer. • Upgrade to our assets could take up to three years lead in time • Alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. • Grampian planning condition to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation. 	Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to liaise closely with Thames Water to ensure that water provision and infrastructure can be provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth. Site template contains information relating to necessary upgrades in line with feedback from previous consultations.
Thames Water - Water Supply - Monks Farm	Monks Farm	Monks Farm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water supply network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand. • Necessary for us to undertake investigations and completion of this will take several weeks. • Up to three years lead in time will be necessary. • To be 	Noted. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to liaise closely with Thames Water to ensure that water provision and infrastructure can be provided in a timely manner alongside the planned growth. Site template contains

Category	Site	Summary	Council Response
		<p>included: “Developers will be required to demonstrate...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand • Drainage Infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity • Drainage strategy would be required from the developer. • Upgrade to our assets could take up to three years lead in time • Alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. • Grampian planning condition to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation. 	<p>information relating to necessary upgrades in line with feedback from previous consultations.</p>
Traffic Congestion	Wantage and Grove Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The roads out of Wantage (A338 North) and (A417 East) are already beyond capacity at peak times. • Adjustments at Frilford and Rowstock junctions will help existing traffic but would not adequately support the proposed increases. 	<p>The proposed highway mitigation has been informed by detailed investigation and close working with the Highways Authority (OCC). No further action.</p>

Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station

Category	Summary	Council Response
Needs of Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan does not make provision for the future need of Network Rail to install a grade-separated junction in the vicinity of the proposed Science Bridge. 	<p>The Council has had ongoing dialogue with the Highways Authority, Network Rail and other stakeholders to help inform plan preparation and is happy to consider any specific Network Rail proposals to assess whether they affect the science bridge or any other planned infrastructure in the area.</p>
OCC - Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core Policy 16 Didcot A power station: the County Council would support an employment-led mixed use redevelopment of this site. If including a residential element, it will be important to create a development which would be an attractive place to live with access to a range of services and facilities by means other than car. 	<p>Comments are welcomed and are noted.</p>
Policy Wording	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core Policy 16 should be amended to allow for a more flexible approach to development (B1, B2 and B8 uses). Inclusion of the word “ancillary” preceding the word ‘retail’ is overly restrictive and should be deleted to ensure the policy is in conformity with the NPPF. Sentence should be added to the end of Paragraph 4.36: It is anticipated that bulky goods retailing that cannot be accommodated at these locations will be provided for as part of the mixed use development of Didcot a Power Station Site (Core Policy 16). South Oxfordshire District Council is concerned to ensure that there are not adverse impacts on the town centre area, we suggest additional text after favourably - 'Subject to no significant adverse impact on the viability and vitality of Didcot Town Centre'. 	<p>The Council agrees that the inclusion of the word ancillary is unhelpful and its deletion helps to improve the consistency of the policy. Revised wording to the policy has been included in the schedule of minor changes.</p> <p>The Council agrees that the additional consideration of viability of Didcot Town Centre also provides useful clarity, particularly as this strengthens the sites use and suitability for bulky good retailing.</p>
Reliance on Single Employment Site	<p>It is suggested that reliance on a single large site (Didcot A Power Station) to fulfil the employment land needs of the District poses a number of problems and risks: i) control of the site is in a single ownership; ii) any problems bringing forward the site could result in major delays which might have damaging impacts if few other new sites were available; and iii) there would be a lack of choice and flexibility for prospective new businesses.</p>	<p>The Council has allocated a number of sites for employment, including part of the Didcot A site. The site is highly suited for employment development, being brownfield land and well located. The allocation has been informed by detailed discussion with the landowner and their plans for releasing the site for development. There are a number of other large sites allocated for employment, including two that form an Enterprise Zone designated in 2011. There are a number of other uses that are being considered for the site alongside employment.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
Scale of Employment Allocation	Why are only 29 of the 47 hectares being earmarked for use at the site at Didcot Power Station?	The portfolio of employment sites proposed for allocation are based on independent advice considering both demand and supply factors. The portfolio contains a number of sites that are highly suitable and available (indeed two are classified as an Enterprise Zone). The whole of the Didcot A site is supported for development through CP 16. By allocating the site for 29ha provides flexibility to facilitate a mixed use scheme on the wider site.
Science Bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Bridge alignment has not been confirmed. It should be made clear that this is an indicative alignment and could be subject to change • Could inhibit developers of Valley Park until this proposed bridged is agreed. • Cooperation is encouraged between OCC and developer on preferred alignment of the bridge. 	Alignment is based on detailed assessment and agreement with Highways Authority. We will continue to work with the Highways Authority to ensure that development on this site does not undermine the provision of the Science Bridge.
South Oxfordshire District Council - Policy Wording	This council is concerned to ensure that there are not adverse impacts on the town centre area, we suggest additional text after favourably - Subject to no significant adverse impact on the viability and vitality of Didcot Town Centre.	The Council agrees that the additional consideration of viability of Didcot Town Centre also provides useful clarity, particularly as this strengthens the sites use and suitability for bulky good retailing. The policy also provides a flexible approach to B1, B2 and B8 uses.

Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South East Vale Sub-Area

Category	Summary	Council Response
A338 North of East Hanney	It is suggested that the plan does not make provision for highway improvements to the A338 north of East Hanney, except for improvements to the junction at Frilford.	Significant highway improvements are proposed across the highway network informed by detailed evidence and dialogue with key stakeholders. Further route based mitigation may be proposed through the Local Transport Plan process that is being led by the Highways Authority.
Cycling	A number of comments were made relating to cycling. These include support from Blewbury Parish Council for the proposed highway and cycle lane improvements. An extension was proposed to the cycleway to Blewbury. Other comments referred to the importance of new cycle lanes being provided between Wantage and Grove and Harwell - cyclists on the A417 is considered to be one of the main reasons for delay on this road between these towns.	The plan already makes provision for improvements to the cycle network between Wantage and Harwell Campus and Didcot.
Delivery of Highway Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No funding for key roads around Wantage and Grove. • The Plan should support new transport infrastructure focused on providing opportunities for travel apart from the private car, in accordance with national planning policies. • Additional lanes between M40 and Chilton • There are no plans at all to widen the A34. • An A34 Strategy does not exist, showing no certainty it can in the future ‘function as a major strategic route. • CP18 (CP12 & 17) cannot safeguard land in South Oxfordshire. • Solutions include long lengths of roads and complex structures, over both railways and floodplains. At “Science Bridge” it is readily apparent ground conditions and levels greatly add to foreseeable engineering risks, costs and complexity. • The land forms part of a Scheduled Monument and therefore in direct conflict with CP39. 	Significant highway improvements are proposed across the highway network informed by detailed evidence and dialogue with key stakeholders. Further route based mitigation may be proposed through the Local Transport Plan process. Delivery of the new Thames Crossing will be taken forward through joint working with SODC and OCC through the LTP and Science Vale AAP processes. The Thames Crossing at Culham makes a significant beneficial improvement to the wider network, including increasing capacity on the A34, particularly in the medium term, while a longer term strategy for addressing the A34 is developed. The VoWH continue to work with the Highways Authority and Highways Agency to address the need for a long term strategy for the A34.
Delivery of Highway Infrastructure (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Halco Abingdon transport report suggested 3 bridges of the Thames, including one to take the pressure of the Culham and also Clifton Hamden bridges. • No particular route has been suggested, however, a route across the fields near Long Wittenham (which regularly floods) which will form an eventual link to the M40. • The 	The Proposal for a new River Crossing of the Thames at Culham has been tested as part of the Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study (ETI) that has been prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority (OCC). The proposal provides a very positive impact on the highway network and helps to alleviate traffic flows associated with the A34

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>proposed scheme will be exceptionally expensive as it would involve a lengthy approach road built up high to avoid flooding. • Alternative bridge possibility should be considered; a second bridge at Culham, a few yards downstream from the existing bridge where the banks are high to avoid flooding (avoiding the cost of raising the section of road) avoiding private properties and linking up with the Dorchester Rd, with traffic calming measure installed around the school. • The road will run from the Didcot perimeter through the bridle paths (soon to stop being used) and will then be upgraded into a public highway, saving money. This will utilise the current rough roads and relieve pressure on the ancient river crossing bridges, providing another route from the North of Didcot. A cheaper and better version than the proposed crossing road. • I believe these comments represent my ward.</p>	<p>that would otherwise be congested. However, the precise alignment of the road will be addressed through a more detailed design phase of work to be completed in partnership with the Highways Authority (OCC) and SODC.</p>
Public Transport and Cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport and smarter choices strategy will increase people moving of this corridor. Additional train services, additional stations, additional parking, additional connecting services, by bus or tram, are required. Welcomes “priority bus system” between Didcot and Harwell. There are limited bus services to major employment sites at Milton Park and Science Vale. The existing large settlement of Grove has lost all buses. The Plan should support new transport infrastructure focused non-car options. The diagrams on p78 could extend the network north of Oxford to Bicester. 	<p>The plan makes provision for improvements to the cycling and public transport network as informed through joint working with the Highways Authority and ongoing work to inform the Local Transport Plan. High level proposals are set out within the Local Plan and more detail is included within LTP4.</p>
Rail Services	<p>The Plan does not make provision for the use of rail services to reduce congestion and improve the sustainability of housing sites.</p>	<p>The plan includes policy support for the re-opening of a railway station at Grove. Significant enhancements are planned for the station at Didcot, which falls within South Oxfordshire District Council, and for improvements to the rail capacity between Oxford and Didcot - this matter will be addressed through the Network Rail Route Strategy.</p>
Safeguarding of land in South Oxfordshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP18 (CP12 & 17) cannot safeguard land in South Oxfordshire. 	<p>Noted. The policy does not seek to safeguard land in South Oxfordshire. Where proposed schemes cross into South Oxfordshire, the areas within South Oxfordshire are described as 'areas of search'.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
		VOWH, SODC and OCC are working closely on infrastructure delivery across their boundaries and are also preparing a joint AAP for this area.
Strategic Transport Linkages outside of the District	P76 - Delivery of strategic highway infrastructure: this section could usefully expand on how transport improvements to be achieved through Science Transit will improve connectivity with employment locations outside of the Vale, particularly Bicester and Begbroke. The diagrams on p78 could extend the network north of Oxford to Bicester.	The Council consider that the wider strategic opportunities beyond the council district boundaries are adequately referenced throughout the document, for example within Chapter 2.
Traffic Congestion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suffers from capacity issues exacerbated by in-commuting. • A34 and A40 have significant impacts on businesses and restrict innovative growth. • A34 and the A417 being close to full capacity at peak times are not addressed. • A415 east of Abingdon and the Culham and Clifton Hampden river crossings congestion concerns. 	The Local Plan has been informed by specific evidence testing the impact of the proposed growth on the highway network and has been prepared in collaboration with the Highways Authority. A comprehensive package of highway and transport improvements are proposed to mitigate any negative impacts and OCC are continuing to work to develop further more detailed proposals.
Transport Assessment	The Transport Assessment of the preferred strategy compared to alternative options is misleading-leading, and hence has not been robustly justified. The Evaluation of Transport Impact, Nov 2014, Table 2.5 provides trip rates for housing and a Generic Business (Class B) use. For Stage 1, in which 13,300 homes are proposed at 0.63 AM Peak trips p. dwelling = 8,400 trips. For Stage 3, in which 20,500 homes are proposed at 0.63 AM Peak trips p. dwelling = 13,000 trips (an increase of 54%). For new jobs, Stage 1 proposes 14,300 jobs, and for Stage 3, 23,000 jobs are proposed, (an increase of 61%). The Transport Evaluation conclusions do not reflect the increased number of AM Peak (and daily) trips of 54% to 61%. The environmental impact in terms of noise, pollution and health of this increase has not been assessed.	The Council consider that the ETI is robust and fit for purpose. It has been prepared in collaboration with The Highways Authority. Not only has the ETI considered the increase in housing and employment proposed, it has also identified additional mitigation and so been able to demonstrate how the additional growth will not lead to a proportionate impact on the highway network.
Western Wantage Link Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of a Western relief road to Wantage would be beneficial. 	Noted. The Local Plan makes provision to safeguard a route for a Western Wantage Bypass to facilitate the longer term delivery of such a route.

Core Policy 18: Safeguarding of Land for Transport Schemes in the South East Vale Sub-Area

Category	Summary	Council Response
A4130 widening	It is stated that the plan refers to land (along/beside the A4310) being 'safeguarded' for future road-widening. Widening stops short of the East roundabout at the entry to Didcot. The result will push the traffic jams up the road towards Didcot.	The area for safeguarding the A4130 has been agreed with the Highways Authority. It should however be noted that the proposal is to widen the A4130 itself, the A34 interchange is subject to a separate scheme that is already in the construction phase.
A417	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No details are provided for the A417 corridor improvements. • The Council have indicated that the HA will not introduce roundabouts at the junctions of the villages south of the A417 as they interferes with the flow of the traffic. • Changing the roundabout at Rowstock and the Junction at Featherbed Lane will do nothing for the village residents south of A417 (hendreds, Ardington, Lockinge and Ginge) who have long delays accessing the roads during rush hour, which will be exacerbated with the new developments in the Wantage area. • Hendred Parish Council traffic survey (16 years ago) determined traffic volumes were 230 vehicle movements at peak times against a road capacity of 180. Nothing has been done to improve the road capacity. • There are now 1200 more houses and 600 less jobs in Wantage increasing the number of cars. There is nothing in the plan to address the basic capacity of the A34. • The increase of the Science Vale will amplify the A34 bottleneck and have even further dramatic effects on the road networks of the surrounding villages. When traffic is diverted from the M4 through Wantage the town grinds to a halt. 	The plan sets out a comprehensive package of infrastructure to mitigate highway impacts and improve public transport and the strategic cycle network. It is the case that infrastructure improvements are focused on the Science Vale area as this is where around 75 % of the strategic growth is focused. However, more detailed work is also ongoing by the Highways Authority to develop Route Based Strategies (including for the A417), which are being taken forward separately. The A417 strategy is considering a range of issues, including for improving access to the A417 from adjoining villages/ routes.
A417 and A34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No details are provided for the A417 corridor improvements. • Council have indicated that the H/A will not introduce roundabouts at the junctions of the villages south of the A417 as they interferes with the flow of the traffic. • Changing the roundabout at Rowstock and the Junction at Featherbed Lane will do nothing for the village residents south of A417 (hendreds, Ardington, Lockinge and Ginge) who have long delays accessing the roads during rush hour, which will be exacerbated with the new developments in the Wantage area. • Hendred Parish Council traffic survey (16 years ago) determined traffic 	The plan sets out a comprehensive package of infrastructure to mitigate highway impacts and improve public transport and the strategic cycle network. It is the case that infrastructure improvements are focused on the Science Vale area as this is where around 75 % of the strategic growth is focused. However, more detailed work is also ongoing by the Highways Authority to develop Route Based Strategies (including for the A417), which are being taken forward separately. The A417 strategy is considering a range

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>volumes were 230 vehicle movements at peak times against a road capacity of 180. Nothing has been done to improve the road capacity. • There are now 1200 more houses and 600 less jobs in Wantage increasing the number of cars. There is nothing in the plan to address the basic capacity of the A34. • The increase of the Science Vale will amplify the A34 bottleneck and have even further dramatic effects on the road networks of the surrounding villages. When traffic is diverted from the M4 through Wantage the town grinds to a halt.</p>	<p>of issues, including for improving access to the A417 from adjoining villages/ routes.</p>
English Heritage - Policy Wording	<p>•The proposed Harwell Link Road is likely to adversely affect the setting of the grade II listed hotel. •A light touch road at grade with minimal signage and other traffic paraphernalia is needed to ensure that the scheme would not be unacceptably damaging.</p>	<p>The Council agrees with the request from English Heritage for minor amendment to policy wording to ensure consideration for the historic environment is also reflected in the policy.</p>
OCC - Public Transport	<p>•New residential development should be shaped around the emerging core public transport network Provide priority measures for buses to avoid congested junctions and road link</p>	<p>Agreed. Reference to priority public transport schemes are already referred to in CP 17 and Appendix A and has been informed by dedicated evidence. Site selection has been informed by their access to public transport and detailed consultation with the Highways Authority.</p>
Public Transport	<p>If it is appropriate for Policy to set out formally the principle that identified highways schemes should not be compromised, then certainly, in line with NPPF paragraphs 17 and 32, Policy to avoid the same kind of prejudice to delivery of high-quality public transport services also needs to be stated. The current Policy wording is out of conformity with national policy and thus is unsound according to the definitions in NPPF para 182.</p>	<p>Agreed. Reference to priority public transport schemes are already referred to in CP 17 and Appendix A and has been informed by dedicated evidence. Site selection has been informed by their access to public transport and detailed consultation with the Highways Authority.</p>
SODC - Safeguarding of land in South Oxfordshire	<p>•To include land in South Oxfordshire policy CP18 cannot safeguard land in South Oxfordshire. Wording needs to be adapted to reflect this. Whilst this Council realises that there is often serious congestion in this area and that solutions need to be found we have some concern about the potential impact of these proposals in South Oxfordshire and therefore reserve judgement on these schemes (South Abingdon Bypass and new Thames Crossing at Culham).</p>	<p>The VoWH is working closely with SODC and OCC to plan for growth across the Science Vale and wider area and are preparing a joint Area Action Plan. This includes preparing joint evidence to identify the need for new highways infrastructure, including for example the new Thames Crossing at Culham. This is important to support growth across the Science Vale area in both VoWH and SODC.</p> <p>Land identified for transport schemes in SODC should be referred to</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
		as 'areas of search'. Detailed planning will be taken forward through the update to the SODC Local Plan process.
Southern Didcot Bypass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The area shown for the Southern Didcot Bypass is excessively large and would preclude the ability of a viable and deliverable housing development to come forward in this region in conjunction with the strategic housing allocation for Valley Park •This Southern Didcot Bypass is also not specifically referred to in Core Policies 17 or 19 	The area identified for the Southern Didcot Bypass is removed as not referenced in CP18 to improve consistency. The delivery of appropriate routes through the Valley Park site, to connect to land in SODC that may come forward for development in the future, will be addressed through site masterplanning. This approach ensures the development is future proofed without sterilising land.
Western Wantage Link Road (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The land proposed to be safeguarded for the West Wantage Link Road does not follow a route which is deliverable. • Land ownership or topography not considered so it's undeliverable. •Only travel options for leaving Wantage are A417 or the B4507 which involve travelling through the busiest parts of Wantage. A Western Link would provide a much needed alternative route out of the town. •Excellent opportunity to deliver the new road, which can be part funded by development on this land and by contributions pooled through CIL. 	The safeguarding route is intended to protect the long term potential for the provision of a Western Wantage Link Road. The actual road alignment will be informed by detailed investigation.
Western Wantage Link Road (2)	It is suggested that a new link road is needed to the west of Wantage linking to the A417 and bypassing the west of Wantage and East Challow.	Land is safeguarded within the Local Plan to protect the long term potential of delivering a Western Wantage Link Road.
Western Wantage Relief Road (3)	It is suggested that additional development to the West of Wantage would help to deliver the Western Wantage Link Road. The provision of this road has a demonstrable benefit and it is self-evidently desirable and has been a long term local aspiration. However, there is no clear mechanism for its delivery. Support for the safeguarding of the route of the Western Wantage Relief Road is provided.	The safeguarding route is intended to protect the long term potential for the provision of a Western Wantage Link Road. The precise road alignment will be informed by detailed investigation in the future, along with detailed consideration for delivery.

Core Policy 19: Re-opening of Grove Station

Category	Summary	Council Response
CP19	Comments are received relating to the safeguarding of plan at grove for a new railway station. These provide both support and objection and include:- It is suggested that the re-opening of Grove Railway Station is not adequately justified and that Network Rail has no firm intentions to deliver such scheme. - The Vale is encouraged to lobby for this change and for this to happen without delay.	Noted. There are reasonable prospects for a new station being provided at Grove within the plan period and the approach is considered to be appropriate and justified.
OCC - Re-opening Grove Station	Appendix E Plan E8 and Core Policy 19 – Re-opening of Grove station: the re-opening of Grove station is an aspiration of the County Council. We would wish to be flexible about the precise location of a station, which may be best located outside the area of safeguarded land shown on Plan E8.	The safeguarding map has been prepared following consultation with and advice received from OCC who recommended the area was based on the previous planning application for the site.

Science Vale Area Action Plan Comments

Category	Summary	Council Response
Cycling Strategy	The objection seeks the proposed cycle network to link to cycle networks in adjoining Districts, as District boundaries are not relevant for those making cycle trips. The proposed network needs to demonstrate co-operation with South & West Oxfordshire, Oxford and West Berks. Links need to be extended to Faringdon/Swindon to the west, to Witney to the north, to Didcot and Wallingford to the east, and towards Newbury to the south.	Noted. The strategic cycle network is focused on the South East Vale Sub Area where around 70% of strategic employment and 75% of strategic housing will be allocated. It is important that strategic infrastructure is focused on the main area if growth to ensure funding is efficiently used. CP35 supports further cycle route provision should this be brought forward through other mechanisms.
Protection of Harwell Village	This paragraph disregards the aim stated in paragraph 5.57 that: "The countryside and villages will have maintained their distinctive character. The Larger Villages will have retained their separate identities..." Treating development within Harwell village as expansion of Didcot, as this paragraph implies, does exactly the opposite: it turns Harwell village into a suburb of Didcot, thus removing its 'separate identity'.	The Plan makes adequate provision for protecting the separate identity of Harwell Village - this is addressed through Appendix A.
Scope of AAP	There is reference to a joint Science Vale Action Plan with South Oxfordshire District Council, but there is no detail. Given that Sutton Courtenay is included in the Science Vale area how can the Parish Council comment on this plan without considering the Action Plan in tandem. This is a consultation with only partial information. Evidence as to the action plan should be provided.	It is clearly stated that the AAP will be prepared separately and a timetable is set out in the Councils LDS. The AAP will be subject to consultation in accordance with appropriate regulations.
SODC - Scope of AAP	Overview Para 4 – This overview implies that Science Vale is only concerned with employment. It would be helpful to refer to the Science Vale area stretching across parts of both Vale and South and its mission to provide employment and housing opportunities, to be an attractive and thriving place, to attract infrastructure and investment It is suggested that insufficient detail is provided about the joint Science Vale Action Plan. Given that Sutton Courtenay is included in the Science Vale area how can the Parish Council comment on this plan without considering the Action Plan in tandem. This is a consultation with only partial information. Evidence as to the action plan should be provided.	The AAP is being prepared jointly with SODC, VOWH and OCC and will be taken forward collaboratively with all three authorities contributing equally to its preparation.
Support	Support is provided for the proposed preparation of the Science Vale Area Action Plan as a means of promoting the international significance of Science Vale as a location for research and innovation and of ensuring that	Noted

Category	Summary	Council Response
	growth in the area is delivered effectively and sustainably. Adopting a joint approach with South Oxfordshire District Council and Oxfordshire County Council in the preparation of the Action Plan is welcomed as a means of coordinating the delivery of housing, jobs and infrastructure across Oxfordshire.	
Supporting Text	Milton Parish does not have a border with Didcot as stated in 5.81. Amend Para 5.81: Sutton Courtenay, Milton and Harwell all...'	Accepted.