



# Appendix 3: Summary of Consultation Responses

## Table of Contents

<b>Core Policies</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Core Policy 4a: Meeting Our Housing Needs.....	1
Core Policy 8a: Additional Site Allocations for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.....	15
Core Policy 8b: Dalton Barracks Comprehensive Development Framework.....	20
Core Policy 12a: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.....	24
Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt.....	31
Core Policy 14a: Upper Thames Strategic Storage Reservoir.....	40
Core Policy 15a: Additional Site Allocations for South-East Vale Sub-Area.....	42
Core Policy 15b: Harwell Campus Comprehensive Development Framework.....	45
Core Policy 16b: Didcot Garden Town.....	48
Core Policy 18a: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area.....	50
Core Policy 19a: Re-opening of Grove Railway Station.....	53
<b>Development Policies</b> .....	<b>55</b>
Development Policy 2: Space Standards (was Development Policy 1 in Preferred Options).....	55
Development Policy 3: Sub-Division of Dwellings (was Development Policy 2 in Preferred Options).....	57
Development Policy 4: Residential Annexes (was Development Policy 3 in Preferred Options).....	58
Development Policy 5: Replacement Dwellings in the Open Countryside (was Development Policy 4 in Preferred Options).....	59
Development Policy 6: Rural Workers Dwellings (was Development Policy 5 in Preferred Options).....	60
Development Policy 7: Re-Use, Conversion and Extension of Buildings for Dwellings in the Open Countryside (was Development Policy 6: Re-use of Buildings for Dwellings in the Open Countryside in Preferred Options).....	61
Development Policy 8: Community Services and Facilities (was Development Policy 7 in Preferred Options).....	62
Development Policy 9: Public Houses (was Development Policy 8 in Preferred Options).....	63
Development Policy 10: Ancillary Uses on Key Employment Sites (was Development Policy 9 in Preferred Options).....	64
Development Policy 11: Community Employment Plans (was Development Policy 10 in Preferred Options).....	65
Development Policy 12: Rural Diversification and Equestrian Developments (was Development Policy 11 in Preferred Options).....	66
Development Policy 13: Changes of Use of Retail Units to Other Uses (was Development Policy 12: Change of Use of Retail Units in Preferred Options).....	67
Development Policy 14: Village and Local Shops (was Development Policy 13 in Preferred Options).....	69
Development Policy 15: Retail Parks (was Development Policy 14 in Preferred Options).....	70
Development Policy 16: Access (was Development Policy 15 in Preferred Options).....	71
Development Policy 17: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans (was Development Policy 16 in Preferred Options).....	72
Development Policy 18: Public Car Parking in Settlements (was Development Policy 17 in Preferred Options).....	74
Development Policy 19: Lorries and Roadside Services (was Development Policy 18 in Preferred Options).....	75
Development Policy 20: Public Art (was Development Policy 20 in Preferred Options).....	76
Development Policy 21: External Lighting (was Development Policy 20 in Preferred Options).....	77
Development Policy 22: Advertisements (was Development Policy 21 in Preferred Options).....	78
Development Policy 23: Impact of Development on Amenity (was Development Policy 22 in Preferred Options).....	79
Development Policy 24: Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments (was Development Policy 23 in Preferred Options).....	80
Development Policy 25: Noise Pollution (was Development Policy 24 in Preferred Options).....	81
Development Policy 26: Air Quality (was Development Policy 25 in Preferred Options).....	82
Development Policy 27: Land Affected by Contamination (was Development Policy 26 in Preferred Options).....	83
Development Policy 28: Waste Collection and Recycling (was Development Policy 27 in Preferred Options).....	84
Development Policy 29: Settlement Character and Gaps (was Development Policy 28 in Preferred Options).....	85

Development Policy 30: Watercourses (was Development Policy 29 in Preferred Options).....	87
Development Policy 31: Protection of Public Rights of Way, National Trails and Open Access Areas (was Development Policy 30 in Preferred Options) .....	89
Development Policy 32: The Wilts and Berks Canal (was Development Policy 31 in Preferred Options).....	90
Development Policy 33: Open Space (was Development Policy 32 in Preferred Options).....	92
Development Policy 34: Leisure and Sports Facilities (was Development Policy 33 in Preferred Options) .....	95
Development Policy 35: New Countryside Recreation Facilities (was Development Policy 34 in Preferred Options).....	97
Development Policy 36: Heritage Assets (was Development Policy 35 in Preferred Options).....	98
Development Policy 37: Conservation Areas (was Development Policy 36 in Preferred Options) .....	100
Development Policy 38: Listed Buildings (was Development Policy 37 in Preferred Options).....	101
Development Policy 39: Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments (was Development Policy 38 in Preferred Options).....	102
<b>Chapter 3.....</b>	<b>103</b>
Chapter 3: Building Healthy and Sustainable Communities .....	103
Chapter 3: Economic Prosperity .....	103
Chapter 3: Sustainable Transport and Accessibility .....	104
Chapter 3: Protecting the Environment and Responding to Climate Change .....	108
<b>Appendix A: Site Development Templates .....</b>	<b>109</b>
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – General Requirements .....	109
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – North of East Hanney .....	110
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – North East of East Hanney .....	113
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (Parish of Fyfield and Tubney) .....	118
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – North East Marcham .....	149
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – South East Marcham .....	153
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – Dalton Barracks.....	157
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – North West Grove.....	165
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – Harwell Campus.....	168
Appendix A: Site Development Templates – West Harwell Village .....	179
<b>Appendix D: The Saved Policy from Local Plan 2011 Regarding Grove Airfield.....</b>	<b>182</b>
<b>Other Categories .....</b>	<b>183</b>
General Comments on the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 .....	183
The Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) – Childrey.....	191
The Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) – Sparsholt.....	193
The Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) – General .....	194
Alternative Sites .....	197
Sustainability Appraisal .....	203
Habitats Regulation Assessment .....	209
Infrastructure General .....	211
Education General .....	215
Self-Build and Custom Build .....	216
Health Care General .....	217
Cycling Infrastructure .....	218
5 year housing land supply (5YHLS).....	220
A34 General.....	222
A417 and A338 General.....	224
Historic Environment.....	225
Green Infrastructure.....	226

## Core Policies

### Core Policy 4a: Meeting Our Housing Needs

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)			Affordable Housing	Comments highlighting the importance of affordable housing. Comments suggest the Council look to restore and regenerate existing buildings and build a much larger proportion of Council houses to enable people on lower incomes the chance of residing in their own home. Provision for more affordable housing for young people and one comment suggests that this should be on the edge of towns and villages.  The County look forward to continued engagement and support recognition of the agreed apportionment of Oxford's unmet for Vale. However they state it is not clear how the housing figures address affordable housing need for Oxford. Further discussions required regarding arrangements to deliver this affordable housing.	The Council agrees the provision of affordable homes is important. The Part 1 plan, Core Policy 24 ensures affordable housing is provided to meet local need. Also Core Policy 25 enables affordable housing to be provided where housing may otherwise be contrary to acceptable.
1098059	Mr and Mrs Anderson					
875920	Daniel Scharf					
1095509	Mr Tim Mundy					
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Affordable housing, overall strategy and infrastructure provision to meet Oxford's unmet need - Oxfordshire County Council	The County seek sites to meet Oxford's need to have potential to be accessible to Oxford through public transport services, support strategies that identify new infrastructure, and not require significant infrastructure. They would prefer sustainable extensions and/or sites located on key transport corridors. The SHMA joint Programme work should be utilised in the site selection process. The County have raised concerns the sites in the Part 2 plan, require significant new strategic infrastructure which is currently unfunded. The County look forward to continued engagement and support recognition of the agreed apportionment of Oxford's unmet for Vale.	The Councils approach to addressing the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is through a combination of Part 1 and Part 2 sites. The Council have amended the Publication Version of the Plan to reflect comments on the Preferred Options Version. This includes allocating all of the quantum of unmet need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe sub area and ensuring that at least 2200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. Over 1600 homes are located on sites allocated in the Part Plan that Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council have already publicly stated they consider are well located to contribute to housing need for Oxford. It is considered that Dalton Barracks will be highly accessible to Oxford, Abingdon-on-Thames and elsewhere and will include direct connections to the public transport interchange proposed for Lodge Hill.  The Council is not aware of any new strategic infrastructure being proposed other than site specific infrastructure, or infrastructure proposed by Oxfordshire County Council.
873089	Dr Andrew Turner			Criticism of National Policy	Comments raise concern regarding national policy and guidance on how the five year housing land supply is calculated. They consider the system makes it hard for a supply to be demonstrated when there are excessively high housing targets.	Comments noted.
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group					
728489	Mr David Marsh Chairman Harwell Parish Council			Criticism of SHMA	We received a number of comments criticising the Oxfordshire SHMA with over half of these from one respondent. Comments suggest the SHMA is out of date and flawed. More recent research has been undertaken on demand for size of housing, it does not address under occupation of existing housing stock, it conflates the market for housing and property investment and is based on projections of job growth that have not been properly scrutinised. The SHMA figures are over optimistic and do not consider the impacts from leaving the EU and	The Examination of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 included testing of the Oxfordshire SHMA in relation to Vale's housing need. It was scrutinised in depth with the Inspector concluding the Vale's housing need is sound. The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 was Adopted at the end of 2016 and thus is considered to be up to date.
875920	Daniel Scharf					
873089	Dr Andrew Turner					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094687	Mrs Campbell				significant political changes internationally on economic growth. There is too much emphasis on economic growth with housing not meeting local need and thus the SHMA should be reviewed as it overstates housing demand.	
1095635	Ms Kim Turner					
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group					
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment					
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	Mr Jon Waite	874466	Delivery Rates	We received a number of comments raising concerns over the deliverability of the larger sites. It has been suggested there is too much reliance on the delivery of large strategic sites both in Part 1 and Part 2 which will raise the risk of delay, in particular in the Science Vale area where there is a significant need for housing. The SEA and Viability Assessment have highlighted significant infrastructure is required. One comment suggests a buffer of least 10% should be added to the overall requirement (equating to 25,036 dws). One comment also states there is a lack of clarity over the number of dwellings the Vale needs to allocate to meet Oxford City's unmet need.	The Site allocations, in both the Part 1 and Part 2 plans consist of sites of different size, type and geography specifically to assist with delivery and following expert advice to the Council and is consistent with advice of the Home Builders Federation HBF).  The Part 1 plan allocates 19 sites (including one LP2011 saved allocation) of which ten are small (c 200) and only three are larger than 1000.  The Part 2 plan allocates 7 sites of which three are smaller sites and only one is larger than 1000.  The Part 2 plan makes provision for close to 10 % buffer.
1096854	RH Systems	Liz Alexander	1096857			
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792			
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533			
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679			
730237	Mrs Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council			Disagreement with Oxford Unmet Need Figure	We received a number of comments that disagreed with the Vale's proportion of Oxford City's unmet need. There were suggestions that the Vale's proportion may increase because South Oxfordshire are not meeting their proportion and there is an overall shortfall when all proportions are totaled. One comment suggested a shortfall of 1,350 dwellings (includes 1,200 dws South Oxfordshire are not delivering and the total proportion is 150 dws short of the 15,000 dws working assumption) and another suggested the working assumption should be 18,000 rather than 15,000. The Plan does not provide any flexibility to deliver more housing to meet this need if not met County wide. Comments suggested there was no evidence behind the unmet need working assumption for Oxford City and the Vale should not have to meet any unmet need. Another mentioned the difference between the South East Vale sub area housing requirement and the Science Vale housing requirement which equates to a total of 600 dws which is not to be met in Blewbury. Some comments state there will need to be evidence of duty to cooperate between the authorities regarding Oxford's unmet need.	The Vale's proportion of Oxford's unmet need has been agreed through the Oxfordshire Growth Board process. The Council is seeking to address in full, the objectively assessed housing need for the district and the quantum of unmet need for Oxford that has been agreed should be addressed within the Vale. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Topic Paper explains how the the authorities have worked together.
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman Group Land Planning Manager Bovis Homes Limited					
1096657	Mr Newman					
1096854	RH Systems	Liz Alexander	1096857			
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments					
1097446	Kier Group Limited	Mr Robson	1097448			
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096815	CEG	Ian Gillespie	1096817			
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568			
1097814	Gale and Binning	Mr Kenneth Dijkman	724542			
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792			
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533			
1027852	Ms Judith Onuh Graduate Planner Thakeham					
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Director Oxford Preservation Trust					
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
1097190	Mr Ian Talbot					
1097340	carlo Maselkowski					
1095630	Ann Rudkin Alexandrine Press			General Comment - Housing Policies	We received one comment suggesting all the housing policies are piecemeal which does not bode well for the future.	The allocations proposed in the Part 2 plan include provision for a 'comprehensive' approach to planning for master-planning and infrastructure delivery at Harwell Campus and Dalton Barracks and includes proposed development at North West Grove, which is allocated specifically to assist master-planning and infrastructure delivery in this part of Grove. All sites are supported by a Development Template which identifies infrastructure and policy requirements following comprehensive consultation with stakeholders.
1096854	RH Systems	Liz Alexander	1096857	General comment on South Oxfordshire's Local Plan	A comment states that the South Oxfordshire Local Plan releases large areas of Green Belt which is inconsistent with National Policy. They suggest it may be that South Oxfordshire seek to allocate some development outside of its boundaries.	The South Oxfordshire Local Plan does not relate to the Vale of White Horse. No further comments.
1094581	Marion & Ian Flower			General Housing Need	A number of comments stated the site allocations in Core Policy 4a and the over housing requirement figures. Comment emphasised the need to meet Oxford's unmet needs. One comment suggested development should be located where it has least environmental harm and another suggested sites should be located where no infrastructure is required. A number of respondents have stated that policies do not	The Council is satisfied that the plan proposals are a strategy for delivering sustainable development in accordance with national policy, legislation and guidance. The Local Plan 2031 seeks to fully meet the objectively assessed need for housing for the district and the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford identified to be
1095989	Mr and Mr J and W Duffield and Cumber Mr J Duffield and W Cumber and Son	Mr Robert Linnell	1095988			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096069	(Theale) Limited Ms Jones Redcliffe Homes Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055		currently meet the housing needs in larger villages including the need for Co-Housing.	addressed within Vale.
1096101	Drivewalk Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055			
1096678	Barberry Developments Ltd	Mr John Pearce	1098025			
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England					
1096854	RH Systems	Liz Alexander	1096857			
1096928	South West Strategic Developments	Mr Matthew Kendrick	1096929			
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust					
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568			
1097369	Trustees of Kemp Accumulation and M	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
1097648	Frilford Heath Golf Club	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533			
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679			
1097403	Douglas C B Bond Woolf Bond Planning LLP					
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	Mr Jon Waite	874466			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
875920	Daniel Scharf					
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452			
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd,					
1097446	Kier Group Limited	Mr Robson	1097448			
875920	Daniel Scharf					
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	General Objection to Location of Housing	A number of comments objecting to further housing that will destroy the local countryside with no account taken of the importance of distinctive landscapes. One comment suggests assessing the amount of vacant properties in Oxford to assist in meeting housing need. We received one comment suggesting this Plan should not cover matters already settled by Plan 1, there is too greater focus on the South East Vale Sub Area, non strategic sites should be the focus and flexibility should be incorporated into the Plan incase further need is required to be met from Oxford. A few comments suggest other locations for housing, such as Appleton to assist in meeting Oxford's unmet need.	The Council considers the proposed allocations are deliverable which is demonstrated within the Site Selection Topic Paper. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to assess the impact of sites on landscape, infrastructure, flooding and viability which has informed the site selection process. The site allocations are in accordance with the Council's Spatial Strategy as detailed in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568			
875920	Daniel Scharf					
1094957	Debby Fox					
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop					
874446	Mr Christopher Baker					
1095947	Maria Cruttenden					
1095984	Mrs Alison Youngman					
1096069	Ms Jones Redcliffe Homes Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055			
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
851677	Mr T W Law					
1096101	Drivewalk Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055			
872574	Mrs Judith Haworth					
1095042	Mrs Woodley					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505			
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)					
1096815	CEG	Ian Gillespie	1096817			
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533			
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679			
1096310	Robin Smith					
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall					
879120	Gow Family Gow Family	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353	Housing Figures Lack Clarity	A few comments suggested the housing figures are unclear in regards to the distribution of housing between the sub areas, for Oxford's unmet need and thus they lack clarity. Concern is also raised regarding how the Plan fulfils the requirement of Part 1 to accommodate 1,840 dwellings. One comment objects to the amalgamation of the 1,000 dwellings identified in Part 1 Plan with Oxford's unmet need.	Comments noted. The Council have updated the presentation of housing figures in the Part 2 plan and provided further explanation within the Sites Selection Topic Papers to assist with how the 1,840 dwellings are fulfilled.
1022473	Rosconn Group	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702			
1094091	Mrs Jackie Bushell			Housing for the Ageing Population	A few comments request the Council take provisions for elderly people into consideration. Concern raised as to whether the Vale are complying with Core Policy 26 and one comment would like to see a retirement village set up within Didcot.	Comment noted. The Part 1 plan, Core Policy 26 promotes and encourages the delivery of housing for the ageing population. The Council will be monitoring the effectiveness of this policy in accordance with the Part 1 plan Monitoring Framework.
875920	Daniel Scharf					
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council					
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council					
1021394	David Burson JPPC			Limit Delivery of Housing	There are two comments which state that the policies adopted and those proposed limit the amount of housing that can be brought forward. The policies need to be more flexible in order to meet Oxford's unmet need and to allow development within the built limits of designated towns and villages.	The Part 1 plan, Core Policy 1 and 4 identify there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in the district within the existing build areas of Larger Village, Local Service Centres and Market Towns.
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533			
1096854	RH Systems	Liz Alexander	1096857	Local Plan Part 1 Allocations Comment	We received two comments relating to Part 1 plan allocations: there are too many allocations at Faringdon which will flood the market and concern over North West Valley Part and the proximity to the roadside services site.	These allocations are within the Adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 which has already been thoroughly tested through the Examination. Part 2 is not proposing to allocate any additional sites at Faringdon.
1057747	Minscombe Properties Ltd	mr. terry gashe	1057745			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096872	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services Oxford City Council			Monitoring of Housing Delivery	We received a number of comments relating to the monitoring of housing delivery. There is an absence of monitoring, delivery phasing and timely action if there is a failure in delivery. Oxford City Council suggest the Plan should include a trajectory for the delivery of sites to meet Oxford's unmet need. Suggestion the Council should commit itself to undertake regular monitoring and review of the changes in employment, housing need, availability of land, availability of funding, and transport infrastructure provision with a view to keeping the plan priorities up to date and undertaking amendments where necessary. Monitoring should monitor the housing supply against the increasing job numbers. Suggest a mechanism is proposed to delay approvals if housing and jobs do not match in terms of delivery.	The Council has an Adopted Monitoring Framework for the Part 1 plan in which monitoring has already taken place and demonstrated within the recently published Monitoring Report. The Council undertakes regular housing monitoring measuring whether housing delivery is on track. A monitoring framework and a housing trajectory for Part 2 will be published alongside the Publication Version of the Plan.
1095787	Mr Tony Parsons					
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					
871494	Mr Noel Newson					
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment					
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)					
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Object to allocating above requirement	We received a number of comments objecting to the Plan allocating above the housing requirement. Comments suggest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been no analysis of cumulative impact or impact on AONB</li> <li>• That the Council are squeezing past additional housing</li> <li>• It requires proper explanation</li> <li>• It will encourage developers</li> <li>• There no robust evidence to justify increase</li> <li>• It is unsustainable and contrary to NPPF and will create gulf of unsellable housing.</li> </ul> Comments question whether the additional housing can be accommodated, is it unnecessary to over supply, the Part 1 Inspector did not see a need for extra sites and it is a creeping housing requirement that is based on a disputed Oxford unmet need figure.	The Council considers the proposed allocations are deliverable which is demonstrated within the Site Selection Topic Paper. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to assess the impact of sites on landscape, infrastructure, flooding and viability which has informed the site selection process. The site selection process has demonstrated there is sufficient land to meet the housing requirement.  It is a matter for the Council to identify the level of site allocations it wishes to make and ensure there is evidence published alongside the plan to justify the approach.
829269	Ms Camilla Romaine					
1094555	Mr Francis Sketch					
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					
1095934	Ms P Dohie					
756175	Mr Robin Draper					
1096035	Mr Evans					
831122	Pamela Dohie					
865961	Mr David Kirk					
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull East Hendred Parish Council					
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568			
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group					
1095034	Dr Ken Rawlings					
756175	Mr Robin Draper			Object to Oxford's Unmet Need being added to South East vale	Comments raised concerns over the Vale's proportion of Oxford City's unmet need being partly met within the South East Vale Sub Area. One comment considers no unmet need should be added to the South East Vale Sub Area as it is already overloaded. The other comment considers the amount of unmet need to be met in the South East Vale Sub Area should not be constrained.	Comments noted. The Council have updated the Publication Version of the local plan to ensure that the quantum of unmet need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is allocated to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe sub area and that 'at least' 2200 homes are demonstrably close to and accessible to Oxford.
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679			
1096872	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services Oxford City Council			Oxford City Council - Affordable Housing	Oxford City Council have raised concerns regarding the delivery of affordable housing as part of the Vale's proportion of Oxford's unmet need. Oxford City Council expect an agreement to be reached to enable an appropriate proportion of new affordable homes in the Vale area to be made available to people on the Oxford register. They will be in contact separately to discuss this and are positive an agreement can be reached. This approach is likely to involve nomination rights being allocated to Oxford for an appropriate proportion of the 2,200 homes. This should be established in the Plan, whilst more detailed matters such as tenure mix, unit size and eligibility could be agreed through a common working framework such as a memorandum of operation. They suggest this does require specific sites to be identified as contributing towards Oxford unmet needs, so that it is clear which sites the agreement should be applied to.	It is agreed that the Council will engage and work positively with Oxford City Council to plan for the allocation of affordable housing to those in need, including those residents who work in Oxford.
1096872	Patsy Dell Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services Oxford City Council			Oxford City Council - Unclear housing needs	Oxford City Council would like to see clear consideration regarding how the Vale's spatial strategy relates to Oxford and whether the sites are sustainable in terms of meeting Oxford's needs, including their connectivity to employment and other key urban resources. The Growth Board assessment of options assessed sites against sustainability assessment criteria that specifically considered these points. The approach taken by the Vale in the Part 2 plan by merging the 2,200 unmet needs requirement into the Vale's target makes it difficult to see how the sites have been considered as suitable or sustainable for the housing needs arising from Oxford. The approach does not acknowledge that making provision for Oxford unmet needs is addressing a different housing need to that of the district's own need. Reference is made to West Oxfordshire and Cherwell who have proposed separate	The Councils approach to addressing the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is through a combination of Part 1 and Part 2 sites. The Council have amended the Publication Version of the Plan to reflect comments on the Preferred Options Version. This includes allocating all of the quantum of unmet need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe sub area and ensuring that at least 2200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. Over 1600 homes are located on sites allocated in the Part Plan that Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council have already publicly stated they consider are well located to contribute to housing need for Oxford. It is considered that Dalton Barracks will be highly accessible to Oxford, Abingdon-on-Thames and elsewhere and will include direct connections

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					strategic objectives and/or allocations to meet the unmet need. They suggest this ensures the process is transparent with particular consideration of how the sites are sustainable in terms of their relationship to Oxford and clear consideration of joint evidence base work. The Plan should be more specific and identify sites that will contribute to Oxford's unmet housing need. If this is not done, it will not be possible to assess whether the Local Plan has met the agreed apportionment for Oxford's unmet need with appropriate sites as the monitoring will not be able to show how much of Oxford's unmet need has been met in the Vale.	to the public transport interchange proposed for Lodge Hill.
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan Senior Planning Policy Officer South Oxfordshire District Council			Oxford's Unmet Housing Need - South Oxfordshire District Council	South Oxfordshire District Council consider Oxford's unmet need of 15,000 is a working assumption and therefore has not been tested. They consider a commitment to review the Vale's proportion should be included in the Part 2 plan relating to when Oxford City have Adopted their Plan and thus have an adopted unmet need figure.	The identified quantum of unmet need for Oxford has been agreed by all local authorities within Oxfordshire with the exception of South Oxfordshire and follows extensive joint working.  It is of course the case that planning does not stand still and that, in due course, it will be necessary to plan for the period beyond 2031. This will be a matter for a future plan.
1100194	Giles Hughes Head of Planning and Strategic Housing West Oxfordshire District Council			Oxford's Unmet Housing Need - West Oxfordshire District Council	West Oxfordshire District Council consider the Part 2 plan should demonstrate how the Vale will deliver affordable housing to meet Oxford's affordable housing need. They suggest a framework developed by all Councils would be helpful setting out how we work together to deliver affordable housing.  West Oxfordshire District Council supports the steps the Council has taken to address Oxford's unmet need and to adopt the apportionment figure of 2,200 dwellings. However they consider further clarity is required regarding which specific sites will contribute towards this need.	It is agreed that the Council will engage and work positively with Oxford City Council to plan for the allocation of affordable housing to those in need, including those residents who work in Oxford.  The Councils approach to addressing the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is through a combination of Part 1 and Part 2 sites. The Council have amended the Publication Version of the Plan to reflect comments on the Preferred Options Version. This includes allocating all of the quantum of unmet need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe sub area and ensuring that at least 2200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. Over 1600 homes are located on sites allocated in the Part Plan that Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council have already publicly stated they consider are well located to contribute to housing need for Oxford. It is considered that Dalton Barracks will be highly accessible to Oxford, Abingdon-on-Thames and elsewhere and will include direct connections to the public transport interchange proposed for Lodge Hill.
872775 728489 1096204 1096678	Strain  Mr David Marsh Chairman Harwell Parish Council  Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment  Barberry Developments Ltd			Policy and Supporting Text Wording	We received comments specifically relating to policy and supporting text amendments; para 2.115 should show there has been 309 homes delivered above the target for the Western Vale, para 2.82 needs rephrasing, seek clarity in the plan that the 5YHLS target does not increase due to Oxford's unmet need, and clarity required over the figures in the Policy.	Comments noted.  Whilst the plan acknowledges the potential for some sites to be capable of delivering more housing in the longer term, this is subject to appropriate infrastructure being deliverable in the longer term. For this reason, it is not appropriate for the Part 2 plan to identify a specific longer term allocation. This approach is consistent with part 1 plan allocations which was found to be sound at Examination.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council – Wording	Footnote B of Core Policy 4a should indicate the scale of housing expected to be provided at Dalton Barracks and at North West Grove beyond 2031.	
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702	Policy does not meet all housing needs	We received a number of comments stating the Plan needs to allocate more dwellings to meet the overall need due to the windfall allowance and 1,000 dwellings to be allocated in Part 2. Comments raise the same concerns for the specific sub areas as well. Suggestion that an additional 10% buffer should be provided.	A windfall allowance, as defined by the NPPF, includes sites which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process. A LPA can include a windfall allowance if there is evidence to demonstrate historic delivery of such sites. It is therefore not appropriate for the Plan to allocate sites to meet this allowance. The 1,000 dwellings identified in Core Policy 4 to be identified in the Part 2 plan are subsumed within the overall total allocated in the Part 2 plan. The Part 2 plan is already allocating above the housing requirement and thus an additional buffer is considered not required.
879120	Gow Family	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			
1096678	Barberry Developments Ltd	Mr John Pearce	1098025			
1022473	Rosconn Group	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			
741313	Radley College	Ms Gemma Care	741289			
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments					
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195			
1097369	Trustees of Kemp Accumulation and M	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
1097648	Frilford Heath Golf Club	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792			
1022473	Rosconn Group	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353	Relationship between Part 1 and Part 2	We received comments suggesting the Part 2 plan is contrary to the strategy and aim identified in the Part 1 plan. The allocations are contrary to the original purpose of the Part 2 plan. One suggests there should be an explanation of why the Plan has been undertaken in two parts and should refocus on allocating small sites. Some comments highlight the urgency in adopting the Part 2 plan.	The Part 2 Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Adopted Part 1 Plan. The Part 1 Plan explains why the Local Plan has been prepared in two parts which has been found to be sound at Examination. Indeed the Planning Inspector presiding over the Part 1 plan recommended a modification to the Part 1 plan to clarify the role of the Part 2 plan. .
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett					
879120	Gow Family	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			
741313	Radley College	Ms Gemma Care	741289			
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments					
1096985	Nathan McLoughlin					
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd			Site Selection	Core Policy 4a proposes to locate new homes in unsustainable village locations, in conflict with the LPP1 spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy, which will increase reliance upon the use of the private car. The villages of East Hanney and Marcham have limited facilities which is recognised in the Site Selection Topic Paper and the SA. The sites election paper outlines the benefits of the sites in terms of delivery of strategic infrastructure yet little detail is included on how these items will be funded and delivered. In contrast the West of Wantage site, the assessment has concluded that a link road cannot be funded and thus development is unlikely.	The Council considers the proposed allocations are suitable and deliverable which is demonstrated within the Site Selection Topic Paper. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to assess the impact of sites on landscape, infrastructure, flooding and viability which has informed the site selection process. The site allocations are in accordance with the Council's Spatial Strategy as detailed in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall	Mr Steven Pickles	724498	Sites do not relate well to Oxford	We received comments raising concerns that the proposed site allocations do not relate well to Oxford in meeting the unmet need. East of Kingston Bagpuize was ruled out of the Oxford Growth Boards' assessment due to distance from Oxford and inadequacy of transport. The allocations in the South East Vale Sub Area are remote from Oxford. The Plan should identify specific allocations to support the delivery of this strategy. The Growth Board evidence demonstrated that there are sufficient capacity at sustainable sites within the Abingdon and Oxford Fringe Sub Area.	The Councils approach to addressing the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is through a combination of Part 1 and Part 2 sites. The Council have amended the Publication Version of the Plan to reflect comments on the Preferred Options Version. This includes allocating all of the quantum of unmet need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe sub area and ensuring that at least 2200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. Over 1600 homes are located on sites allocated in the Part Plan that Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council have already publicly stated they consider are well located to contribute to housing need for Oxford. It is considered that Dalton Barracks will be highly accessible to Oxford, Abingdon-on-Thames and elsewhere and will include direct connections to the public transport interchange proposed for Lodge Hill. The proposed development at Kingston Bagpuize is not identified as addressing the quantum of unmet need for Oxford being addressed within the Vale.
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop					
1022463	J A Pye Oxford Ltd					
1096872	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services Oxford City Council					
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Student Accommodation	We received one comment highlighting there are no policies for student accommodation.	Comment noted. There is no evidence in the Vale to suggest a need for student accommodation
730280	Mr Tim Comyn Sparsholt Parish Council			Support	Comments which state their support the Council's approach for meeting Oxford's unmet need	Comments noted.
843219	Mr Simon Handy Senior Planner Strutt & Parker LLP	David Murray-Cox	1097679	Support for additional homes in the Science Vale	We received comments supporting additional allocation in the South East Vale Sub Area to support the economic growth and delivery of strategic infrastructure.	Comment noted.
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)					
729502	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	Ms Lois Partridge	976501	Support for allocating above requirement	One comment supports the allocation of more housing than the Vale's requirement as this will give flexibility for unforeseen circumstances with delivery.	Support noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1051321	Mr Paul Walker Strategic Development Manager Oxford Bus Company			Support for Larger Sites	Comments support the allocation of larger sites, stating this will help the Council to plan for infrastructure.	Support noted.
730231	Mrs Susan Blomerus Appleton with Eaton Parish Council					
729502	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	Ms Lois Partridge	976501	Support meeting Oxford's Unmet Needs	We received a number of comments supporting the Plan in meeting some of Oxford's unmet need. Comments related to supporting over allocation which provides flexibility, allocating in Abingdon on Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub area and South East Vale Sub Area. Oxford City Council support the Part 2 plan's commitment to meet Oxford's unmet needs and look forward to a positive dialogue. However one comment did suggest the Council reconsider the reliance on Neighbourhood Plans to deliver the additional dwellings.	Support noted.
1096196	R M Burson EM Burson and Sons					
1096872	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services Oxford City Council					
1096895	MBC Estates Ltd	Mr Maltman	1096293			
741313	Radley College	Ms Gemma Care	741289			
730280	Mr Tim Comyn Sparsholt Parish Council					
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679			
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792			
1094583	Dr Youngman			Support Smaller Sites	We received a number of comments supporting the allocating of smaller sites. Two comments highlighted a need to look at smaller sites on roads with better accessibility to Oxford. Suggestions that the Council identify smaller parcels of greenfield land to maintain a 5YHLS, ensure choice and competition and disperse growth and thus limit impact. The SA supports the allocation of smaller sites. There are too many strategic sites when opportunities exist to accommodate housing on alternative sites at higher tier settlements. Strategic sites are also complex and have long lead in times. Larger sites should be complimented by smaller sites to ensure deliverability in the short term. Part 2 plan does not support appropriate development at smaller villages which does not reflect Part 1 or the Housing White Paper.	Comments noted. The Council have allocated appropriate smaller sites in the Part 2 Plan and are supporting neighbourhood plans in allocating smaller sites or for them to come forward through the Development Management process where in accordance with the Development Plan.
730197	Councillor Simon Howell Councillor Vale of White Horse District Council					
730226	Councillor Elaine Ware Councillor Vale of White Horse District Council					
879120	Gow Family	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1022473	Rosconn Group	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			
1096928	South West Strategic Developments	Mr Matthew Kendrick	1096929			
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568			
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792			
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679			
1097403	Douglas C B Bond Woolf Bond Planning LLP					
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792			
1096985	Nathan McLoughlin					
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533			
730237	Mrs Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council			Support the Plan in not allocating Smaller Sites	One comment supported the Plan in not allocating sites under 50 dwellings in rural villages that would be unsustainable options.	Support noted.
1096815	CEG	Ian Gillespie	1096817	Supports Green Belt Releases	Comments highlight the Part 1 Inspectors comments on potential releases of land from the Green Belt through the Part 2 process. They support the need to potentially release land from the Green Belt to help meet Oxford's unmet need.	Comment noted. As part of the sites selection criteria, the impact on Green Belt has been considered.
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792			
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533	Supports Small Scale Growth at Appleton	A comment states small scale growth in Appleton will support economic growth and promote retention and development of local services and community facilities in Appleton.	The Site Selection Topic Paper demonstrates sites at Appleton have been considered and discounted as preferred sites.
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568	Transport	Comments which highlight the need to provide sustainable transport within the Vale district, if the Council are going to meet Oxford's Unmet need as well as our own. One comment highlights that the Western Vale has suitable transport between Faringdon and Oxford and therefore, the Western Vale is capable of accommodating some of Oxford's Unmet Housing Need.	The Council considers that the agreed quantum of unmet housing need being addressed within the Vale should be provided for within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe sub-area.
1096895	MBC Estates Ltd	Mr Maltman	1096293			
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568	Western Vale Housing Need not being met	We received a number of comments suggesting the housing needs of the Western Vale are not being met. There are concerns that the windfall allowance stills needs to be met and allocations should be provided to meet at least some of this. In	The Council consider there is no need to to allocate any additional sites in the Western Vale sub area as the housing requirement for this sub area has already been met. In addition to this, sites in the Western Vale sub area are

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094532	Ms Fiona Campbell Fraser	Mr Mike Robinson	1094537		particular as the current progress of Neighbourhood Plan in the Western Vale, the 240 dwellings will not necessarily cover this requirement. The strategy does not reflect the Council's strategy at LPP1 of allocating in all three sub areas. Another comment states the Council will be in a stronger position if the reliance on windfalls was reduced with further allocations providing choice and competition. Allocations should be provided in the Plan in the event allocations in Part 1 are not delivered. The housing requirement for the Western Vale should be revisited in line with the need to meet Oxford's unmet need. Part 2 Plan does not provide the most appropriate strategy as development is located at more unsustainable locations than Faringdon. The requirement for the Western Vale is an apportionment of the overall need in the Vale and this Plan dismissed any potential options to accommodate unmet housing needs in this area. It is not clear why the 222 dwellings have been removed from the Plan.	considered to not relate well to Oxford and thus the Council do not consider it an appropriate sub area to allocate sites to meet its proportion of Oxford's unmet need. A windfall allowance, as defined by the NPPF, includes sites which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process. A local planning authority can include a windfall allowance if there is evidence to demonstrate historic delivery of such sites. It is therefore not appropriate for the Plan to allocate sites to meet this allowance. Details on these matters are within the Site Selection Topic Paper.
1096101	Drivewalk Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055			
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman Group Land Planning Manager Bovis Homes Limited					
1096854	RH Systems	Liz Alexander	1096857			
1096928	South West Strategic Developments	Mr Matthew Kendrick	1096929			
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments					
1099225	Welbeck Strategic Land Ltd					

**Core Policy 8a: Additional Site Allocations for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096985 1098082	Nathan McLoughlin Phillip Carder			Dalton Barracks – Objection	Comments raised concerns over the deliverability of Dalton Barracks within the Plan period. Lack of evidence and information regarding the trajectory for this site and whether this takes account for the time to go through the planning process. Evidence is insufficient to support the delivery of 1,200 within Plan period. Also, that Shippon is too small to take this size of development.	The Council is satisfied the site is available and deliverable within the plan period, A housing trajectory will be published alongside the Publication Version Local Plan.
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council		East Hanney – Archaeology	East Hanney Parish Council is concerned that desk top studies do not always reveal potential archaeology, and requests that Resistivity, Magnetometry, test trenches, field walks and metal detecting surveys must be conducted before any works are carried out, particularly on the proposed East Hanney site allocations.	Archaeology is a matter for Oxfordshire County Council who have been consulted on the proposals. Site investigations should be expected to be consistent with County Council requirements.
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council		East Hanney – Biodiversity	Comment raises concerns over how the 'no net loss' of biodiversity requirement that is set out in policy will be realised?	The Site Development Templates include a number of development/infrastructure requirements including biodiversity and green infrastructure. The Site Development Templates ensures developers undertake ecological surveys in accordance with best practice. Detail of how a net gain will be realised will be assessed at planning application stage. All proposals will need to demonstrate compliance with Development Plan policies.
873872 1096803 861678	Mrs Sheila Wilkinson Mr D J H Salter Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council		East Hanney – Community Services and Facilities	Comments raised concerns that the existing village of East Hanney has a limited level of community services and facilities and infrastructure to support further development, including schools, drainage, shops and medical facilities will be required. East Hanney Parish Council raised the following key issues related to the proposed allocations North East of East Hanney and North-West of East Hanney: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan should recognise the character of East Hanney as set out in the Inspector's Report for Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</li> <li>Not appropriate for an urban extension as East Hanney is a rural, not urban, settlement.</li> <li>East Hanney Parish Council would like further input and comment on the proposed allocations if taken forward to the next stage of the Plan.</li> <li>New development proposals should reflect the historic character of the existing village.</li> <li>Visual impact from all directions should be considered for development proposals, e.g. approaching the Lowland Vale Village of East Hanney.</li> <li>Proposed allocations should bring benefit to the village and community through Section 106 developer contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).</li> <li>Residents who responded to the Community Survey objected to the proposed allocation North East of East Hanney.</li> </ul>	The Local Plan 2031 Part 1, Core Policy 3, was assessed by an independent Planning Inspector at Examination. The Inspector concluded that this policy was soundly based and would help to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. Core Policy 3 identifies East Hanney as a Larger Village. The Site Development Templates identify further infrastructure requirements necessary to support the development, such as expansion of existing schools and medical facilities. The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders and infrastructure providers to identify future and key infrastructure requirements necessary to support the delivery of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. This will be through the preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The Council has considered these comments in preparing the Publication Version Local Plan. Plan preparation has been informed by comprehensive evidence, including landscape assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. The Council is satisfied that limited development (130 dwellings on two sites) is appropriate at the Larger Village of East Hanney. It is considered that the sites relate well to the village and that existing services and facilities and the opportunity for enhancement are satisfactory to support this level of development. Furthermore, the Site Development Templates highlight some of the key requirements for development at each site. Core

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						Policy 7 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures new services and facilities are delivered alongside new housing. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published to support the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. The IDP identifies the necessary infrastructure to support the delivery of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.
1097593	Susan Halliwell	Director for Planning and Place at Oxfordshire County Council		East Hanney – Education	Oxfordshire County Council raise the following key issues in relation to proposed allocations North East of East Hanney and North of East Hanney: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any development on these sites should contribute on a proportionate basis towards the capital cost being occurred by the County Council to expand the St James CE Primary School.</li> <li>Developments would also be expected to contribute towards necessary additional off-site nursery, secondary and SEN school capacity.</li> <li>Sites not exempt from CIL, funding from CIL would be expected.</li> </ul>	Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures the proposed allocations north east of East Hanney and north west of East Hanney contribute towards the improvement of St. James Primary School and towards the expansion of existing secondary school places in the area. The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to plan for future improvements to education and school provision. Further detail will inform the Site Development Templates to support the Publication Version of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.
1096803	Mr D J H Salter			East Hanney – General Comment	A comment provided detailed background to an individual's connection with East Hanney.	Comment noted.
1098090 1098052 1097369 825516 861678 874446 865961 879508 873873	K Rolfe Ms Hazel Abraham Mr Jon Waite Mr Keith Diment Mr Guy Langton Mr Christopher Baker Mr David Kirk Mr Geoff Gardner Mr and Mrs Clive and Ann Fewins			East Hanney – Objection	A number of objections were received in relation to the proposed allocation at East Hanney. Comments were received in relation to each of the following; <p>Flooding: More than one comment suggested that East Hanney is prone to flooding and concern was raised that additional housing will increase likelihood of flooding. East Hanney has a high water table and traditional approaches to SUDs would not work here. Proposed sites act as soakaways for water. Mitigation of flood risk will impact viability. Drainage should be improved before development.</p> <p>Connectivity: residents are unlikely to integrate with the village due to the distance between the village core and the proposed sites. New residents are unlikely to use the village facilities because of poor access.</p> <p>Noise: the sites cannot be developed due to noise levels because of the proximity to the A338.</p> <p>Community facilities: comments raise concern that village facilities had been lost and those that remain were well-used and often fully booked and required additional funding for maintenance.</p> <p>Traffic: Comments raised concern over additional vehicles in East Hanney and potential for increased congestion.</p> <p>Village and Landscape character: comments detailed the historic character of the settlement and raised concerns that the historic character and landscape of the village would be threatened or lost.</p> <p>General: more housing is inappropriate in East Hanney and other sites are available.</p>	The settlement of East Hanney is recognised as a larger village in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. New development will assist in consolidating existing services and facilities while encouraging the emergence of new ones. The emerging Neighbourhood Plan for East Hanney may assist in delivering additional community services or enhancing existing ones. The Environment Agency have recently updated their flooding maps for East Hanney. The site is not located within an area of Flood Zones 2 and 3. The Council considers the approach used in the selection of sites is consistent with national policy and guidance as demonstrated in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
1098065	Mr M J Rolfe			East Hanney Objection –	Comment raised a concern that the St James CE Primary School currently uses temporary classrooms. The school site	Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures the proposed allocations North East of East Hanney and North-

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				Education	is not large enough to expand.	West of East Hanney contribute towards the improvement of St. James Primary School and towards the expansion of existing secondary school places in the area.
871191 1096193 1098065	Mrs P J McCall Mr W McCall Mr M J Rolfe			East Hanney Objection – Flooding	Comments raised concerns with historic flooding in East Hanney. Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic areas of floodplain located on land allocated for housing.</li> <li>• Builders will have to ensure that homes are resilient to flood risk – where will all the water go?</li> <li>• Compensation for surrounding homes in the event of a flood.</li> </ul>	Noted. The Site Development Templates requires developers to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment/surface water drainage strategy based on information contained in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and liaison with the Local Lead Flood Authority and Environment Agency to support a planning application. The Council have undertaken a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the preferred sites which has informed the site selection process.
1098065	Mr M J Rolfe			East Hanney Objection – Health Care Facilities	Comment raised concern with the strain that further development in East Hanney will have on existing medical facilities including the Wantage Health Centre and Wantage Hospital.	Noted. The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders, including the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and NHS England to plan effectively for health care facilities to accommodate the proposed growth planned for in the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. The Council has worked with other stakeholders and infrastructure providers to prepare a comprehensive Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to ensure the proposed development is delivered alongside sufficient improvements in services and facilities. The IDP is published alongside the Publication Version of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. Furthermore, the Site Development Templates ensures the proposed allocations North East of East Hanney and North-West of East Hanney contribute towards improvements to the existing healthcare facilities in the area.
873873	Mr and Mrs Clive and Ann Fewins			East Hanney – Objection – Infrastructure	Comment raised concerns that the proposed allocations at North East of East Hanney and North-West of East Hanney will create problems for existing infrastructure such as schools, drainage, and the A338.	Supporting infrastructure will be planned in a timely manner and be delivered in parallel with growth, in accordance with Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services, of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The Site Development Templates identify further infrastructure requirements necessary to support the development, such as expansion of existing schools and medical facilities. The Council have worked with key stakeholders and infrastructure providers to identify key infrastructure requirements necessary to support the delivery of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. This is set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).
1097648 741327	Mr Jon Waite Mr Jon Waite	Frilford Heath Golf Club David Wilson Homes Southern	874466 874466	East Hanney – Objection – Recent Appeal Decision	Comments raised objections to the settlement of East Hanney being a suitable location for housing, despite the conclusions of two appeal decisions; land south of Summertown, East Hanney and land south of Steventon Road, East Hanney.	The Council consider that the larger village of East Hanney is a sustainable location for housing. The Local Plan 2031 Part 1, Core Policy 3, was assessed by an independent Planning Inspector at Examination. The Inspector concluded that this policy was soundly based and would help to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. Core Policy 3 identifies East Hanney as a Larger Village. The Site Development Templates identify further infrastructure requirements necessary to support the development, such as expansion of existing schools and medical facilities.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						The Council would like to highlight that the outcomes of the appeal decisions to the south of Summertown, East Hanney and south of Steventon Road, East Hanney found that the principle of development was acceptable at East Hanney, but was dismissed on other grounds.
No ID	No name			East Hanney Objection – Rural Character	Comment raised concern that the proposed allocations at North of East Hanney and North East of East Hanney will be inappropriate and will not reflect the character and setting of a rural village. New housing developments should reflect historic and rural character and protect important green spaces.	Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that the proposed allocations North East of East Hanney and North-West of East Hanney conserve and enhance the historic and rural character of East Hanney through appropriate design and landscaping. The Site Development Templates ensures development proposals undertake a Landscape and visual impact assessment to inform the site design, layout, capacity and mitigation requirements. The Council's Site Selection Topic Paper outlines the Council's approach and method to assessing the sites demonstrating it has been robust.
873873	Mr and Mrs Clive and Anne Fewins			East Hanney – Objection – Settlement Hierarchy	Comment raised concerns that East Hanney is categorised as a larger village despite the loss of the mobile library service and the school being over capacity. Further housing developments on the edge of East Hanney may meet Oxford's un-met housing needs but will not bring benefit to the existing community of East Hanney.	The Council consider that the larger village of East Hanney is a sustainable location for housing. The Local Plan 2031 Part 1, Core Policy 3, was assessed by an independent Planning Inspector at Examination. The Inspector concluded that this policy was soundly based and would help to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. Core Policy 3 identifies East Hanney as a Larger Village. The Site Development Templates identify further infrastructure requirements necessary to support the development, such as expansion of existing schools and medical facilities.
776299	Tom Smailes	Planning Manager at Linden Homes		East Hanney – Support	This comment supports the development at East Hanney	Support noted.
1097593	Susan Halliwell	Director for Planning and Place at Oxford County Council		Oxfordshire County Council – East Hanney	The County Council supports the sites at East Hanney stating that the sites are relatively well located for public transport and the primary school is already being explored.	
1096245	Rebecca Howard			East of Kingston Bagpuize – Objection	This Proposal will not address the problem of lack of housing in Oxford but will instead only increase the number of cars on the road all heading towards a city that cannot cope with the cars it already has on a daily basis.	Comment noted.
1098046	Anna Clarke	St Helen Without Parish Council		General Housing Need	Comments from St Helen Without Parish Council acknowledging LPP2 need to facilitate new housing.	Comment noted.
776299	Tom Smailes	Planning Manager at Linden Homes		Objection over Windfall Allowance	Comments suggest this sub area should deliver more housing than that provided including meeting all of the Vale's proportion of Oxford's unmet need.	Comments noted. The housing requirement is not a maximum and the plan is flexible to enable more housing to be delivered. A windfall allowance, as defined by the NPPF, includes sites which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process. A local planning authority can include a windfall allowance if there is evidence to demonstrate historic delivery of such sites. It is therefore not appropriate for the Plan to allocate sites to meet this allowance.
1096815	Ian Gillespie	CEG	1096817	Local Plan Part	We received comments regarding LPP1 allocation at North	Comment noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				2031: Part 1 – Site Allocations	Abingdon supporting the delivery of this site and outlining its progress.	
1095507	Mr Eric Smith			Location of Housing	We received a number of comments regarding the location of the allocations in this sub area with a few comments suggesting there is an absence of proper assessment and the allocations are inconsistent with spatial strategy as either they are located at locations not near to Oxford or Abingdon and at smaller larger villages which represent a disproportionate increase and thus too much growth. Suggestions that Botley or Faringdon would be more appropriate. Suggestions that East Hanney and Kingston Bagpuize are unconstrained and offer good range of facilities. The strategy does not protect the countryside and Green Belt should be protected and maintained to the west of Abingdon which is currently inadequate in the Plan. The strategy limits larger village with no allocations to provide additional housing, plan needs strengthening to ensure development does not proceed within transport measures in place and some agreement over this sub area meeting Oxford's unmet need. Further housing should be increase at Dalton Barracks which would result in no housing needing to be delivered at Marcham and Kingston Bagpuize. The Plan emphasises the need for excellent public transport but many localities have none.	The Council's Site Selection Topic Paper outlines the Council's approach and method to assessing the sites demonstrating it has been robust. The Council has allocated sites in accordance with the Spatial Strategy. The impact on the landscape and Green Belt has been appropriately assessed as part of the site selection assessment. The trajectory of sites will be considered alongside the timing of infrastructure. The strategy is flexible to enable appropriate housing to come forward at larger villages in accordance with CP3. The Council agrees further housing can be delivered at Dalton Barracks but this is beyond the plan period and thus other sites will still be required. The Council are undertaking work to assess the opportunities for public and sustainable transport within the district.
1095737	Mrs Tilley					
1096096	Mr Steven Nichols					
879508	Mr Geoff Gardner	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505			
1096719	Alastair Lambie					
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				
1097446	Mr Robson	Kier Group Limited	1097448			
1097677	David Murray-Cox	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679			
1097814	Mr Kenneth Dijkman	Gale and Binning	724542			
928815	Patrick Blake	Assistant Asset Manager Highways England				
741327	Mr Jon Waite	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	874466			
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer for Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				

**Core Policy 8b: Dalton Barracks Comprehensive Development Framework**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Dalton Barracks - General Comment	A number of general comments were received in relation to the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. More than one comment was received in relation to each of the following:	The Council recognise the importance of planning for the site comprehensively, considering its long term potential and planning appropriately for infrastructure.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A bridleway should be provided through the country park or on the edge of the site.</li> <li>• The country park should act as a buffer between the new development and the existing villages nearby.</li> </ul>	The Council have amended the policy to reflect its intention to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site to set out the detailed parameters to inform masterplanning of the site that will also facilitate greater opportunities for stakeholders to influence, in more detail, planning for the site.
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration should be given to appropriate infrastructure for the site, including transport education and health.</li> </ul>	It is considered that opportunities exist for addressing many of the detailed points raised through preparation of the SPD.
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield Vice-Chair Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site should link with a new park and ride at the Marcham Interchange.</li> <li>• A strong network of footpaths and cycleways are required which will reduce traffic.</li> <li>• The site should deliver more than the projected 1,200 dwellings in the plan period.</li> </ul>	The site area has been redrawn to exclude small areas of flood plain.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ECO principles, such as those seen at Bicester Ecotown, should be used alongside the Garden Town/Village Principles.</li> <li>• Employment should be provided on site.</li> </ul>	The Council have worked proactively with Oxfordshire County Council and Thames Water to accommodate their comments in planning for the site, including through amending the Development Site Template for this site.
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some Garden Town/Village Principles are absent, including land value capture for the benefit of the community and community ownership of land and long term stewardship of assets.</li> <li>• Garden Town/Village Principles need to be upheld.</li> <li>• Site should replace the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 allocations at Abingdon, Radley and Kennington.</li> </ul>	
1095914	Miss Michelle Kerr				Other general comments include:	
1095667	Mr Lakeland Chairman Blewbury Parish Council				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher densities should be sought (CPRE)</li> <li>• There are small areas of Flood Zone 2/3 on the edge of the site. Suggest redrawing the boundary to exclude these (Environment Agency)</li> <li>• Masterplanning of the site should have regard to 'Active Design' (Sports England)</li> </ul>	
1096099	Mr & Mrs G Sloper				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of comments received transport assessment and provision, education, footpaths and cycleways (Oxfordshire County Council).</li> </ul>	
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsure of the impact on the local water and waste networks. Studies will be required. (Thames Water)</li> <li>• The local community should be given advance notice before development begins on the site.</li> </ul>	
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishioners Against Damage to the Environment				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plots should be sold for self-build.</li> <li>• Conservation area of nearby villages should be protected.</li> <li>• A concern about light pollution arising from development of the site.</li> <li>• The runway should be used a bypass for a Cothill.</li> </ul>	

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094607	Mr David Churchouse					
730294	Mr George Edmonds-Brown Wootton Parish Council					
871494	Mr Noel Newson					
1074850	Mr Paul Belcher					
1094651	Mr Paul Taylor					
831316	Mr R Garrett					
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock					
1095787	Mr Tony Parsons					
1093252	Mrs Karen Magrath					
1095635	Ms Kim Turner					
1075360	Ms Penny Baker					
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England					
727300	Ms Troth Wells The British Horse Society					
1097495	Vicky Aston Sport England					
1095815	Carole Page					
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679	Dalton Barracks - Objection	A number of objections were received in relation to the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. More than one objection was received in relation to each of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation would merge the settlements of Shippon and Whitecross</li> <li>There is significant traffic congestion in the area, both on local roads and also the A34.</li> <li>There is a lack of infrastructure, including no A-Roads, Schools, or Health Provision.</li> <li>Site is unlikely to deliver 1,200 dwellings in the plan period. There is a lack of evidence demonstrating how this will be achieved.</li> <li>Contamination on the site is likely to delay delivery further.</li> </ul>	The Council recognise the importance of planning for the site comprehensively, considering its long term potential and planning appropriately for infrastructure.
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield Vice-Chair Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee					The Council have amended the policy to reflect its intention to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site to set out the detailed parameters to inform masterplanning of the site that will also facilitate greater opportunities for stakeholders to influence, in more detail, planning for the site.
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd					It is considered that opportunities exist for addressing many of the detailed points raised through preparation of the SPD. The Council have amended the site proposed site area and area proposed for release from the Green Belt to ensure that land between Dalton Barracks and Whitecross are retained in

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095918	Mr & Mrs Neil Wilkins-Privett				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cumulative impact of development here and in Marcham will be significant.</li> <li>Development of the site should be strictly limited to the existing brownfield land. There should be no need to release the site from the Green Belt.</li> <li>Development of the site will negatively impact upon the nearby Special Area of Conservation, SSSI and local nature reserves.</li> <li>Local wildlife near the barracks will be destroyed, incl. on agricultural land in the allocation.</li> <li>The agricultural land between the Barracks and Whitecross should not be included in the allocation.</li> <li>Oxford City should be challenged further to develop brownfield sites there.</li> </ul> <p>Other objections include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parish Council – Inappropriate Scale. Development will erode gap and local distinctiveness. Evidence submitted from the local residents survey also.</li> <li>There will be a deterioration in air quality</li> <li>The barracks should be revered back to its previous use, and reinstate any footpaths, bridal paths and the original farm house (Pewit House)</li> <li>Such a large allocation should have been addressed through Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</li> <li>A number of developers seek additional site allocations to allow further time for Dalton Barracks to come forward.</li> <li>Site delivery is overoptimistic (Oxford City Council)</li> </ul>	<p>the Green Belt. This will ensure that separation between Dalton Barracks and Abingdon-on-Thames, Whitecross and Wootton will all be retained.</p> <p>The Council have reduced the scale of proposed development at Marcham from 520 dwellings to 90 which will help to reduce potential cumulative impact</p> <p>Significant work has been undertaken, and will be ongoing, to ensure that potential for sustainable public transport connectivity with the site can be maximised. This will include connecting the site with the proposed public transport interchange at Lodge Hill providing premium bus connections to Oxford Centre and via Rapid Transit Line 3 to employment locations to the east of Oxford (as per Oxfordshire County Council Science Transit Strategy).</p> <p>Further opportunities exist for new road provision through the site to minimise impact on existing roads, for example providing relief for Denceworth Road and providing access to re-route existing buses.</p> <p>The MOD have confirmed the availability of the site to deliver housing within the plan period.</p> <p>The allocation will deliver a wide range of key infrastructure which will mitigate the impact of growth in the local and wider area.</p> <p>There is a requirement to investigate potential ground contamination issues.</p> <p>The Council has engaged closely with Natural England and the Environment Agency on matters relating to ecology (including the nearby SAC/SSSI) and flooding. It is considered that the provision of an 80 hectare (minimum) Country Park will provide more than satisfactory mitigation to any potential ecological impact.</p>
1094607	Mr David Churchouse					
730294	Mr George Edmonds-Brown Wootton Parish Council					
1093269	Mr Michael Swann					
1094160	mr patrick minns					
1094651	Mr Paul Taylor					
1094611	Mrs Janet Churchouse					
1096093	Mrs Sally Nichols					
729502	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	Ms Lois Partridge	976501	Dalton Barracks - Support		
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill Chairman Oxford Green Belt Network Oxford Green Belt Network					
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield Vice-Chair Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee					
1092822	Dr Kevin Langley					
1095782	Michael Page					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730284	Mr Brian Rixon				specific requirements identified in Appendix A.	
1094607	Mr David Churchouse				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England welcome the country park as an opportunity to offset the impact on the SAC. Request the Council to liaise with BBOWT and the National Trust. Seek further clarity on what uses are intended for the country park. There is a need to buffer high quality habitats, including the potential for extension of existing nature reserves. Project level transport and air quality calculations should be included in the requirements.</li> <li>BBOWT welcome the provision of recreational open space, but needs to be carefully considered in terms of size, design and connectivity with the wider countryside, in a manner that takes people away from Cothill Fen SAC.</li> </ul>	
1094284	Mr James Greenman					
929661	Mr Martin Small Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England					
1094651	Mr Paul Taylor					
1051321	Mr Paul Walker Strategic Development Manager Oxford Bus Company					
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England					

**Core Policy 12a: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095787 874446	Mr Tony Parsons Mr Christopher Baker			(i) Support for Marcham bypass (ii) Timing / funding /deliverability of infrastructure	A Marcham bypass would ease congestion, improve air quality and allow more houses to be built at Marcham in the future. There is no timescale or funding commitment for the providing the infrastructure for which land has been safeguarded. Sustainable transport improvements should be in place before highway improvements. Conditions relating to infrastructure provision should be placed on new development.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes required to support development in the Local Plan, and beyond.
873089 1022242 1095787	Dr Andrew Turner Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group Mr Tony Parsons			A34 bus lane	Comments relate to the request for more detail and clarification as to the design of the bus lane.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4.  Work is ongoing to plan for infrastructure delivery in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council and will include more detailed feasibility work.
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment			Abingdon bus lane	Comment suggesting that additional work must be undertaken to extend the safeguarding of the single carriageway both-bound bus lane from the A34 Marcham Road junction. This will also provide additional benefit by increasing connectivity to the Marcham junction park and ride and the wider Science Vale Transit Strategy.	In partnership with Oxfordshire County Council and the relevant stakeholders, the Council are undertaking extensive evidence base work in terms of a sustainable transport study for the District. This study, focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford, focusing on bus/cycle/walk access to/form Dalton Barracks area. This includes assessment of impact on the proposed bus lane on the A34, and possible options for bus service improvements. The study has also undertaken a review of alternative Park and Ride sites.
760211 763485 729502	Dr Andrew Pritchard Mr Ian Leggett Botley-Eynsham Community Path & Bike Safe Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	Mr Paul Slater Ms Lois Partridge	872479 976501	Additional suggestions for safeguarding / schemes	Comments make additional suggestions for the safeguarding of land to improve transport. Request for land to be safeguarded for the B4044 Community Path	In partnership with Oxfordshire County Council and the relevant stakeholders, the Council are undertaking extensive evidence base work in terms of a sustainable transport study for the District. This study, focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford, focusing on bus/cycle/walk access to/form Dalton Barracks area. This includes assessment of impact on the proposed bus lane on the A34, and possible options for bus service improvements. The study has also undertaken a review of alternative Park and Ride sites. To consider safeguarding land for the B4044 Community Path

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Concern about safeguarding for Park & Ride site at Cumnor	Premature to safeguard land for Cumnor Park & Ride site. Detrimental to the Green Belt, noise and air quality. Would encourage more car use. Suggest including a policy or criteria to ensure that a Park & Ride site causes no harm to the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside, the setting of attractive villages, or the amenities of residents, and are strictly limited in terms of their use. Suggested alternative site on the triangle of land between Oxford Rd and Cumnor Hill. Engagement with the Parish Council is encouraged.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill Chairman Oxford Green Belt Network Oxford Green Belt Network					
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock					
928876	Mr Stephen Pickles					
960396	Parish Councillor Cumnor Parish Council					
873089	Dr Andrew Turner			Concern about safeguarding for Park & Ride site at Lodge Hill	Comments questioning the proposal of a park and ride site at Lodge Hill due to the proximity of other park and ride sites and good public transport network. Concerns include site location, road safety, cycle access, combined effect of increased traffic from new developments, integration with bus services and increased congestion  One comment raises concern about the value of the green belt in this location, and the proximity and thus potential harm to Radley Park.  There are a number of comments expressing concern about a Park & Ride site at Lodge Hill. Specific concerns include its impact on the Green Belt, the possibility of undermining the existing bus service. There are also a number of comments suggesting the Marcham Interchange as a more suitable location.  A Park & Ride at Lodge Hill interchange would have a negative impact on Sunningwell. A number of suggestions for locating it at Marcham Interchange, rather than Lodge Hill, for reasons including that it would be less of an intrusion into the Green Belt. It is suggested that a site at Marcham Interchange would be more convenient for Dalton Barracks.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1094284	Mr James Greenman					
871494	Mr Noel Newson					
1095737	Mrs Tilley					
1095635	Ms Kim Turner					
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill Chairman Oxford Green Belt Network Oxford Green Belt Network					
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group					
830457	Peter and Susan Clare					
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett					
1096015	Mr West					
730284	Mr Brian Rixon					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment					
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			Environment Agency response	Concern that three areas of safeguarded land (Marcham bypass, Milton Slips and Grove Train Station) have been proposed within areas of fluvial flood risk (i.e. Flood Zones 2 or 3), but there is no Sequential Test or L2 SFRA to accompany them. We are of the opinion that by safeguarding land, you are effectively allocating those areas as being appropriate for the development suggested, without having undertaken appropriate assessment of the flood risks posed, which may demonstrate that these areas are not appropriate. Without appropriate flood risk assessment being undertaken, we would find these safeguarding areas to be unsound.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.  Detailed feasibility work will be required before any detailed schemes are brought forward and this stage would include, as a matter of course, detailed consideration for flooding risk associated with the proposed highway schemes.
929140 1096064	Dr Judith A Webb  Mrs Rebecca Read			Environmental impact of Marcham bypass	Comments noting whether the Marcham bypass should take account of the presence of the Marcham Spring LWS at the earliest stages.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.  Detailed feasibility work will be required before any detailed schemes are brought forward and can include consideration for this matter.
730190 725864 929685 871494	Councillor Debby Hallett  Dr D.I. Scargill Chairman Oxford Green Belt Network Oxford Green Belt Network  Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)  Mr Noel Newson			General concern about safeguarding for Park & Ride sites	The safeguarded sites for Park & Ride are in the Green Belt, would encourage car travel and add to air quality problems. Comments also suggest that it would be more sustainable for the entire journey to be made by bus and that Park & Rides should be located as close as possible to where people live to avoid shifting congestion to rural areas.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.  In partnership with Oxfordshire County Council and the relevant stakeholders, the Council are undertaking extensive evidence base work in terms of a sustainable transport study for the District. This study, focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford, focusing on bus/cycle/walk access to/form Dalton Barracks area. This includes assessment of impact on the proposed bus lane on the A34, and possible options for bus service improvements. The study has also undertaken a review of alternative Park and Ride sites.
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and			General environmental concerns	Concern about potential effects on biodiversity caused by some of these proposals including the potential for policy wording to be strengthened in relation to biodiversity gain.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust					delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.  Detailed feasibility work will be required before any detailed schemes are brought forward and can include consideration for this matter.
729502	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	Ms Lois Partridge	976501	General support for policy	Support for the safeguarding of land as outlined in Core Policy 12a.	Noted
1096870	Mr Gloag Merton College	Mr Davies	1096871	General support for safeguarding for Park & Ride sites	Support for the safeguarding of land as outlined in Core Policy 12a. Comments expresses general support for the safeguarding of land for Park and Ride schemes	Noted
1095989	Mr and Mr J and W Duffield and Cumber Mr J Duffield and W Cumber and Son (Theale) Limited	Mr Robert Linnell	1095988			
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England			Highways England response	Highways England would like to further discuss these schemes with VoWHDC as and when they come forward, in order to ensure that any impacts to the SRN are appropriately considered and mitigated in line with NPPF and Circular 02/2013.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1095951	Meriel Baker			Infrastructure - A420	A420 already hopelessly overcrowded	The Council have worked in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to prepare technical evidence to support plan preparation including the Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI) Study. This demonstrates that the proposed development does not lead to a significant change in how the highway network performs and that the A420 functions relatively well, especially in comparison to some other locations within the district.
871494	Mr Noel Newson			Lodge Hill junction	This comment suggests that, given the lack of available funding, the merits of the full movement junction at Lodge Hill should be reviewed.	Funding for this junction has now been confirmed by Government and is considered to be deliverable within the first part of the plan period.
1096334	Richard Jonas			Objection to safeguarding for Marcham bypass	The area of lands far in excess of the amount which is needed to fulfil the proposal made by the County Council about 10 years ago and should be reduced accordingly. I do not think you are justified, therefore, in safeguarding a substantial part of my land and that of others, with no time scale and for a purpose that appears unlikely to be fulfilled. the safeguarding of land unrealistically, blights it unnecessarily. If the Planning Authority persists in safeguarding the Marcham Bypass, perhaps you will feel that the time is opportune to discuss, and bring forward, the future development of the remaining land.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning			OCC response	In relation to Dalton Barracks, OCC recommend that a provision for safeguarding land for strategic footpath and	Noted. The Council have added this safeguarding to the plan in accordance with OCC guidance.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	and Place Oxfordshire County Council				cycleway improvements, including to and from the Dalton Barracks site and the proposed park and ride sites, is included within Core Policy 12a. This is supported by NPPF paragraphs 35, 69 and 75.	
1051321	Mr Paul Walker Strategic Development Manager Oxford Bus Company			Oxford Bus Company response	They propose the policy wording be amended to so that the sites reserved come forward in a coordinated manner applying a sequential test to provision at existing park and ride sites as well as being able to demonstrate what journey time improvements can be made that would be a sufficient and deliverable alternative to what is currently provided. We support the allocation at Lodge Hill as long as this includes access and egress onto the A34 to serve Oxford	<p>The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.</p> <p>In partnership with Oxfordshire County Council and the relevant stakeholders, the Council are undertaking extensive evidence base work in terms of a sustainable transport study for the District. This study, focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford, focusing on bus/cycle/walk access to/form Dalton Barracks area. This includes assessment of impact on the proposed bus lane on the A34, and possible options for bus service improvements. The study has also undertaken a review of alternative Park and Ride sites.</p> <p>The Council welcome the opportunity to work with Bus Operators to ensure delivery of an effective and fit for future service.</p>
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Marcham Bypass	westernmost part of the safeguarded land is underlain by deposits of soft sand and it lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area to which policy M8 of the submitted Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 Core Strategy (2015) as proposed to be modified (February 2017) applies. .Construction of a road within this safeguarded land would be unlikely to be significant and therefore no objection is likely to be made on minerals sterilisation grounds to construction of a road in this location.Need to be made clear there is no current proposals to dleiver a bypass.	Noted
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Policy Wording and Supporting Text	Para 2.107: This could usefully refer to the proposed Oxford-Cambridge Expressway in setting the context of Science Vale. Para 2.63 is not correct; the County Council is not carrying out a Corridor Strategy as as such. Improvements to the traffic signals at A415/ A338 Junction may be needed at some point during the lifetime of the Plan.	Noted. The Council have added this safeguarding to the plan in accordance with OCC guidance.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council Support	A Park & Ride facility on the A420 corridor at Cumnor is consistent with the Countys proposals in LTP4 - Oxford Transport Strategy.The Park & Ride facility on the A34 corridor at Lodge Hill and land for a bus lane along the A34 are essential to the delivery of Rapid Transit services. However, it should be noted delivery of these strategic infrastructure measures alone will not fully mitigate the impact of the proposed development sites.	<p>The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.</p> <p>In partnership with Oxfordshire County Council and the</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						relevant stakeholders, the Council are undertaking extensive evidence base work in terms of a sustainable transport study for the District. This study, focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford, focusing on bus/cycle/walk access to/form Dalton Barracks area. This includes assessment of impact on the proposed bus lane on the A34, and possible options for bus service improvements. The study has also undertaken a review of alternative Park and Ride sites.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Policy Wording and Supporting Text	One respondent suggests that it should be explicitly mentioned in LPP2 that the Lodge Hill slip roads are required for the developments north of Abingdon. Clarity required with supporting text - paragraph 2.57/2.58	The delivery of south facing slips to A34 junction at Lodge Hill, in conjunction with strategic development to the north of town, are explicitly mentioned in para 5.37 of the supporting text for Core Policy 12: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements with the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area, of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1, and the development templates for the North West and North of Abingdon-on-Thames development sites.
1095989	Mr and Mr J and W Duffield and Cumber Mr J Duffield and W Cumber and Son (Theale) Limited	Mr Robert Linnell	1095988	Support for Marcham bypass	Support for the safeguarding of land for Marcham bypass, including comments relating to air quality and traffic volume through the village.	Noted
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett					
1094583	Dr Youngman					
1095455	Mrs Carolyn Blackmore					
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Support safeguarding for A34 bus lane	Overall support for a bus lane on the A34 between Hinskey Hill and Lodge Hill interchanges. Some comments seeking clarity on whether bus lane is new carriageway or the conversion of an existing lane.	Noted. It is proposed that an additional land will be provided in the north bound direction between Lodge Hill and Hinksey Interchanges.
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group					
1094038	Dr Elizabeth Knight			Timing/ funding/ deliverability of infrastructure	There is no timescale or funding commitment for the providing the infrastructure for which land has been safeguarded. Sustainable transport improvements should be in place before highway improvements. Conditions relating to infrastructure provision should be placed on new development. Additional suggestions for safeguarding schemes are given.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.  The Council recognises the challenges associated with funding highway infrastructure and will continue to support the County Council, who as Highway's Authority lead planning for highway improvements within Oxfordshire. The highway schemes included in the plan at the request of the County Council have been included within the emerging Oxford
1094647	Ellie Flemming					
1096903	Miss Alex Simmons					
1095784	Mr Garside					
1095667	Mr Lakeland Chairman Blewbury Parish Council					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094676	MR COLIN ABBOTT					Infrastructure Strategy. The Council will continue to support the County Council in taking every opportunity to ensure infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner.
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment					
1097184	Mr Rod Stone					
1095787	Mr Tony Parsons					
1094889	Mrs Amanda Davies					
1097176	Mrs Rosemary Stone					
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195			

**Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
741313	Radley College	Ms Gemma Care	741289	Alternative Green Belt release - Land at Abingdon	<p>Comment raised concerns of the implication of the Housing White Paper in making efficient use of land and to avoid building homes at low densities</p> <p>Parcel of land at Abingdon does not contribute to Green Belt purposes and its retention in the Green Belt is a missed opportunity by the Council.</p> <p>The parcel of land can be brought forward in advance of further strategic allocations.</p>	The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation. Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.
879120	Gow Family	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353	Alternative Green Belt release - Land at Appleton	This comment proposes an alternative site in Appleton to address the housing needs. They question whether Dalton Barracks will be deliverable and should be removed from the plan	The Site Selection Topic Paper demonstrates sites at Appleton have been considered and discounted as preferred sites.
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533	Alternative Green Belt Release - Land at Appleton House	<p>Comment suggested that an alternative parcel of land should be released from the Green Belt to the north west of Appleton.</p> <p>The parcel of land was previously identified as land to be removed from the Green Belt as part of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 process.</p> <p>The Green Belt Review undertaken on behalf of Oxfordshire Growth Board demonstrates that the land parcel performs poorly against the assessed criteria.</p>	The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation. Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.
1022463	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	Mr Steven Pickles	724498	Alternative Green Belt release - land at Honeybottom Lane, Wootton	<p>Comment suggested that an alternative parcel of land should be released from the Green Belt at Honeybottom Lane, Wootton.</p> <p>The respondent suggests that the assessment of parcel 7 in the Green Belt Study is not considered to be an objective review in relation to the contribution of the site to separation of settlements.</p> <p>The site is screened on both of its frontages to Honeybottom Lane and Lamborough Hill</p>	The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation. Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195	Alternative Green Belt release - Land at Oxford University, Said Business School	<p>Comment suggested that the Council should be more proactive in considering the release of further land from the Green Belt in addition to the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks.</p> <p>Land at Oxford University is located within a sustainable location close to Oxford and there are clear exceptional circumstances to remove the site from the Green Belt to assist in meeting the Council's proportion of Oxford's un-met housing needs.</p>	The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation. Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.
1022473	Rosconn Group	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353	Alternative Green Belt release - Land at Wootton	This comment proposes an alternative site at Wootton. They question the deliverability of Dalton Barracks and it should therefore be removed from the Local Plan.	The Site Selection Topic Paper demonstrates sites at Appleton have been considered and discounted as preferred sites. The Publication Version of the Paper will include an Appendix that explains this.
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195	Alternative Green Belt release – Land north of Hazel Road, Botley and Land west of Tilbury Lane, Botley	Comment suggested that exceptional circumstances exist to release a site west of Tilbury Lane, Botley from the Green Belt to assist the Council in meeting its proportion of Oxford City's un-met housing needs.	The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation. Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792	Alternative Green Belt release - Land south of Cumnor	Comment suggested that exceptional circumstances exist to release a site at land south of Cumnor. The parcel of land was confirmed by the Council in the Green Belt Review to support the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 to be suitable for release from the Green Belt.	The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation. Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792	Alternative Green Belt release - land south of Cumnor	Comment suggested that exceptional circumstances exist to release a site at land south of Cumnor. The parcel of land was confirmed by the Council in the Green Belt Review to support the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 to be suitable for release from the Green Belt.	The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation. Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.
1097403	Douglas C B Bond Woolf Bond Planning LLP			Alternative Green Belt release - Land west of Lashford Lane, Wootton	Comment questioned the acceptance that the land west of Lashford Lane, Wootton is no longer suitable for release from the Green Belt for residential development.	The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation. Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.
1095415	Ms Sue Holmes Director of Estates and Facilities Management Oxford Brookes University			Alternative Green Belt release - Harcourt Hill Campus	Comment suggested that Core Policy 13a does not include proposals to remove Harcourt Hill Campus from the Green Belt despite the recommendation set out in the Inspector's Final Report into the Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The removal of Hartcourt Hill Campus should be brought in line with the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks.	The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation. Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.
1096872	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services Oxford City Council			Comments from Oxford City Council	Oxford City Council raised the following key issues with Core Policy 13a: Green Belt Study is limited to Dalton Barracks and does not reconsider sites at Botley and Cumnor, which scored highly in the sustainability assessment undertaken by the Oxfordshire Growth Board. Sites at Botley and Cumnor should be considered as reasonable options as part of the Green Belt Study to support the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.	The sites identified by Oxford City Council have been considered through the site assessment process, including the landscape capacity study (Area E) and are considered to not be suitable for development due to a significant adverse impact on the landscape and the Oxford Green Belt. The Council has explained this in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt. It is noted that Oxford City Council have publicly supported development on the Local Plan Part 1 sites at North Abingdon, North West Abingdon, North West Radley, South of Kennington and have again supported development at North Abingdon in their response to the Part 2 plan Preferred Options Consultation as being suitable to contribute to Oxford unmet need within the Vale. The Council has already allocated, or has granted planning permission, for 1660 dwellings on these sites, close to and accessible to Oxford.
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill Chairman Oxford Green Belt Network Oxford Green Belt Network			Green Belt boundary	Comments raised concerns over the proposed Green Belt boundary, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boundary for proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks should shift to the West leaving Green Belt behind the rural setting of Whitecross and Shippon</li> <li>Development on Dalton Barracks should be limited to the proposed 1,200 dwellings and not be allowed to grow further.</li> <li>Green Belt should continue to be 'washed' over the</li> </ul>	The Council have amended the site proposed site area and area proposed for release from the Green Belt to ensure that land between Dalton Barracks and Whitecross are retained in the Green Belt. This will ensure that separation between Dalton Barracks and Abingdon-on-Thames, Whitecross and Wootton will all be retained. Shippon will form an integrated part of the proposed settlement at Dalton Barracks and thus its retention in the Green Belt would be inconsistent with policy for other settlements inset within the Green Belt.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094998 1093269 1096126	Committee) Mr and Mrs Michael & Judith Hosking Mr Michael Swann Paul Clayton				<p>settlement of Shippon to protect its character</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Policy 28: Settlement Character and Gaps could apply to the case in Shippon.</li> <li>• Question the intention to remove all of the site from the Green Belt and how a large area can remain within it - the plan should provide clarification</li> <li>• Previously developed land within the Green Belt can be redeveloped without the removal of Green Belt providing the impact on openness is not disproportionately greater. Comment questions whether new green belt will be created to replace that lost in North Abingdon.</li> </ul>	
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Director Oxford Preservation Trust			Green Belt enhancement	<p>Comment suggested that if land is taken out of the Green Belt, alternative land of a similar scale should be brought into Green Belt protection.</p> <p>High contributions and funding towards the enhancement of Green Belt land and to improve its public access and local biodiversity.</p> <p>The Local Plan 2031 Part 2 should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt.</p>	A Green Belt review of the land within and surrounding Dalton Barracks has identified the potential for some of this land to be released. These comments have been considered in finalising the green belt boundary around Dalton Barracks.
1095856	Dr Janet Banfield			Green Belt Study methodology	<p>Comments questioned the methodology of the Green Belt Study, in particular the study is concerned with viewpoints from members of the public, and should focus on prioritising the value of the local residents. The comments also question the process whereby parcels are divided and looked at in isolation, rather than in combination.</p> <p>The Council has endorsed the findings and recommendations from the Green Belt Study.</p>	The Council is proposing to amend part of the Green Belt boundary around Dalton Barracks. The Council have undertaken an additional Green Belt Assessment of those sites located in the Green Belt that are being assessed as part of the site selection process.
879508 851026	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd Mrs Debbie Dance Director Oxford Preservation Trust	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	Housing White Paper - Exceptional Circumstances	<p>Comments raise concerns over the implications of the Housing White Paper in relation to justifying exceptional circumstances for amending Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceptional circumstances exist for land being released from the Green Belt for development, only when local authorities are able to demonstrate they have examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting their identified requirements.</li> <li>• 1 comment suggested that higher contributions can be collected from development as a consequence of land being released from the Green Belt that could be used to enhance Green Belt land.</li> <li>• 1 comment suggested that Local Plan 2031 Part 2 is silent on the findings of the Oxford Green Belt Study.</li> </ul>	<p>A Green Belt review of the land within and surrounding Dalton Barracks has identified the potential for some of this land to be released.</p> <p>The Council is proposing to amend part of the Green Belt boundary around Dalton Barracks. The Council have undertaken an additional Green Belt Assessment of those sites located in the Green Belt that are being assessed as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that all alternatives have been assessed and that development at Dalton Barracks will not cause harm to Green Belt purposes.</p>
1098046 1098046	Anna Clarke St Helen Without Parish Council Anna Clarke St Helen Without Parish Council			Objection to Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt	<p>There were a number of objections to Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt based on the following reasons:</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No justification or evidence that exceptional</li> </ul>	Dalton Barracks strategic location within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area means that it is an ideal location to support growth while seeking to minimise the need to travel. The outcomes of Local Plan 2031 Part 1 allow flexibility for green belt boundaries to be reviewed through Local Plan 2031 Part 2. The release of this land from the Green Belt will support economic growth both in the District

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095815	Carole Page	David Murray-Cox	1097679		<p>circumstances exist to warrant removing further land around Dalton Barracks out of the Green Belt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IM Properties v Lichfield has already established that there is no test that green belt land is to be released as a last resort</li> <li>Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 Hickinbottom J confirms that preparing a local plan is not in itself an exceptional circumstance justifying alteration to a green belt boundary.</li> <li>Implications of Housing White Paper - definition of exceptional circumstances - authorities should amend Green Belt boundaries only when they can demonstrate they have examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting their identified requirements.</li> </ul> <p>Local policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contrary to Core Policy 13 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1</li> <li>Contrary to Development Policy 28: Settlement Character and Gaps in the emerging Local Plan 2031 Part 2</li> <li>Proposed allocation contrary to garden village principles in being self-contained and not merged with existing settlements.</li> <li>Core Policy 13 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 already permits development of previously developed land in the Green Belt.</li> <li>Planning Inspector criticised the Vale for proposing to delete sites from the Green Belt where there was no substantiated future development need.</li> <li>Release of a significant site for development, not previously considered available by Oxfordshire Growth Board or the Council is considered to be a major change in circumstances.</li> </ul> <p>Dalton Barracks allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocation is large enough to accommodate 1,200 dwellings to contribute towards Oxford City's un-met housing need without taking further land out of the Green Belt.</li> <li>Objection to proposed scale of development with little or no evidence of infrastructure provision that is costed or associated with the proposed allocation.</li> <li>Deletion of land from the Green Belt is not necessary to achieve the strategic aim of developing the Dalton Barrack site.</li> <li>Optimise the density of the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks.</li> </ul>	<p>and also in Oxford City.</p> <p>The removal of land from the Green Belt allows the potential to maximise the efficient reuse of previously developed land in this area, allowing it to be masterplanned comprehensively and cohesively.</p> <p>Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.</p>
1095649	Charles Jones					
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)					
1095856	Dr Janet Banfield					
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield Vice-Chair Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee					
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)	Mr Steven Pickles	724498			
1094872	Helen Hicks					
1022463	J A Pye Oxford Ltd					
1095782	Michael Page					
1096098	Miss Charlotte Nichols					
1096097	Miss Ciara Nichols					
1095976	Mr Carter					
1096242	Mr Marks					
1098097	Mr and Mrs Richardson					
1096698	Mr and Mrs Nigel Burton					
871162	Mr Andrew Andrew Lane					
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094607	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment Mr David Churchouse				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing need and economic growth:</li> <li>Uncertain nature of future housing need</li> <li>Concentration of economic growth in the south of the District that encourages future housing developments to the south rather than the north of Abingdon</li> <li>Concentrating development on Green Belt ignores the availability of alternative sites outside of the Green Belt to cater for housing need, e.g. land to the south of Abingdon.</li> </ul> <p>Green Belt purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing settlements of Shippon and Whitecross need to be protected from urban sprawl. Both should remain in the Green Belt and be protected by open land.</li> <li>Removal of Whitecross and Shippon from the Green Belt would destroy views over green land, increase traffic problems and noise levels and provide a lower standard of living for residents.</li> <li>Suggestion that an open buffer of land is maintained between Shippon and the proposed allocation and meets the Garden Village principles.</li> <li>Release of land to the east makes an important contribution to the Green Belt by preventing coalescence of Shippon, Dalton Barracks and Whitecross</li> <li>Coalescence between settlements:</li> <li>Releasing further land from the Green Belt will erode green spaces and merge villages and town together, losing their individual identities, rural character and historic boundaries.</li> <li>Whitecross is a meaningful settlement separated by Green Belt land from Abingdon, Shippon, Dalton Barracks, Dry Sandford, Wootton, Boars Hill and Sunningwell.</li> <li>Importance of the integrity of the Green Belt in preventing coalescence with the city of Oxford and the market town of Abingdon</li> <li>Importance of the integrity of the Green Belt in maintaining the rural character of the village of Wootton and the large hamlet of Whitecross</li> </ul> <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>St Helen Without Parish Council residents survey indicates 65% do not want any sections of land removed from the Green Belt. 33% do think it is appropriate to remove parcels of land from the Green Belt, but only the brownfield sections of previously developed land.</li> <li>Impact on local biodiversity and wildlife</li> <li>Green Belt provides local amenity for residents</li> </ul>	
730294	Mr George Edmonds-Brown Wootton Parish Council					
1097190	Mr Ian Talbot					
1096225	Mr Richard Bahu					
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock					
1097184	Mr Rod Stone					
1094885	Mr Sonke Adlung Senior Editor Oxford University Press					
1095787	Mr Tony Parsons					
1094611	Mrs Janet Churchouse					
1097176	Mrs Rosemary Stone					
1096247	Mrs V Jackson					
1095635	Ms Kim Turner					
1096126	Paul Clayton					
1096060	Simon Tonks					
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield locations should be used before destroying open countryside surrounding towns and villages</li> <li>No consideration in the plan of loss of enjoyment of the countryside and benefits in terms of health and well-being</li> <li>Concept of Green Belt and open countryside is overlooked by planners</li> </ul>	
1096815	CEG	Ian Gillespie	1096817	Oxford City un-met housing need	<p>Comments supported the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks in principle, but questioned the Council's approach to meeting Oxford City's un-met housing need</p> <p>Key issues raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer the whole of Oxford's un-met housing need to be met outside the Green Belt</li> <li>Green Belt boundary review should be constrained solely to amendments to the Green Belt boundary at Dalton Barracks</li> <li>Council should be more proactive in considering the release of further land from the Green Belt in addition to the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks.</li> </ul>	<p>Dalton Barracks strategic location within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area means that it is an ideal location to support growth while seeking to minimise the need to travel. The outcomes of Local Plan 2031 Part 1 allow flexibility for green belt boundaries to be reviewed through Local Plan 2031 Part 2. The release of this land from the Green Belt will support economic growth both in the District and also in Oxford City.</p> <p>The removal of land from the Green Belt allows the potential to maximise the efficient reuse of previously developed land in this area, allowing it to be masterplanned comprehensively and cohesively.</p> <p>Further details of this is set out in the updated Topic Paper 2 - Site Selection. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.</p>
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock			Policy Wording and Supporting Text	Comment suggested amending paragraph 2.55 to provide clarity that "a Green Belt study of the Dalton Barracks site demonstrates that the removal of the built-up part of the site from the Green Belt would have a limited impact on the function of the Green Belt"	Noted
1095789 1095760 1094639	Miss White Mr Alex White Mr Peter White			Proposed Inset from Green Belt at Whitecross	Comments suggest extending the boundary of the Green Belt to include additional properties at Whitecross.	The Council have amended the site proposed site area and area proposed for release from the Green Belt to ensure that land between Dalton Barracks and Whitecross are retained in the Green Belt. This will ensure that separation between Dalton Barracks and Abingdon-on-Thames, Whitecross and Wootton will all be retained.
730190 729502 1100194 1096937 730284	Councillor Debby Hallett Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD) Giles Hughes Head of Planning and Strategic Housing West Oxfordshire District Council IM Land Mr Brian Rixon	Ms Lois Partridge Mrs Rebecca Horrocks	976501 1096940	Support in principle for Dalton Barracks - Objection to Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt	<p>There were a number of comments that support in principle the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks, although some object to Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt based on the following reasons:</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No justification or evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to warrant removing further land around Dalton Barracks out of the Green Belt</li> <li>IM Properties v Lichfield has already established that there is no test that green belt land is to be released as a last resort</li> <li>Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 Hickinbottom J confirms that preparing a local plan is not in itself an exceptional circumstance justifying alteration to a green belt boundary.</li> <li>Implications of Housing White Paper - definition of</li> </ul>	Noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
741313	Radley College	Ms Gemma Care	741289		exceptional circumstances - authorities should amend Green Belt boundaries only when they can demonstrate they have examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting their identified requirements.	
1095856	Dr Janet Banfield					
1022463	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	Mr Steven Pickles	724498		Local policy:	
1098059	Mr and Mrs Anderson				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contrary to Core Policy 13 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1</li> <li>• Contrary to Development Policy 28: Settlement Character and Gaps in the emerging Local Plan 2031 Part 2</li> <li>• Proposed allocation contrary to garden village principles in being self-contained and not merged with existing settlements.</li> <li>• Core Policy 13 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 already permits development of previously developed land in the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Planning Inspector criticised the Vale for proposing to delete sites from the Green Belt where there was no substantiated future development need.</li> <li>• Release of a significant site for development, not previously considered available by Oxfordshire Growth Board or the Council is considered to be a major change in circumstances.</li> </ul>	
1094607	Mr David Churchouse					
1096067	Sophie Jamieson					
1095815	Carole Page					
1095656	Catherine Webber					
1095856	Dr Janet Banfield					
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield Vice-Chair Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee					
1094611	Mrs Janet Churchouse				<p>Dalton Barracks allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocation is large enough to accommodate 1,200 dwellings to contribute towards Oxford City's un-met housing need without taking further land out of the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Objection to proposed scale of development with little or no evidence of infrastructure provision that is costed or associated with the proposed allocation.</li> <li>• Deletion of land from the Green Belt is not necessary to achieve the strategic aim of developing the Dalton Barrack site.</li> <li>• Optimise the density of the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks.</li> </ul> <p>Housing need and economic growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertain nature of future housing need</li> <li>• Concentration of economic growth in the south of the District that encourages future housing developments to the south rather than the north of Abingdon</li> <li>• Concentrating development on Green Belt ignores the availability of alternative sites outside of the Green Belt to cater for housing need, e.g. land to the south of Abingdon.</li> </ul>	

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<p>Green Belt purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing settlements of Shippon and Whitecross need to be protected from urban sprawl. Both should remain in the Green Belt and be protected by open land.</li> <li>• Removal of Whitecross and Shippon from the Green Belt would destroy views over green land, increase traffic problems and noise levels and provide a lower standard of living for residents.</li> <li>• Suggestion that an open buffer of land is maintained between Shippon and the proposed allocation and meets the Garden Village principles.</li> <li>• Release of land to the east makes an important contribution to the Green Belt by preventing coalescence of Shippon, Dalton Barracks and Whitecross</li> <li>• Local Plan 2031 Part 2 contains no further incursion into the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Welcome outcomes of the Green Belt Study that the allocation and adjacent land is considered not to contribute strongly to the purposes of the Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p>Coalescence between settlements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Releasing further land from the Green Belt will erode green spaces and merge villages and town together, losing their individual identities, rural character and historic boundaries.</li> <li>• Whitecross is a meaningful settlement separated by Green Belt land from Abingdon, Shippon, Dalton Barracks, Dry Sandford, Wootton, Boars Hill and Sunningwell.</li> <li>• Importance of the integrity of the Green Belt in preventing coalescence with the city of Oxford and the market town of Abingdon</li> <li>• Importance of the integrity of the Green Belt in maintaining the rural character of the village of Wootton and the large hamlet of Whitecross</li> </ul> <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St Helen Without Parish Council residents survey indicates 65% do not want any sections of land removed from the Green Belt. 33% do think it is appropriate to remove parcels of land from the Green Belt, but only the brownfield sections of previously developed land.</li> <li>• Impact on local biodiversity and wildlife</li> <li>• Green Belt provides local amenity for residents</li> <li>• Brownfield locations should be used before destroying</li> </ul>	

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<p>open countryside surrounding towns and villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No consideration in the plan of loss of enjoyment of the countryside and benefits in terms of health and well-being</li> <li>• Concept of Green Belt and open countryside is overlooked by planners</li> <li>• General support from Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) for Core Policy 13a.</li> <li>• Dalton Barracks is already an industrial brownfield area</li> <li>• Strategic importance of growth in this location in proximity to Oxford and the wider national initiative of the Oxford - Milton Keynes, Cambridge Growth Corridor</li> </ul>	

**Core Policy 14a: Upper Thames Strategic Storage Reservoir**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
872112  1096173	Mr Ken Oliver  Brian Stovold	Project Officer at Wiltshire Swindon & Oxford Canal Partnership  Chainman at East Vale Branch & Trustee Wilts & Berks Canal Trust		Alignment of Wilts and Berks Canal	Local Plan 2031 Part 2 should consider the need to reference the provision of a new route of the Wilts & Berks Canal in the event that the proposed reservoir was to proceed.	The Council agree with the Partnership that reference should be made in Local Plan 2031 Part 2 to the provision for a new route of the Wilts & Berks Canal. This is a policy requirement in Core Policy 14 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and provides clarity in the event that the Upper Thames Reservoir is decided by Thames Water as their preferred option in the Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) 2014.
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanne Parish Council		Impact on traffic and access	Comment recommends that consideration should be given to the impact of the planned reservoir on transport and access to East Hanney	Core Policy 14 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures that any proposal for a reservoir include measures to avoid or mitigate significant adverse effects identified through an environmental impact assessment, including on the local and wider highway networks.  Furthermore, criteria (v) in Core Policy 14 ensures a new route for the diverted Hanney to Steventon Road.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer at Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust		Need for Water Supply	A proposal for a new reservoir should be based on an assessment of the need for increasing water supply.	Thames Water continues to examine the means by which sufficient water can be provided to meet the future needs of the regions.  Thames Water is currently preparing an update to their Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) 2019, which has identified the possible need for a major new reservoir in the district between the villages of Drayton, East Hanney and Steventon.  The Council continues to safeguarded land for new reservoir capacity until such time as it is no longer considered necessary, as set out in the WRMP 2019 or in light of decisions made by Thames Water or the Secretary of State.
1024194	Ms Louise Dale	Defence Infrastructure Safeguarding		MOD concerns over flocking birds on large bodies of water due to risk of birdstrike to aircraft	The MOD has concerns over the potential for large flocks of birds at the new reservoir, due to the risk of birdstrike to aircraft from nearby military bases.	Noted. In accordance with Core Policy 14 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1, any proposal for a reservoir must include measures to mitigate or avoid significant adverse effects identified in the Environmental Impact Assessment.
1097353	Liam Ryder	Planner at Gladman Developments		Objection to Appendix F – Safeguarded area	Objections to the safeguarded site of the reservoir since the land set aside includes land which has recent planning permission for housing.	The Council agrees that the safeguarded area should be amended for inclusion in the Publication Version of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. This is referenced in Core Policy 14a.
1097646	Ian Hepburn	Planning Advisor for North Wessex Downs AONB		Objection – Impact on AONB	Respondent does not consider proper account has been taken of the likely impact of major development on the AONB.	Core Policy 44 will apply when assessing development proposals.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096915	Mr Fenwick	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Objection – Safeguarding	A number of objections are made against Core Policy 14a. Key issues raised are that	Comments acknowledged.
1097830	Graham Ritchie	Planning Manager at David Wilson Homes Southern			1. the area safeguarded for a new reservoir is partly located within a site that is actively being promoted through the local plan process.	The safeguarded area has been updated to reflect the latest evidence available from Thames Water. The decision as to whether a reservoir is needed, or should be developed, should Thames Water identify that it is needed will be dealt with outside the Local Plan process. Any proposal for a reservoir would be considered as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure project and thus would be determined by the Secretary of State
1097353	Liam Ryder	Planner at Gladman Developments			2. the area safeguarded has increased beyond that in Local Plan 2031 Part 1 with no explanation.	
874446	Christopher Baker			Traffic Impact	Local Plan 2031 Part 2 should consider the potential impact of traffic should the proposed reservoir proceed.	Core Policy 14 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures that any proposal for a reservoir mitigates the impact of construction on highways.
929661	Mr Martin Small	Principle Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) at Historic England		Support – Historic England	Historic England maintain their support for Core Policy 14 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and therefore welcome Core Policy 14a to updated the safeguarded area.	The Council acknowledge Historic England's support for this policy. Core Policy 14a updates the area safeguarded between the settlements of Drayton, East Hanney and Steventon.
725556	Thames Water Property Services			Support – Thames Water	Thames Water support for Core Policy 14a and Appendix C for the safeguarded area for Upper Thames Reservoir between the settlements of Drayton, East Hanney and Steventon.	Support welcomed.

**Core Policy 15a: Additional Site Allocations for South-East Vale Sub-Area**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd		Housing numbers	One comment questions why the LPP2 (Core Policy 8a) allocation for houses in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area is in excess of the amount required to address Oxford's unmet need.	Comment noted.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Impact on AONB	One comment questioned whether we have policies to protect and preserve the AONB.	Local Plan Part 1 includes CP44 which sets out the Council's policy regarding landscape and the AONB.
1096196	R M Burson	EM Burson and Sons		Local Plan 2031 Part 1 Allocations	Comments regarding the LPP1 allocations around Grove, welcoming the opportunity to comment and noting their interests in the Monk Farm and Grove Airfield Allocations.	Comment noted.
1097677	David Murray-Cox	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	Location of housing	We received a number of comments regarding the location of housing. A couple of comments highlighted the outcome of the Inspector's Report for LPP1 regarding the removal of 1400 dwellings in the Science Vale and reemphasised the dwellings that are being proposed. One comment from CPRE suggested there is too much cumulative impact from both sites in LPP1 and LPP2 and due to transport impacts, phasing is required. Three comments mentioned the difference between the South East Vale sub area housing requirement and the Science Vale housing requirement which equates to a total of 600 dwellings which is not to be met in Blewbury. It is suggested that the Council should pursue a strategy which seeks to deliver this remaining requirement for around 600 dwellings on deliverable sites at sustainable settlements elsewhere within the South East Vale Sub-Area.	Comments noted. The Council is seeking to fully meet the identified housing requirement for the Vale. The Council is also seeking to allocate 'additional' housing within the Part 2 plan in the South East Vale Sub-Area for the reasons set out in the plan. The Council's Strategic Sites Topic Paper explains the site selection process including the assessment criteria used to determine preferred sites. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to assess the impact of sites on landscape, infrastructure, flooding and viability which has informed the site selection process.
1096069	Ms Jones	Redcliffe Homes Ltd	832055			
929685	Dr Peter J Collins	CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)				
741327	Mr Jon Waite	David Wilson Homes Southern	874466			
1096872	Patsy Dell	Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services at Oxford City Council		Oxford City Council – No specific sites identified to meet Oxford unmet need	Oxford City Council suggest no certainty is provided as to whether Oxford's unmet needs are to be met in this sub area as no sites are identified near Didcot Station. In the Growth Board assessment, no options around Didcot were assessed. Not all of those working in Oxford will take the train as they are employed on other areas of the city.	The Council has amended the plan to ensure that unmet need for Oxford is addressed within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and that at least 2,200 homes are demonstrably close to and accessible to Oxford.
1096050	Mr Ben Barber	Redcliffe Homes Ltd		Objections to Harwell Campus Allocation	We received general objections to the Harwell Campus allocations stating it contradicts Local Plan 2011 Saved Policy E13 and there are a number of alternative, more suitable sites that should be identified.	The Council's Site Selection Topic Paper demonstrates the suitability, availability and deliverability of this site and why other alternatives are not preferred.
831122	Pamela Dothie					
1096054	Miss Sandra Yates					
1096069	Ms Jones					
1095528	Mrs Helen Waters	Redcliffe Homes Ltd	832055	Objection to Harwell Campus Allocation – No Evidence	We received a number of comments suggesting there is no evidence to support the Harwell Campus allocation as the need for a work, live, play campus has not been demonstrated including the economic impact if this were not to be provided. There is no convincing evidence to indicate that any existing or new employers at Harwell would, in the future, not be equally	Evidence prepared by Harwell Campus has been made public as part of their response to the Preferred Options Consultation. The Council has published a report to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment
1096069	Ms Jones					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
776299	Tom Smailes	Planning Manager at Linden Homes			successful in attracting people to work there as long as there is sufficient, suitable housing within the Science Vale area generally. Therefore, exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated. Reference has been made to the LPP1 Inspectors findings.	through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists.
756168	Jane Woolley					
1096196	R M Burson	EM Burson and Sons		Objection to North West Grove Allocation	We received comments raising concerns regarding the delivery of the North West Grove Allocation. Two of these comments did emphasise the importance of maximising the benefit of allocating in the South East Vale Sub Area however they suggest this site has many obstacles and is impacted by the delivery of the adjoining sites which also still have obstacles. Two alternatives suggested: Grove Park and further development at Monks Farm.	The Council has been clear that it does not anticipate development coming forward until later in the plan period. The site is proposed for allocation to assist the master-planning of Grove (Including parts of the Monks Farms and Grove Airfield Sites) together in a joined up and comprehensive way thus facilitating better planning for infrastructure delivery.
1097677	David Murray-Cox	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679			
831122	Pamela Dothie			Objection to Over Allocation	One comment raised concerns that the LPP2 housing figures for the South East Vale Sub Area looked substantially different from LPP2.	Comment noted. The figures were updated in the Preferred Options document to reflect the need to accommodate a proportion of the unmet housing need for Oxford to be met within the Vale. The figures are updated further within the Publication Version to reflect the 'residual' needed to ensure the Part 2 plan fully meets the total housing need identified, which incorporates the Vale Objectively Assessed Need and unmet need for Oxford to be met within the Vale.
1097403	Douglas C B Bond	Woolf Bond Planning LLP		Objection to site at Wootton	Some sites allocated or considered to meet Oxford's unmet need are not near Oxford and not near train stations, in particular the site near Wootton should not be considered appropriate for development.	The Council have made amendments to the Publication Version of the plan to demonstrate that at least 2200 homes allocated by the Local Plan 2031 Parts 1 and 2 are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford.
1097677	David Murray-Cox	David Wilson Homes (Southern)		Overall Deliverability	Comments stating that they have significant concerns over the deliverability of the proposed allocations.	The Council's Site Selection Topic Paper demonstrates the suitability, availability and deliverability of the sites and why other alternatives are not preferred.
831122	Pamela Dothie			Policy Wording	Comments highlight specific concerns over the housing figures. A comment states the Table needs to include the 400 dwellings at Didcot A site. One further comment highlights the differences between LPP1 and LPP2 tables for housing supply and suggests including wording to explain that.	Comments noted. Amendments have been added to address these points.
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	Senior Planning Policy Officer at South Oxfordshire District Council				
1097593	Susan Halliwell	Director for Planning and Place at Oxfordshire County Council		Oxfordshire County Council – Policy Wording	The County Council highlighted an inconsistency between footnote b and policy 15a for NW Grove (one states 300 and the other 400)	
1097814	Mr Kenneth Dijkstra	Gale and Binning	724542	Provide Additional Housing for Oxford's Unmet Need	One comment suggest that based on the entire Local Plan strategy for the Science Vale, there appears to be no sound justification for constraining the ability of the South-East Vale Sub-Area to accommodate a more significant proportion of the unmet needs of Oxford City.	The Council are not constraining housing in the South East Vale Sub Area, rather they are supporting further housing through proposing further allocations in LPP2 within this Sub Area.
730242	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris	Chilton Parish Council		Support Harwell Campus Allocation	We received support for the Harwell Campus allocation from the Harwell Campus Partnership, Chilton Parish Council and Oxfordshire LEP. The Parish Council suggest the allocation could be halved with needs still being met. They suggest the following sentence is included "The development of a new	The Council acknowledges and welcomes support for the allocation and have taken the proposed amendments into consideration in refining the Plan.
1094557	Ms Beal	Economic				

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097487	Steve Sensecall	Development Coordinator OxLEP  Harwell Campus Partnership			neighbourhood at the Campus offers the opportunity to create a purpose-built environment, tailored towards the housing needs of the Campus".	
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Strategic Development Manager at Oxford Bus Company		Support North West Grove Allocation with amendments	The Oxford Bus Company supports the site allocation but requests amendments relating to the level and scope of improvements to the bus service. Amendment includes: propose that the policy be reworded to include reference to the level and scope of bus service improvements to this development and the relevant developers' contributions arising from it.	The Council acknowledges and welcomes the support of the Oxford Bus Company. Comments noted.
1097491	Peter Frampton	Summix (Chilton) Development LLP		Support Smaller Sites	One comment highlights the importance of supporting medium-small house builders and LPP2 does not provide any opportunities for these as all allocations are too large.	Comment noted. LPP2 does allocate some smaller sites to support medium-smaller house builders, and in addition to this the Plan supports small sites being allocated through NDPs, or to come forward through the Development Management process, which will further support medium-smaller house builders.
1097677	David Murray-Cox	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	Support South East Vale Meeting Housing Needs	We received comments supporting allocations in the South East Vale Sub Area as it is capable of meeting some of the unmet needs from Oxford. Highlights that Grove Station could open up opportunities for development.	Comments noted.
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Strategic Development Manager at Oxford Bus Company		Transport – Harwell Campus	The Oxford Bus Company supports the site allocation but requests amendments relating to the level and scope of improvements to the bus service. Amendment includes: propose that the policy be reworded to include reference to the level and scope of bus service improvements to this development and the relevant developers' contributions arising from it. They do not support or object to potential housing at Milton Heights.	The Council acknowledges and welcomes the support of the Oxford Bus Company. Comments noted.

**Core Policy 15b: Harwell Campus Comprehensive Development Framework**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
733208	Mrs Heather Saunders			District Heat Network	This comment is encouraging the use of a District Heat Network at Harwell Campus. They suggest inclusion in the supporting text.	Comments noted. The Council considers that this matter will be best addressed through the preparation of the SPD for this site. The policy does not seek to limit opportunities and such a scheme could come forward subject to the economic viability of delivering a scheme being demonstrated.
728489	Mr David Marsh	Chairman at Harwell Parish Council		Enterprise Zone Boundary	Comment states the allocated site lies within an enterprise zone. The adopted policies map may need correcting if this site is taken forward.	Comment noted. The Council are aware the Policies Map will need to be amended to reflect the allocations in the Part 2 plan.
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon	Planning Specialist at Environment Agency		Environment Agency: Policy Wording and Supporting Text	The Environment Agency have requested rewording the text. Minor addition to paragraph to include biodiversity mitigation before compensation is considered. Adding mitigation will ensure compliance with other policies which have a hierarchy of actions where compensation for the impact of development is a last resort.	The Council agree with this proposed amendment.
728489	Mr David Marsh	Chairman at Harwell Parish Council		Exemplar Housing	This comment questions how the word exemplar can be measured when describing housing.	Comment is noted. The Council will include the work 'exemplar' within the plan glossary.
928815	Patrick Blake	Assistant Asset Manager at Highways England		Highways England – Engagement	Highways England would welcome the inclusion of public and statutory organisations to help design the development, especially the transport and landscape.	The Council has engaged with the statutory bodies as well as key prescribed bodies in relation to the evolution of the Plan and this policy. The Council will continue to work with these bodies including on a future SPD.
929661	Mr Martin Small	Principal Adviser (Historic Environmental Planning) at Historic England		Historic England – Historic Assessment	Historic England suggest a change in wording is required to CP15a to contain a firm requirement for all developers to conform with the framework. Historic buildings and environment need to be taken into account.	Comment is noted. The Council agree with this proposed amendment.
727300	Ms Troth Wells	The British Horse Society		Horse Society – Horse Route	This comment wishes to see a horse crossing built within the new development to avoid any major accidents at Icknield Way.	The Site Development Template ensures Icknield Way is integrated into the scheme. Also, the Council considers that this request will be addressed through the requirements of Core Policy 33(vi) and Development Policy 30 and can be considered within the detail of developing the site specific SPD.
1097814	Mr Kenneth Dijkstra	Gale and Binning	724542	Impact on Enterprise Zone	Comments which highlight the lack of evidence and justification to lose employment space for housing. By allocating the site for housing, it undermines the SHMA, LPP1 and the government's aim for employment growth. The land should be safeguarded for employment reasons only or evidence should be provided to justify the allocation.	Evidence prepared by Harwell Campus has been made public as part of their response to the Preferred Options Consultation. The Council has published a report to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists.
1097646	Ian Hepburn	Planning Advisor for North Wessex Downs AONB		Objection – Landscape	There are a number of comments relating to the impact development at Harwell Campus will have on the AONB including, landscape, wildlife and historic assets. There is also a lack of regard to the removal off two sites at Harwell campus within LPP1. Any more development will need to regard the existing buildings, residents, wildlife and the economy as there	The Council's Strategic Sites Topic Paper explains the site selection process including the assessment criteria used to determine preferred sites. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to assess the impact of sites on landscape, infrastructure, flooding and viability which has informed the site selection process. This demonstrates the
929685	Peter J Collins	CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale				

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096035 728489 730242 1098026 1095843 1095677 1094231	Mr Evans Mr David Marsh Ms Mary Elizabeth Morris Mrs Katie Fraser Dr James Wickens Mr and Mrs Hunter Miss Kim Pringle	of White Horse Committee)  Chilton Parish Council			is a difference that the impact housing development and employment development have on the landscape.	redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall.  The Council has engaged with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders on matters relating to landscape and the natural environment.
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem	Natural England		Natural England – Welcome Design Frame	This comment welcomes the Comprehensive development framework for Harwell campus but advises that the LVIA should be undertaken to ensure that information is available to inform the allocation of the site. Also the development should look to deliver a net gain in biodiversity and so the ecological study should include mitigation and enhancement proposals.	Comment is noted. The LVIA is published alongside the Publication Version of the Local Plan. The Council agrees with the proposed change relating to biodiversity.
728489	Mr David Marsh	Chairman at Harwell Parish Council		No Framework	A comment questions whether all development will abide by the comprehensive development framework when the development at present time does not exist.	The framework will be provided in the form of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which in itself will be subject to its own dedicated public consultation. An SPD is a material consideration which will inform any future planning applications, once adopted.  The Council is committed to progressing the SPD quickly to ensure that it can inform any proposals for development coming forward on the proposed allocation.
1095677 1096211 829404 1097863 1097865	Mr and Mrs Hunter Mr Farrell Mr and Mrs Chapman Karen Harrison Paul Harrison			Objection to Land North of Icknield Way	There are a number of comments which disagree with the development of housing north of Icknield Way. They feel it is wrong to develop greenfield land which is in the AONB and wish for it to be developed as a Country Park.	The land north of Icknield Way is already allocated for employment through Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists.  The Council's evidence demonstrates the redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall.
1094557	Ms Beal	Economic Development Coordinator OxLEP		Oxfordshire LEP Support	Oxfordshire LEP support the allocated site at Harwell Campus.	Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with the LEP.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097646	Ian Hepburn	Planning Advisor for North Wessex Downs AONB		Policy Wording and Supporting Text	There are a number of comments which request rewording the text within the development template and the wording within Core Policy 15b to provide clarification. These vary from minor wording amendments to more in-depth wording and information. Some examples include; More clarification needed in regards to the numbers mentioned in the supporting text and the numbers in the policy. Expansion over existing wording is needed as well as mention to the SPD document within the Policy.	The Council have considered the requested changes in updating Core Policy 15b, its supporting text, and the site specific requirements contained in Appendix A of Local Plan 2031 Part 2.
728489	Mr David Marsh	Chairman of Harwell Parish Council				
1022990	Mr Ben Lewis	Magnox Limited and the NDA	1022989			
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Strategic Development Manager at Oxford Bus Company		Support Harwell Campus	There are a number of comments that support the allocated site at Harwell Campus. Some believe that more evidence is still need but agree with the idea of a work-live-play concept. Some believe that the numbers need to be reconsidered in regards to both increasing and decreasing. The SPD concept is well received and some organisations would like to offer their input.	Comments noted. Evidence prepared by Harwell Campus has been made public as part of their response to the Preferred Options Consultation. The Council has published a report to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists.
1022990	Mr Ben Lewis	Magnox Limited and the NDA	1022989			
1097487	Steven Sensecall	Harwell Campus Partnership	1097490			
1022426	Carolyn Organ	Ptarmigan Land Ltd	1097350	Harwell Campus – Transport	A comprehensive approach to growth at Harwell campus that includes housing and other facilities, would offer the potential to reinforce identified infrastructure proposals.	Comment noted.

**Core Policy 16b: Didcot Garden Town**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095667	Mr Lakeland Chairman Blewbury Parish Council			Didcot Garden Town Principles and Implementation	Comments support principle of Didcot Garden Town but raise concerns over loss of green space, housing quality and transport links. Comment also raises concern that language of policy is not clear and is not explicit about what is being planned.	Comments noted. To further support the delivery and the successful implementation of the Didcot Garden Town Initiative, further detail in respect of design, infrastructure, green infrastructure, services and facilities will be set out in a future Development Plan Document (DPD) or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Statutory bodies, organisations and the general public will have further opportunities to review and comment on the implementation of the Didcot Garden Town Initiative.  The Council acknowledge the County's comments. Development Policy 27: Waste Collection and Recycling and provides sufficient guidance in regards to recycling in new developments. Core Policy 42 in Local Plan 2031 Part 1 encourages schemes for renewable and low carbon energy generation within developments.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett					
728489	Mr David Marsh Chairman Harwell Parish Council					
1096211	Mr Farrell					
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)					
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England					
1057747	Minscombe Properties	Mr Terry Gashe	1057745			
1051321	Mr Paul Walker Strategic Development Manager Oxford Bus Company					
1097495	Vicky Aston Sport England					
1097593	Susan Halliway Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council – Didcot Garden Town Principles	Oxfordshire County Council recommend that health and well being are included in the overall identity that the master plan will champion for Didcot. They are also believe that there is an opportunity to embrace resource efficiency as an integral part of green living. They would like to see something in the masterplan principles about sustainability in relation to energy, water and resource use, including re-use, recycling and composting.	
728489	Mr David Marsh Chairman Harwell Parish Council			Include Harwell Village in Para 2.106	Request to include Harwell Village in sentence outlining the importance of maintaining separation between Didcot Garden Town and the surrounding villages.	The Council recognises the importance of safeguarding the separate identity and characteristics of individual settlements as well as open gaps that form separation between places. The Part 2 Plan, sets out Development Policy 28: Settlement Character and Gaps which seeks to protect further against the loss of physical or visual separation between settlements. In interpreting this policy, the Council will take into account both the individual effects of the proposal and the cumulative

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						effects of existing and other proposed developments.
1096672	Mays Properties Ltd		1096673	Masterplan Area - Remove land south of the A4130	No objection to Didcot Garden Town in principle, although an objection that the designated area includes their land at Milton Interchange.	The Council consider the Masterplan area is appropriate which has been informed by the Council's Delivery Plan for the Didcot Garden Town area.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull East Hendred Parish Council			Objection - No allocated development sites	Objection to Core Policy 16B for not identifying housing sites or policies to enable Didcot Garden Town to meet the proposed housing requirements for Science Vale and the South East Vale Sub-Area.	Core Policy 4a and 15a identify additional housing sites in the South East Vale and Science Vale areas. It is not the purpose of Core Policy 16b to allocate additional sites.
1057747	Minscombe Properties Ltd	mr. terry gashe	1057745	Reference to the Didcot Growth Accelerator and Didcot Enterprise Zones	Request to include reference to the Didcot Growth Accelerator Enterprise Zone alongside references to Milton Park and Harwell Campus.	The Council recognises economic importance of the Didcot Growth Accelerator and are working hard to ensure the succesful, and continued, delivery and implementation of the Enterprise Zone.
929661	Mr Martin Small Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Scheduled Monuments and Heritage Assets should be included in the Masterplan Design Principles.	A comment regarding the proximity of the proposed Didcot Garden Town to a scheduled monument of a settlement site north of Milton Park and to the east of Appleford. Suggestion that Figure 2.7 should include an additional Masterplan principle requiring conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and heritage assets.	The NPPF considers Heritage Assets and Scheduled Monuments as an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved relating to their significance. The Development Management Policies of the Local Plan Part 2 recognises the significant importance of such assets. Core Policy 39, DMP35 and the Local Plan read as whole, provide a robust planning framework to ensure all applications consider the protection of the Vale's historic environment.
1097495	Vicky Aston Sport England			Sport England Comment - Active Design Guidance	Recommendation from Sport England that their Active Design principles be referenced in the Didcot Garden Town Masterplan Principles. One instance of a change to text to reference this was suggested.	To further support the delivery and the successful implementation of the Didcot Garden Town Initiative, further detail in respect of design, infrastructure, green infrastructure, services and facilities will be set out in a future Development Plan Document (DPD) or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Statutory bodies and organisations and the general public will have further opportunities to review and comment on the implementation of the Didcot Garden Town Initiative.
1024194	Ms Louise Dale Defence Infrastructure Safeguarding			Statutory Consultation and notification of any future plans	The Defence Infrastructure Safeguarding need to be informed and consulted on any future plan's in relation to height restrictions within the aerodrome height safeguarding consultation zone at RAF Benson.	As required by the Town and Country Planning Act (2012), the Council will consult with all relevant statutory bodies and organisations on the development of any future applications.
928815  1100197	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England  Mr Peter Canavan Senior Planning Policy Officer South Oxfordshire District Council			Support	Support from Highways England for the six high level principles that have been developed, including the aim to reduce the reliance on motorised vehicles and move towards active and public transport. Support from South Oxfordshire District Council for the inclusion of this policy and joint work on this project.	The Council make note of the support and will continue to work statutory bodies and relevant Council to deliver the Didcot Garden Town Initiative.

**Core Policy 18a: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
728489	Mr David Marsh Chairman Harwell Parish Council			Additional/alternative suggestions for safeguarding	Comments making suggestions for additional safeguarding: (i) Southern Didcot spine road, (ii) route from NPR to Oxford via A4074, (iii) Park & Ride site on the Steventon side of the A34, (iv) new pedestrian/cycle bridge across the A34 connecting Harwell to Valley Park and (v) a cycle route from Wantage to Harwell/Didcot.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group					
1094091	Mrs Jackie Bushell					
1020916	Ms Eleanor Owen					
874657	Mrs Gwendoline Marsh Farm Manager Milton Manor Farms			Concern regarding improved A34-Milton Park access	The proposed access will only benefit Milton Park employees. Parking at Milton Park will still be a concern. The impact on Milton village should be considered, including the preservation of Milton Manor. Initiatives to improve safety on the A34 should be a higher priority. Consultation should be undertaken with the Parish Council, landowners and other interested parties. Suggested alternative to reposition the slips on less viable agricultural land on the Steventon side of the A34 and create a Park & Ride site, reducing noise pollution and the impact on Milton Manor. Also suggestions to consider a rail stop for Milton Park, increase access for cars to Milton Park from the A4130 using either the existing tunnel access or a bridge, improve access to Milton Park from Didcot.  Comments raising concern about the impact on the amenity value of the land to Milton and Steventon, impact on Milton Manor and that it will only move the problem to within the Milton Park site.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1096902	Mrs Nicola Rees					
1097553	Mr & Mrs John * Anne Wattam					
1020916	Ms Eleanor Owens					
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			Environment Agency Response	The Environment Agency do not consider it appropriate to safeguard land in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and in proximity to sensitive protected habitats and species without appropriate evidence that the areas to be safeguarded are appropriate. This is especially the case for flood risk, where we feel that a Sequential Test and Level 2 SFRA need to be provided as evidence. We feel that without this evidence, any future assessment of flood risk may be prejudiced by the land that has been safeguarded.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.  Detailed feasibility work will be required before any detailed schemes are brought forward and this stage would include, as a matter of course, detailed consideration for flooding risk associated with the proposed highway schemes.
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			General objection to policy	General concern the policy does not safeguard land for infrastructure relating to Wantage and Grove.	Infrastructure requirements relating to Wantage and Grove are set out in the adopted Local Plan Part 1.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097559	MEPC	Laura Black	1097558	General support for policy	General support for the safeguarding of land for infrastructure improvements which will result in greater accessibility to Milton Park.	Noted.
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England			Highways England Response	Highways England would like to further discuss these schemes with VoWHDC as and when they come forward, in order to ensure that any impacts (capacity, safety etc.) to the SRN are appropriately considered and mitigated in line with Circular 02/2013.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1057747	Minscombe Properties Ltd	mr. terry gashe	1057745	Milton Park Employment Access Link and Backhill Lane railway tunnel	The Milton Park Employment Access Link (Backhill Lane railway tunnel)• will commence construction in 2017.	Noted.
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler			Objection to A34-Milton Park access	This comment suggests that land should not be safeguarded without consultation with land owner.	Noted. The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Milton Park Slips	Land for slips serving Milton Park can be safeguarded in case it is required. Ongoing transport assessment will identify whether it is needed - it is already known that there are likely future problems at Milton Interchange which will necessitate some further interventions. Funding for such a proposal is not currently known and the views of Highways England need to be sought as technical work is prepared.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Pedestrian and Cycle Bridge	A pedestrian and cycle bridge for Milton Heights is important given the Local Plan Part 1 allocation of land at Milton Heights. The Planning Committee on 12th April 2017 resolved to approve an application on the allocated site pending a S106 agreement which includes developer funding of the bridge, the western edge of which is on that land. The bridge will land on the eastern side of the A34 behind the Milton Services. Applications relating to the development of that land were also considered on 12 th April 2017. A further area of safeguarding is sought to ensure that the pedestrian/cycle route extends to the junction of the A4130, allowing for continuation to the link through the Backhill Lane tunnel. An amendment to the map is therefore sought, details of which can be provided by the county Council.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Policy and Supporting Text	Page 61 Para 2.109 - when the plan says 'necessary' to planned employment and housing development, what does	Yes.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				Wording	necessary mean? Does it mean required?	
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan Senior Planning Policy Officer South Oxfordshire District Council			South Oxfordshire District Council Support for Memorandum of Understanding	Comment from South Oxfordshire District Council proposing that a Memorandum of Understanding is drawn up between the district and county Councils regarding planning for development and delivery of the cross-border package of highway improvements (including key infrastructure improvements, particularly the link and river crossing between Didcot and Culham Science Centre).	Agreed. A MOU was prepared to support the Part 1 plan. Work is under way to prepare a new MOU to support the Part 2 plan.
1057747	Minscombe Properties Ltd	mr. terry gashe	1057745	Support for pedesdtrian/cycle bridge over A34	General support for the provision of the bridge and safeguarding of land.	Noted.
1057747	Minscombe Properties Ltd	mr. terry gashe	1057745	Sustainable transport improvements - Milton Interchange Trunk Road Services	Masterplan for the Milton Interchange Trunk Road Service location highlights the inclusion of foot and cycle paths, a proposed pedestrian and cycle bridge across the A34 and new bus-stops on the A4130.	Noted.

**Core Policy 19a: Re-opening of Grove Railway Station**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679	General Comment on Policy 19a	Generally, supports the principle of the station, however would like to see the station located to the east of the A338, where it should be commercially viable and makes Grove more sustainable.	The Council have made note of this comment when preparing the publication version of the plan. and are continuing to work with key stakeholders and developers to ensure the appropriate transport infrastructure is delivered in an appropriate location.
1096196	R M Burson EM Burson and Sons			Concern about Policy 19a	Concern raised regarding the extent of safeguarded land impacting on allocated site from LPP1. Should not safeguard land until further more detailed work has been undertaken.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council Comment	The County Council would like to see safeguarding land for pedestrian and cycle links to the proposed station location. In addition to this, land for Grove Station could provide potential for a new strategic transport hub in this part of Science Vale. Further work needs to be done during the period before submission of the Plan to refine the area that needs to be safeguarded.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			Environment Agency response	The Environment Agency consider it is not appropriate to safeguard land in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and in proximity to sensitive protected habitats and species without appropriate evidence. This is especially the case for flood risk, where we feel that a Sequential Test and Level 2 SFRA are needed.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.  Detailed feasibility work will be required before any detailed schemes are brought forward and this stage would include, as a matter of course, detailed consideration for flooding risk associated with the proposed highway schemes.
725573	Ms Barbara Morgan Network Rail			Network Rail response	Network Rail support the principle of improving connectivity throughout the Thames Valley, but have reservations as to how this will be practicably achieved without additional track capacity (i.e. 3/4 tracking the current 2-track railway between Swindon and Didcot).	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.  The Council look forward to continue to working with Network Rail to assist with delivering a Station at Grove within the plan period as part of wider improvements between the rail network between Bristol, Swindon, Oxford and Cambridge.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096810  758065	Williams Grand Prix Engineering Limited  Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	Mr Mike Robinson  Mr Andrew Raven	1096811  758063	Object to Policy 19a	Concern raised regarding proposing safeguarded land on Williams employment site and they would like to be involved in further discussions. Comments highlighted potential conflicts with Monks Farm allocation and the safeguarded land and that there is limited evidence to justify safeguarding of land for station.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council and based on detailed work undertaken by the County Council.
1095667  756493  929685  827932	Mr Lakeland Chairman Blewbury Parish Council  Mr Graham Mundy Clerk Grove Parish Council  Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)  Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Support for Policy 19a	Comments providing general support, with the following further points noted: 1. Light rail connections to/from Science Vale should be supported 2. Network Rail have not committed to take station forward	Noted.

## Development Policies

A new Development Policy has been added during the Regulation 19 (Publication) stage of the Part 2 plan. The new policy is Development Policy 1: Self and Custom-Build. As a result, all policies after this have since been updated, and in this report, will be numbered as they are in the Publication version of the plan (with reference to what they were called during the Preferred Options consultation).

### Development Policy 2: Space Standards (was Development Policy 1 in Preferred Options)

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull, East Hendred Parish Council			Housing Policies Constrain Development	One comment raised concerns that Development Management Policies 1-6 will constrain housing on sites within existing buildings and thus increase the need for further land to be released for housing.	These policies ensure that isolated developments are prevented in the countryside whilst enabling appropriate small scale housing development. They are therefore enabling appropriate small scale housing development rather than constraining.
730190 1027852 1094599 1094098 1097830 875920 1022346 1022209 902666	Councillor Debby Hallett Ms Judith Onuh, Graduate Planner Thakeham Mr James Proyer, Planner Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Mrs Cheryl Reeves, Equalities Officer, Vale of White Horse District Council Graham Ritchie, Planning Manager David Wilson Homes Southern Daniel Scharf Mrs Victoria Trotman, Group Land Planning Manager Bovis Homes Limited Bloor Homes South West University of Oxford			No Evidence and Lack of Flexibility	There were comments regarding a lack of evidence supporting this policy and that there is a lack of flexibility in the policy. The Housing Strategy is not available to review the evidence behind this policy. It should reflect the empirical evidence. Lack of detail on the viability assessment, particularly it does not appraise all the home size scenarios and therefore there is no evidence that the size of smaller units envisaged by the Council are viable. One comment suggested the Council consider research 'down-sizing in place'. The policy will have a significant impact on the viability of housing developments. The Space Standards do not have to be applied rigidly, they should be used as a guide. The recent Housing White Paper also casts doubt over the Space Standards and this should be considered. Recommendations for a transition period, if adopted, or a lower proportion for Category 2.	The Council has undertaken evidence to support this policy which will be presented in the Housing Strategy. The Strategy will be available to view alongside the Publication Version of the Plan. The Viability Assessment relating to the Publication Version of the Local Plan has appraised the outcomes of the Housing Strategy to ensure the viability of development has been considered and reflected in the policy. The Council acknowledges the recent draft of the Housing White Paper.
1100197 1103287	Mr Peter Canavan, Senior Planning Policy Officer, South Oxfordshire District Council Vale Disability Access Group	Mrs Helen Tilton Mr Mark Owen	1022208 1097195	Support	There are two comments that welcome the policy but one would like to ensure parking is provided.	The comment has been noted by the Council. The Council Design Guide SPD provides provision for parking standards when developing new dwellings. Oxfordshire County Council also provide guidance for parking as referenced by Part 1 plan policies.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Unclear Policy	There were comments relating to a lack of clarity. The policy is hard to understand and there is concern over how it will be	The policy has been refined for inclusion within the Publication Version.

<b>Consultee ID</b>	<b>Consultee and / or Organisation</b>	<b>Agent and Organisation</b>	<b>Agent ID</b>	<b>Comment Category</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard				implemented.	

**Development Policy 3: Sub-Division of Dwellings (was Development Policy 2 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
875920	Daniel Scharf			Accommodation for the elderly	This comment highlights concerns over appropriate housing for the elderly which includes providing self-contained accommodation on the ground floor.	Core Policy 26 in Local Plan 2031 Part 1 provides a policy in relation to accommodating the current and future needs of the ageing population.
875920	Daniel Scharf			Density	The supporting text should emphasis the advantages that terraced housing brings, including the efficient use of resources in both the building and living phases.	This policy will apply to any terraced housing which has an application to sub divide. The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 contains Core Policy 23, which covers housing density.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			Monitoring	This comment questions how the policy will be monitored as subdivision of dwellings do not always require planning permission.	The monitoring of appropriate use and, if required, appropriate action, is a process undertaken through the Council's enforcement team. The Council are proposing a development policy for Sub Division of Dwellings which promotes appropriate sub divisions where needed.
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council			Parking	The comment raises concerns of adequate on-site parking and loss of greenspace.	Appropriate parking is provided in accordance with Core Policy 35 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The Design Guide makes reference to transforming front gardens to parking in principle DG82: Parking.
875920	Daniel Scharf			Permitted Development	Comment discusses permitted development rights in regards to sub-dividing dwellings.	The Council note that the conditions in which dwellings can be divided under permitted development rights should be made clearer.
875920	Daniel Scharf			Promoting Sub division of Dwellings	This comment asks the Council to promote subdivision of dwellings through Permitted Development and Policy.	The Council has reviewed the policy to ensure it is clear, especially in relation to conditions allowed under permitted development rights for sub dividing dwellings.
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock			Consistency within the Plan	This comment suggests that all the policies should be consistent in how they link to Local Plan 2031 Part 1.	The Council note this and will ensure consistency between the two plans.
827932	Julie Maberley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Support	This comment supports point 4 of Development Policy 2.	The Council has noted the support for the policy.

**Development Policy 4: Residential Annexes (was Development Policy 3 in Preferred Options)**

<b>Consultee ID</b>	<b>Consultee and / or Organisation</b>	<b>Agent and Organisation</b>	<b>Agent ID</b>	<b>Comment Category</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			Appropriate Car Parking	One comment raised a concern that the need for additional on-site parking is not mentioned within this policy.	The Policy does include criteria to ensure adequate and safe access is achieved. The inclusion of appropriate car parking will be considered, although given the nature of annexes it is unlikely extra car parking would be required.
730190  760211	Councillor Debby Hallett  Dr Andrew Pritchard			Monitoring of Annexes	There has been concern raised as to how the use of annexes are monitored and if appropriate action will be taken if the use is not appropriate.	The monitoring of appropriate use and, if required, appropriate action, is a process undertaken through the Council's enforcement team. The Council are seeking to ensure the policy enables appropriate annexes where needed, rather than providing opportunities for new single dwellings to be provided.

**Development Policy 5: Replacement Dwellings in the Open Countryside (was Development Policy 4 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
831747 096204	Mr Richard Whitlock  Mr Colin Thomas, Sunningwell Parishioners Against Damage to the Environment			Amend Wording	The comments suggest amending the wording. This includes: (ii) delete "would have" insert "can demonstrate that it has (iii) delete "footprint" insert "footprint and exterior visual impact". Paragraph 3.32 should also be amended to say "will be considered in accordance with". The Council should also consider including the phase noise and vibration into the policy.	The Council have given consideration to these comments and updated the policy to improve clarity
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council			Sustainability of development	Development should not be assumed just because its replacing an existing dwelling.	The Local Plan looks to overcome the challenge of ensuring development is sustainable through a number of policies in the Part 1 Plan including Core Policy 22: Housing mix, Core Policy 23: Housing Density and Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing.
960396	Cumnor Parish Council			Character	This comment welcomes the policy but would like the third point to make reference to the character of the area.	The plan is to be read as a whole. This is covered by Core Policy 37 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 which ensures development proposals respond positively to local character and reinforce local identity.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins, CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			Amenity	This comment would like the policy to make consideration to noise and vibrations of developing dwellings in the Open Countryside.	The plan is to be read as a whole. This detail is covered by the amenity policies in the Part 2 Plan

**Development Policy 6: Rural Workers Dwellings (was Development Policy 5 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			Permanent Occupancy Condition	One comment raises a need for the policy to ensure the occupancy condition is permanent and never removed.	The policy ensures the appropriate condition regarding occupancy is attached to the dwelling.
875920 1021394	Daniel Scharf  David Burson JPPC			Support for Rural Worker Dwellings	Comments supporting rural worker housing to support a positive development strategy for the redevelopment of rural buildings and support growth in agriculture and local food production. It should be located in sustainable locations.	The Council agrees which is reflected in Development Policy 5 and Development Policy 6.
875920	Daniel Scharf			Policy Wording	One comment suggests three changes to the policy wording: Permanent full time basis should be replaced with wholly or mainly; and use financial viability instead of economic sustainability. Both changes reflect standard wording and help avoid confusion. The Plan could refer to the Ecological Land Cooperative model where smallholders are clustered under the ELC management which ensures continued productivity and compliance with conditions.	The Council has considered these proposed changes in refining the policy for the Publication Version.

**Development Policy 7: Re-Use, Conversion and Extension of Buildings for Dwellings in the Open Countryside (was Development Policy 6: Re-use of Buildings for Dwellings in the Open Countryside in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock			Impact of Curtilage Development	One comment raises concern over the impact of curtilage development on the countryside and the greenbelt. Recommends the policy is extended to reference this impact and link to CP13.	The Council has considered these proposed changes in refining the policy for the Publication Version, however the plan should be read as a whole and thus CP13 will apply.
1094394	Claire Arnold Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			Sustainability of re-use	Comment express concern that re-use of buildings will not result in sustainability in terms of employment, education, infrastructure, public transport, healthcare, safety and parking.	The Local Plan ensures development is sustainable through a number of policies in the Part 1 Plan including Core Policy 22: Housing mix, Core Policy 23: Housing Density and Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing.
929661	Mr Martin Small Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Historic and architectural merit	Comment recommends that retention of features of architectural or historic merit should be required for converted buildings.	The Council note this comment and has considered including a criteria into the policy for the Publication Version of the plan
730284	Mr Brian Rixon			Policy detail	Comment suggests policy should be more specific to avoid interpretation conflicts and state how the policy will be enforced. The development should abide by the rural character.	Core Policy 37 of Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Design Guide SPD should be considered when determining planning applications. This includes applications for the reuse of a building in the open countryside. The Council's enforcement team monitor the appropriate use and, if required take appropriate action. The Council are seeking to provide a policy to help protect the open countryside from development that does not conform to the local character.
1021394	David Burson JPPC			Unused modern agricultural buildings	Comment makes point that modern farm buildings are not always in use because of changes to farming practice and therefore sensitive re-development of such sites would be preferable to decline of unused modern farm buildings.	Development Policy 5 and 6 of the Part 2 Plan support the redevelopment of buildings in the open countryside. They provide clear criteria which helps to protect and enhance the landscape and character of the area. Core Policy 37 in Local Plan 2031 part 1 provides a policy that also helps to protect the Local Distinctiveness.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			Noise and vibration	Comment suggests that development policies 4 and 6 should include consideration of noise and vibration effects.	This detail is covered within the amenity policies of the Part 2 Plan.

**Development Policy 8: Community Services and Facilities (was Development Policy 7 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094394	Claire Arnold Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			Lack of flexibility	Comment notes that development policy does not make provision for flexibility in planning considerations to enable community facilities to serve growing populations.	The Policy supports the provision of new and extended facilities and thus enables provision to serve extended populations.
856633	Mr Ross Anthony Planning Advisor Theatres Trust			Support	There is support for this development Policy however the inclusion of culture needs to be mentioned. The benefits that art and culture can have to a community is mentioned and concludes that the plan should promote art and culture at all levels.	The Council fully support that art and cultural contributes to the local communities. Local Plan 2031 Part 2 is proposing to introduce a policy in regards of Public Art. The Council's Design Guide SPD also provides some policy guidance in regards to encouraging art within the community.
902666	University of Oxford					
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock			Policy Wording	Comment states objection to the word 'particularly' in the policy as may allow for developments that do not comply with the criteria.	The Council has considered altering the text to reflect the change proposed. The Council is proposing Development Policy 34 within Local Plan 2031 Part 2 which looks to support small scale recreational facilities.
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			Burial Plots	Comments raise concern over the long term availability of burial plots and suggests development policy should address this issue.	Noted. The Council considers that proposals for new burial provision can be accommodated within the existing policy framework, including national policy
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Town Clerk Abingdon-on-Thames Town Council					
830213	Mr Nigel Warner Town Clerk Abingdon-on-Thames Town Council					
830213	Mr Nigel Warner Town Clerk, Abingdon-on-Thames Town Council					
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Multifunctional facilities	Comment suggests that development policy should include details regarding multifunctional facilities that allow disparate members of the community to meet when they otherwise would not.	The Policy supports the provision of new and extended facilities which includes the provision of multi-use community facilities.
1103287	Vale Disability Access Group			Provision for people with access issues	Comment states that developers planning community services and facilities should consider the needs of those with access issues e.g. people with limited vision and wheelchair users.	The Council consider the policy provides sufficient flexibility and has been informed by Equalities Impact Assessment.

**Development Policy 9: Public Houses (was Development Policy 8 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Policy should apply to other categories	Comment questioning why the policy doesn't apply to other uses, if considered a community hub.	<p>The Council recognises that other uses than Public Houses can contribute to social cohesion and community facilities. However, in recent times, it is clearly evident that there has been a national decline in the development and retention of Public Houses. This is due to a number of factors, most commonly for residential development, due to their often large plot sizes and capacity to develop several dwellings, or conversion to alternative uses. In light of this, the Council have proposed for reasonable evidence to be demonstrated before any loss to Public Houses will be permitted. This will help support the vitality and sustainability of the Vale's rural communities.</p> <p>The Council is also proposing in Part 2 of the Plan, a number of Development Policies to help further safeguard community services, facilities and amenities.</p>

**Development Policy 10: Ancillary Uses on Key Employment Sites (was Development Policy 9 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			DM9 - Existing Policy question	This comment questions if there is an existing policy to support ancillary uses on employment land.	This Policy will replace Policy E13 in the Local Plan 2011. The purpose of this is to update the Saved Policy of the Local Plan 2011.
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			DM9 - Loss of employment land	This comment raises concerns over the loss of employment use if ancillary uses are permitted on employment land.	The policy seeks to ensure the vitality and viability of existing employment sites and businesses through the provision of additional services and facilities. The policy states that any non-B-use class proposals must not undermine the main business or employment function of the site. Many ancillary uses generate their own forms of employment, albeit not strictly under the B-use class.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull East Hendred Parish Council			DM9 - Objection	The parish Council objects to the use of LDO's for other uses than employment on employment land.	The process of using LDOs has been successful on major employment sites such as Milton Park. LDOs can restrict the extent of non B-use class uses to ensure the main employment function is retained.
1094394	Arnold Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			DM9 - Regeneration of centres	This comment raises concerns over having other uses than employment will delay or obviate the regeneration of central businesses.	The policy seeks to ensure the vitality and viability of existing employment sites and businesses through the provision of additional services and facilities. The policy states that any non-B-use class proposals must not undermine the main business or employment function of the site.
756175	Mr Robin Draper			DM9 - restriction to scientific and technical users	Comment suggests more stress should be placed on restricting use to scientific and technical. Comment further suggests that use for warehousing and distribution should be restricted to avoid increasing load on infrastructure.	Comment noted.

**Development Policy 11: Community Employment Plans (was Development Policy 10 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730190 1097839 1097845	Councillor Debby Hallett Nick Tucker Sally Tucker			DM10 - Limited Existing Employment Opportunities	A few comments state that there is insufficient local employment opportunities already which give rise to more commuters and congestion.	The purpose of CEPS is to encourage local employment opportunities and resources which would reduce the need for in-commuting and reduce congestion on the district's road network.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			DM10 – Query	This comment questions if Community Led Employment plans work and what it is that they do.	The purpose of CEPS is to encourage local employment opportunities and resources which would reduce the need for in-commuting and reduce congestion on the district's road network. CEPs have proven successful tools in Oxfordshire, as demonstrated in the OxLEPs evidence around this.
1094394 875920 827932	Claire Arnold Clerk Watchfield Parish Council Daniel Scharf Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			DM10 - Requirement for CEPs	There are a number of comments which request that CEPs and LSP's to be a mandatory requirement.	There is merit in considering making CEPs/LSPs a requirement for large scale development where significant employment is likely to be generated. It should still remain an option for other developments.
1094557	Ms Beal Economic Development Coordinator OxLEP			DM10-Support	This comment supports the policy but would like some clarification as to when an LSP would be required.	The Council makes note of the support. There is merit in considering making CEPs/LSPs a requirement for large scale development where significant employment is likely to be generated. It should still remain an option for other developments.
1094098	Mrs Cheryl Reeves Equalities Officer Vale of White Horse District Council			Strengthen Wording	Development Policy 32 should recognise the need to provide safe, attractive, convenient open space that is accessible for all users including equestrians.	Noted. Development Policy 32 ensures that the provision of open space, including public open space and children's play and youth provision is in accordance with national standards including Fields in Trust standard and Green Flag Award. These national standards take into account equal access to open space for all users.

**Development Policy 12: Rural Diversification and Equestrian Developments (was Development Policy 11 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
727300	Ms Troth Wells. The British Horse Society			DP11-Support	This comment supports the inclusion and the wording of this policy.	The Council have noted the support for this policy.
1094394	Claire Arnold Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			DP11 - Bridleway retention/ enhancement	There is merit in considering further the need for local policies to protect and where possible enhance existing bridleways.	The Council consider Development Policy on Public Rights of Way sufficiently covers this.
1094547	Mrs Gimigliano					
875920	Daniel Scharf			DP11 - Query	This comment questions why the Council are encouraging horsiculture in their Local Plan when the future of food supply and security in the wake of Brexit is uncertain. They mention the difficulties young farmers have in accessing affordable land and associated housing.	Equestrian development forms part of the rural economy and needs to be supported in line with national policy. The Council would like to make provision for horsicultural use within the district using current guidance until the government have resolved the political issues surrounding Brexit.
874621	Mrs Denise Fletcher			DP11 - Dalton Barracks bridleway	This comment would like a safe and easy to access bridle path to run through the Dalton Barracks site to decrease the amount of accidents on the road. They make reference to a past bridle path on the site.	The Dalton Barracks site will incorporate a Country Park of at least 80 hectares and considers that there is substantial opportunity for provision of such facilities.
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock			DP11 - Refer to other policies in the plan. Suggested changes.	This comment would like the policy to link up to other policies within the plan to ensure the countryside and the green belt are protected.	The Plan should be read as a whole and as such the policies regarding the countryside and green belt will apply without specific mention within this policy.
850741	Mr Tom Ormesher Environment and Land Use Adviser NFU South East			DP11 - Farm Shops Objection	This comment criticises the criteria within the policy which sets out restrictions on new farm shops where they should not undermine the deliverability of viability and vitality of shopping provisions in nearby villages.	The Council considers this criteria to be in conformity with national policy ensuring there is not an impact on existing provision in settlement centres.
850741	Mr Tom Ormesher Environment and Land Use Adviser NFU South East			DP11 - No rural agri expansion policy.	This comment states that there is no policy to enable the development of farm buildings for agricultures and are therefore not meeting the requirements within the NPPF.	This is sufficiently addressed through Core Policy 28 and where appropriate through permitted development rights. Equestrian development forms part of the rural economy and needs to be supported in line with national policy.

**Development Policy 13: Changes of Use of Retail Units to Other Uses (was Development Policy 12: Change of Use of Retail Units in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council			Parking standards	Comments stating that the Policy does not mention the need for adequate parking.	All applications, including retail uses, will be considered alongside the Council's Urban Design Guide SPD and the Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards as set out in Part 1 policy.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			Permitted Change of Use	Comment stating that the policy restricts a change of use to residential because it will result in a loss of goods and services.	Development will be permitted if the application can demonstrate the proposal will add to the range and variety of goods and services available to the local residents.
827932	Julie Maberley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Primary and Secondary Frontages	<p>Comments expressing the belief that Kings Walk should be included in the RTCS Report, 2017.</p> <p>Comments identifying concern that the policy will offer an opportunity for developers to change primary and secondary retail frontages to residential accommodation (C3).</p> <p>Concerned the policy will offer an opportunity for developers to change primary and secondary retail frontages to residential accommodation (C3).</p> <p>Allocations should be made to meet the expected demand for Retail Floorspace.</p> <p>Future proposals should demonstrate how viability, retention of employment and design and parking standards will be implemented.</p>	<p>The Vale of White Horse Retail and Town Centres Uses Study (Updated March, 2017) (RTCS, 2017), read alongside the RTCS, 2013 and the Addendum, 2014, assesses the implications of the additional strategic housing options, and the likely associated changes in the retail floor-space needs arising from the revised population figures. This includes a substantial audit of retail services and uses with primary and secondary frontages within the main settlements of the District. The 2017 report recommended, some minor alterations to the existing retail areas was needed to reflect changing circumstances in population growth, market trends, new and existing facilities and emerging policies from Part 2 of the Plan. This can be found in Appendix H of the Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>The 2017 report, used a sequential approach to define the area for town centre boundaries and shopping frontages so that it can determine what is considered to be in-centre, edge of centre and out of centre, and whether a retail impact assessment is required. The Council consider that this approach is most prudent to control the mix of uses in order to provide an appropriate balance of uses to maintain the vitality and viability of the centre. This is also consistent with Core Policy 32 and DMP 12, in which any change of use application will be subject to criteria including, the impact on the function, viability, character and appearance of existing provision and the amenity of neighbouring uses.</p> <p>Any new proposals will have to meet the Local Plan's design standards and criteria, the Council's Urban Design Guide SPD, and Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards.</p>
827932	Julie Maberley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Retail Floorspace Capacity	Allocations should be made to meet the expected demand for Retail Floorspace.	The focus for future retail development and other town centre uses will continue to centre on the Primary and Secondary retail frontages, as defined in the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, and consistent with the plans settlement hierarchy (Core Policy 3). The Council are working proactively to ensure the District's retail floor-space capacity is being met, with several large developments being committed to development in Abingdon, Botley and Great Western Park. The Council will continue to support any new proposals in the District that meet the Local Plan's criteria as set out in Core Policy 32, DMP 12 and the Local Plan Part 1 and 2, read as a whole.
729147	Sainsbury's Supermarkets	Daniel Andrews	1096881	Supportive	Sainsbury's wish to express their support for the inclusion of their store at Limborough Road, Wantage, for proposed 'New Primary Shopping Frontage', as detailed in Appendix H	Noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					(Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages) of the Plan, Part 2.	

**Development Policy 14: Village and Local Shops (was Development Policy 13 in Preferred Options)**

<b>Consultee ID</b>	<b>Consultee and / or Organisation</b>	<b>Agent and Organisation</b>	<b>Agent ID</b>	<b>Comment Category</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1094957	Debby Fox			Lack of facilities	This comment highlights that facilities are closing in villages and existing facilities are struggling to meet the existing demand.	The Council work with other service providers such as Oxfordshire County Council and the CCG to ensure there is appropriate facilities to meet any new development within local communities.

**Development Policy 15: Retail Parks (was Development Policy 14 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730190  1096672	Councillor Debby Hallett  Mays Properties Ltd	  G R Planning Consultancy Ltd	  1096673	Bulky Goods	<p>This comment questions the definition of bulky goods. They also question if the policy can be limited to ancillary services which could be distributed on the retail park.</p> <p>Support the Policy in essence. However, Bulky Goods is not a supported reference in national policy terms or has been used by the Council in previous planning applications and/or decisions.</p> <p>For the Policy to work with CP32, there is a need to reference all retail parks outside existing centres.</p>	<p>Bulky Goods, as defined in the Planning Portal Glossary is: 'Goods of a large nature (for example DIY, furniture, carpets) that sometimes require large areas for storage or display.' A definition will be added to the plan glossary.</p> <p>The districts two main retail parks, Fairacres (Abingdon-on-Thame) and Seacourt Retail Park (Botley, Oxford), which have been specifically established to provide outlets for bulky goods distributors. Consequently, DMP 14 provides a robust planning framework to ensure any change of use application must conform to DMP 14, Core Policy 32 and the Local Plan, read as a whole, and therefore complies with the Local Plan's spatial strategy.</p>
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			Remove this Policy	<p>Remove this policy, because the policy leaves open the possibility of developers applying for change of uses at Botley retail park, which is not aligned to the imminent renewal of the park.</p>	<p>Applications brought forward at the Seacourt Retail Park will only be permitted if they comply with policies contained in the Local Plan. Development Policy 14, offers sufficient flexibility, while ensuring any change of use will not be detrimental to the existing uses and areas of Botley central area and Abingdon-on-Thames, before any development will be permitted.</p>

**Development Policy 16: Access (was Development Policy 15 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1051321	Mr Paul Walker, Strategic Development Manager Oxford Bus Company			Bus route requirements	This comment highlights that any new development should be bus friendly. It sets out some requirements in regards to the width of roads and what is needed at bus stops.	The Council are working Closely with Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant stake holders to ensure the most suitable bus routes are taken forward and catered for when planning for new development in accordance with Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility and Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking in the Part 1 Plan.
861678	Mr Guy Langton, East Hanney Parish Council			East to West Transport	The Parish Council highlight the lack of transport between the east and west of the county. The plan to build a new reservoir will also have consequences to the community and this will need to be considered.	Noted.
928815	Patrick Blake, Assistant Asset Manager Highways England			Highways England response	Highways England support for policy.	The Council has noted the support and will continue to work with the relevant stakeholders to ensure the best options are taken forward.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			Non-car access	Comment notes that policy fails to include requirement for access by foot, bicycle or public transport.	Core Policy 35 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 looks to promote public transport, cycling and walking. This policy looks to ensure that new developments provide safe and easy access to paths, cycle routes and public transport. The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council, developers and relevant stakeholders to ensure the most viable transport routes are provided.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull, East Hendred Parish Council			Objection to policy	Policy fails to provide a cycle map and policy on the design of safe pedestrian and cyclist facilities.	The Council considers that Development Policy 15: Access, adequately sets out additional detail to complement that provided by Core Policy 37 and the Local Plan, read as a whole. Additional information on Districts Cycle network can be found on the Council's adopted policies map.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett		Comment suggests high quality design requirement not relevant to access and also suggests policy needs to be amended to be more specific and less susceptible to subjectivity.			
756175	Mr Robin Draper			Policy wording amendment	Comments that suggest changes to the wording. This includes; state that occupation of development should not be allowed until (i) improvements to the site access have been completed and (ii) the off-site improvements to the highway infrastructure are fully secured. - state that the evidence should be provided to demonstrate conformity with the policy - In the first para delete "proposals for development will need to also demonstrate that:" Insert "proposals for development will need to also demonstrate with provision of a robust assessment that:" - Criterion i of this policy has words missing, as "causing safety" makes no sense. They suggest it's re-worded to say "causing a risk to highway safety".	The Council has made note of the proposed changes and has considered them in preparation for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
871494	Mr Noel Newson					
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishioners Against Damage to the Environment					

**Development Policy 17: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans (was Development Policy 16 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094394 875920 1094599	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council  Daniel Scharf  Mr James Proyer, Planner Persimmon Homes (Wessex)			Concern over effectiveness of transport assessments and travel plans	Comments raising concern about the effectiveness of transport assessments and travel plans.	Promoting sustainable modes of travel such as public transport, cycling and walking, is a key priority for both Vale of White Horse District Council and for Oxfordshire County Council. For this reason, transport assessments and travel plans should set out the transport issues relating to a proposed development, explain how a development will be managed post-occupation, with a package of measures and initiatives aimed at reducing the number of car journeys made to and from the site by providing a choice of modes of travel. A Transport Assessment will then be used by the Council to help us determine whether the impact of development is acceptable and supported by the necessary mitigation methods from the impact of development, where necessary.
1096242 1096204	Mr Marks  Mr Colin Thomas, Sunningwell Parishioners Against Damage to the Environment			Dalton Barracks	There are two comments that raise concern over the traffic implications if new dwellings would be built at Dalton Barracks. One would like clarification over Dalton Barracks being classed as a major development.	The Council considers the development of Dalton Barracks as a major development and as such, will be required to submit a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, as detailed Development Policy 16, before any development can commence. These will be developed in accordance with County Council guidance.  Further comments are made in relation to consultation responses relating to Dalton Barracks.
1094098	Mrs Reeves, Equalities Officer, Vale of White Horse District Council			Equalities	Strengthen policy to encourage travel plans that include requirements for people with disabilities.	This policy requires Travel Plans to be developed in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council and Planning Practice Guidance, which set out the requirement for developers to consider the needs of those whose mobility is impaired.
1051321	Mr Paul Walker, Strategic Development Manager, Oxford Bus Company			General support for policy	Support policy and are keen to work with all parties to ensure bus services for new developments.	Noted.
928815	Patrick Blake, Assistant Asset Manager Highways England			Highways England response	Support policy and where appropriate would like the scope of the transport assessment to be agreed with Highways England.	Noted.
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset, Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)			Objection - traffic survey	One respondent has raised a concern that developers may avoid peak times of day or year when carrying out traffic surveys.	All major developments will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment or Statement and Travel Plan in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council and Planning Practice Guidance.
1097593	Susan Halliwell, Director for Planning and Place, Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council response	There should be a requirement for a sustainable transport strategy to accompany the Transport Assessment or Design and Access Statement and reference should be made to compliance with the County's Walking and Cycling Design Guide (due for adoption in May 2017).	All major developments will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment or Statement and Travel Plan in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council and Planning Practice Guidance.
1094607	Mr David Churchouse			Suggestions for new/additional highway infrastructure	1. Reinstate Faringdon Road to original route, 2. New road from Marcham interchange to Honey bottom Lane/Fox Hill, 3. Blackcross/Barrow Rd to be used by villagers only.	Noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
874621 725573	Mrs Denise Fletcher Ms Barbara Morgan Network Rail			Wording	Comments that make reference to the changes in wording. Two comments would like the policy to make reference to Bridlepaths. One comment would like to request that transport assessments should quantify the impact on rail network, contributions to improvements are made where appropriate and commitment to consult Network Rail.	All major developments will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment or Statement and Travel Plan in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council and Planning Practice Guidance.  Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services sets out that all new development will be required to provide for the necessary on-site and, where appropriate, off-site infrastructure requirements arising from the proposal. Network Rail are consulted on those applications which are considered to have an impact on rail.

**Development Policy 18: Public Car Parking in Settlements (was Development Policy 17 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096843	Neil Hancox			Abingdon - parking and congestion	Comments relating to the need to ensure adequate parking in Abingdon town centre; adequate parking for new housing, specifically mentioning North Abingdon; and problems with congestion in the town centre.	All applications will be considered and determined alongside the Vale of White Horse Design Guide SPD, Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards and the Local Plan, read as a whole.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			Need for a policy on sustainable transport	Policy to provide cycle facilities, including parking. Provision of public transport also needs to be considered.	Local Plan 2031 Part 1 includes Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility, which seeks to support key improvements to the transport network and promote sustainable transport and accessibility.
1097593	Susan Halliwell, Director for Planning and Place, Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council response	Oxfordshire County Council suggest that definition of suitable and sufficient includes the provision of segregated pedestrian walkways within car parks and guidance to ensure that where possible car parking and ancillary access and egress routes do not obstruct pedestrian desire lines and minimise danger to cyclists arising from reduced visibility and the opening of vehicle doors. The provision of segregated pedestrian walkways in car parks is a legal requirement under Regulation 17 of the Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1992 and the remainder are supported by NPPF paragraphs 35, 69 and 75.	The Council has considered Oxfordshire County Council's comment in refining the supporting text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
827932	Julie Maberley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Safeguard land for parking	Land should be safeguarded for parking in town centres and on the edge of market towns.	The Council considers that the safeguarding of land should only be used to safeguard the necessary infrastructure requirements to support the growth of the Local Plan, as to ensure that any future proposed development does not prejudice the future delivery of these sites, as required by national policy. The Council does not consider it prudent to safeguard land for parking in the Markets Towns as this could affect the town's future development potential and the economic viability and vitality.
827932	Julie Maberley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Support for policy and suggested additional wording	Support for policy and suggestion that any change of use in town centres which is likely to encourage more cars should be required to contribute to the improvement of parking provision.	Noted. All applications will be considered and determined alongside the Vale of White Horse Design Guide SPD, Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards and the Local Plan, read as a whole.
873403	Ms Flora Nuttgens			Town centre parking - existing properties	Parking should be available to purchase or rent, to existing residents of town centre properties which do not currently have nearby parking.	All applications will be considered and determined alongside the Vale of White Horse Design Guide SPD, Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards and the Local Plan, read as a whole.
872775	Strain			Town centre parking - new development	Development within or near town centres should address the need for additional parking spaces.	All applications will be considered and determined alongside the Vale of White Horse Design Guide SPD, Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards and the Local Plan, read as a whole. All applications will also be required to provide robust evidence in relation to parking as part of their Transport Assessment.
1094098	Mrs Cheryl Reeves, Equalities Officer, Vale of White Horse District Council			Wording to strengthen policy	Strengthen policy to include reference to disabled parking provision.	Proposals for improving or replacing the quality of town centre parking provisions will be supported where the proposals complement Core Policy 32 in the Part 1 Plan, the Council's Design Guide SPD and Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards, which highlights the necessary provision for disabled parking.

**Development Policy 19: Lorries and Roadside Services (was Development Policy 18 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096672 1057747 756175 871494 1096204	Mays Properties Ltd Minscombe Properties Ltd  Mr Robin Draper  Mr Noel Newson  Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment			Amendment to policy wording	Five comments make recommendations to change the wording within this policy. These include: - consider inputting wording to include a wider range of services at Milton Interchange site. - consider including a policy to promote the option of alternative uses within the allocated roadside services site at Milton Interchange and other sites. - Clarity is needed as it currently indicates that lorry resting areas are envisaged at Milton Interchange - Adding a criteria to the policy to state that locations within the Green Belt will only be considered when all possible sites have been eliminated/proposals will recognise the test set out in para 90 of the NPPF.	The Council has considered the comment in updating the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England			Highways England response	Highways England is keen to continue working collaboratively with the VoWHDC with regard to lorries and roadside services.	The Council has noted this comment and will continue to work with key stakeholders, including Highways England in planning for lorry and roadside services
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill Chairman Oxford Green Belt Network Oxford Green Belt Network			Oppose lorry park at Lodge Hill	Opposition to Lorry Park at Lodge Hill due to its location within the Green Belt and possible pressure to develop in and around Sunningwell.	Development Policy 18 does not mention Lodge Hill as a potential site for lorry and roadside services. The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders to determine the most appropriate locations for lorry and roadside services
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council response	Policy does not identify suitable areas for lorries to park and it is suggested that this draft Policy be reviewed. The Milton Services site does not provide for Lorry Parking.	The policy has been updated to improve clarity.

**Development Policy 20: Public Art (was Development Policy 20 in Preferred Options)**

<b>Consultee ID</b>	<b>Consultee and / or Organisation</b>	<b>Agent and Organisation</b>	<b>Agent ID</b>	<b>Comment Category</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1094599	Mr James Proyer, Planner Persimmon Homes (Wessex)			Type of Art	This comment states that the policy should not enforce developers to contribute to sites larger than 0.5 hectares.	This policy will replace the saved policy from Local Plan 2011, which also states that public art should be required on sites larger than 0.5 hectares. The Council notes that there are other ways to contribute positively to the making of a place, but public art encourages public enjoyment and engagement, promote the renewal of social skills and support the local economy. The Design Guide SPD also provides further detail on public art.
1022209	Bloor Homes South West	Mrs Helen Tilton	1022208	Type of Art and Contributions	This comments states that developers should not be restricted as to the type of art they can produce and that existing and emerging policies do not duplicate the requirement for contributions.	
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195	Design Guide SPD	This consultee would like to ensure that this policy is closely linked to the principles within the Design Guide SPD.	

**Development Policy 21: External Lighting (was Development Policy 20 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096204  1097646	Mr Colin Thomas, Sunningwell Parishioners Against Damage to the Environment  Ian Hepburn, Planning Advisor, North Wessex Downs AONB			Policy criteria	A few comments suggested the need to include additional criteria in the policy.  North Wessex Downs AONB would like to see specific reference made to maintaining and enhancing dark night skies within the AONB and its setting.  Sunningwell Parishioners Against Damage to the Environment (SPADE) seeks to retain the criteria in Saved Policy DC20 of the Local Plan 2011, in particular criteria ii) and for the Council to take remedial measures if Development Policy 20, Core Policy 37 and principles in the Design Guide SPD are not met.	Noted.
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon, Planning Specialist, Environment Agency			Support for Development Policy 20	Environment Agency support Development Policy 20 and supporting text.	The Council acknowledge Environment Agency's support for this policy.
1097646	Ian Hepburn, Planning Advisor, North Wessex Downs AONB			External Lighting	Incorporate with DMP20: External Lighting.	In deciding on planning applications, including leisure and sport facilities, the Council will consider both Development Policy 20: External Lighting and Development Policy 33: Leisure and Sports Facilities and the Local Plan 2031, read as a whole.

**Development Policy 22: Advertisements (was Development Policy 21 in Preferred Options)**

<b>Consultee ID</b>	<b>Consultee and / or Organisation</b>	<b>Agent and Organisation</b>	<b>Agent ID</b>	<b>Comment Category</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1094098	Mrs Cheryl Reeves, Equalities Officer, Vale of White Horse District Council			Policy criteria - Equality	Equality Officer suggests adding further detail in policy criteria to take into account visual impairments.	The Council consider the policy provides sufficient flexibility and has been informed by Equalities Impact Assessment.
929661	Mr Martin Small, Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Support for Development Policy 21	Historic England supports Development Policy 21, in particular criteria iv.	The Council acknowledge Historic England's support for this policy.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Visual impact of advertisements in Botley	One comment related to the application of this policy for instances where there is a visual impact from advertisements on lorries, with a particular focus at Botley.	Advertisements on vehicles do not require planning permission provided that the primary purpose of the vehicle is as a vehicle.

**Development Policy 23: Impact of Development on Amenity (was Development Policy 22 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094599	Mr James Proyer, Planner Persimmon Homes (Wessex)			Justification for the Policy	Is the Policy necessary because there a number of Policies throughout the Plan that offer the same level, or even more, level of protection on the listed amenities as contained within the Policy.	The Council considers Development Policy 22: Impact of Development on Amenity is consistent with national policy and is important to ensure any future applications will not cause un-due harm to the amenities of neighbouring and/or nearby properties.
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			Loss of amenity through on-street parking.	The Policy does not protect the neighbouring and/or nearby properties from a loss of views from on-street parking.	The Council only take into account material planning consideration when deciding on planning applications. The loss of view is not a material planning consideration when deciding on planning applications All applications will be considered and determined alongside the, Local Plan 2031, Vale of White Horse Design Guide SPD and Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards.
872775	Strain			Loss of views	Outlook should be included in point i. of the policy.	The Council can only take into account material planning considerations when deciding on planning applications. Outlook or the loss of views is not a material planning consideration when deciding on planning applications
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			More stringent wording to the Policy	The Policy wording is unclear and should expressly detail how much harm is considered acceptable.	In line with National Policy, the Council will consider each application on the merits and constraints of the proposal. The policy should allow sufficient flexibility in order to determine development proposals of a varied nature.
929685 1096906 1097646	Dr Peter J Collins, CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)  Mr Clark Gordon, Planning Specialist Environment Agency  Ian Hepburn, Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB			Support	Comments in support of the Policy All requirements as detailed in DMP22, should be considered at the application stage and followed up after development. The limitations for soundproofing in terms of industrial plan use, should be noted at the application stage.	Noted. Development Policy 22, will ensure all applications consider the impact of development on amenity. The Council's building control and enforcement teams will ensure all design conditions and standards are adhered to, during and after completion.
1022242	Dr David Illingworth, North Abingdon Local Plan Group			Support of the Policy in relation to the North Abingdon development site.	Support for (in relation to the North Abingdon development site), Development Policies: 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 32 and 33.	Support noted and welcomed.

**Development Policy 24: Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments (was Development Policy 23 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094599	Mr James Proyer, Planner, Persimmon Homes (Wessex)			Justification for the Policy	Is the Policy necessary because there a number of Policies throughout Plan that offer the same level, or even more, level of protection on the listed amenities as contained within the Policy.	The Council considers Development Policy 23: The Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments, is important to ensure any future applications will not cause un- due harm to the amenities of neighbouring and/or nearby properties.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Support	Comments express support for development policy 23.	Support noted and welcomed.
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon, Planning Specialist, Environment Agency					
1022242	Dr David Illingworth, North Abingdon Local Plan Group					

**Development Policy 25: Noise Pollution (was Development Policy 24 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094394	Claire Arnold Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			Impacts of noise on wider environment	A number of comments relate to the effects that noise pollution can have off-site on the wider environment and the tranquillity of rural areas.	Development Policy 24 ensures that where proposals are likely to create additional noise that would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring uses, the environment and biodiversity, they are appropriately mitigated. Furthermore, Core Policy 44: Landscape in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 seeks to ensure the Vale's landscape will be protected from harmful development and where possible enhanced including features that contribute towards the tranquillity and need to protect against intrusion from light pollution, noise and motion.
1022209	Bloor Homes South West			National and local standards	The policy should refer to example standards and ensure that the policy is flexible to take into account future changes to standards.	Development Policy 24 includes a footnote reference to the adopted British Standards.
730190 730190	Councillor Debby Hallett Councillor Debby Hallett			Application of Development Policy 24	One respondent raised concerns regarding the application of the Noise policy. Concerns included noise levels in gardens and amenity areas due to proximity to roads, and a request for a specific measurable tolerance limit on noise to dwellings. Comment related to the application of the policy for instances where development is located near the A34.	The policy ensures that noise-sensitive uses are located and designed in such a way that they are protected from existing sources of environmental noise, and the policy contains a footnote which refers to the current British Standards. The Council is currently developing guidance relating to setting standards for noise mitigation.
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment			Direction of Development Policy 24 - Road noise	Policy should make it clear that noise generating development also includes noise from roads, for example the A34.	Noted. The supporting text to Development Policy 24 makes it clear that road traffic is a particular source associated with noise and vibration.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			CPRE response - Impacts of noise on wider environment	A number of comments relate to the effects that noise pollution can have off-site on the wider environment and the tranquillity of rural areas.	The Council acknowledge CPRE's support for Development Policy 24 and Development Policy 22.
1096906 1097646 1022242	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency  Ian Hepburn Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB  Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group			Support for Development Policy 24	Environment Agency, North Wessex Downs AONB Unit and The North Abingdon Local Plan Group support Development Policy 24 and supporting text.  However, North Wessex Downs AONB Unit would like to see specific reference to maintaining and enhancing the tranquillity of the AONB.	The Council acknowledge the Environment Agency's, North Wessex Downs AONB and North Abingdon Local Plan Group's support for Development Policy 24.  The Council has considered this comment in refining the accompanying text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

**Development Policy 26: Air Quality (was Development Policy 25 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Air Quality: Proof reading	One respondent has noted some proofreading errors.	Noted. The Council has considered adding a footnote reference to the Council's Air Quality Action Plan and the emerging Air Quality Developers Guidance in the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan
1022242	Dr David Illingworth, North Abingdon Local Plan Group			Amendment - Air Quality: North Abingdon Site allocations	North Abingdon Local Plan Group are concerned that North Abingdon Site Allocations will increase traffic through Abingdon AQMA and Abingdon Bridge. Avoid development that creates close, canyon like structures around busy roads that will prevent pollution from dispersing. New development should show that traffic generated would not add to air pollution.	Noted. Development Policy 25: Air Quality ensures that development proposals of a large scale or likely to significantly impact on air quality, including where located in or near an AQMA will require an Air Quality Assessment to be undertaken in line with best practice and guidance. Applicants will be required to take into account the Council's emerging Air Quality Developers Guidance.
1094394 1097544 873089	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council Rachel Roberts, Air Quality Officer Vale of White Horse District Council Environmental Protection Team Dr Andrew Turner			Amendment - Air Quality: Developers Guidance	Respondents suggested amendments to the Air Quality policy: 1) The Air Quality officer recommends referring to the emerging Air Quality Developers Guide 2) North Abingdon Local Plan Group suggests that the policy prevents closely built canyon like developments which prevent the dispersion of pollutants over busy roads. 3) Watchfield Parish Council suggests that the impact of existing Air Quality on proposed development be considered and that developers monitor air quality data over a 24 hour period.	Noted. Development Policy 25: Air Quality ensures that development proposals of a large scale or likely to significantly impact on air quality, including where located in or near an AQMA will require an Air Quality Assessment to be undertaken in line with best practice and guidance. Applicants will be required to take into account the Council's emerging Air Quality Developers Guidance.
1096275 737198	Ms Powell Mr David Walton	Mr David Walton	724845	Objection - Air Quality: policy ineffective	Respondents have objected to the Air Quality policy on the grounds that it is ineffective and should be more strongly worded to remedy the issue of air pollution.	Objections noted.
1097646 1096204	Ian Hepburn, Planning Advisor, North Wessex Downs AONB Mr Colin Thomas, Sunningwell Parishioners Against Damage to the Environment			Support for Air Quality Policy	North Wessex Downs AONB and SPADE welcome Development Policy 25. However, SPADE would like a clearer definition of 'near' in relation to development proposals.	The Council acknowledges and welcomes the support and has considered the proposed amendment in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan, Senior Planning Policy Officer, South Oxfordshire District Council			Support for Air Quality Policy	Support for Air Quality Policy.	The Council acknowledges and welcomes the support.

**Development Policy 27: Land Affected by Contamination (was Development Policy 26 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
756175	Mr Robin Draper			Wording of Development Policy 26	<p>Policy should be strengthened to ensure that development does not occur in areas that are subject to pollution.</p> <p>Paragraph should be added to the policy to ensure housing and other development is kept apart from areas that are sensitive to pollution where they cannot reasonably co-exist.</p> <p>In particular, any development adjacent to, or on historic landfill cells will be rejected unless the Council can be totally assured that the pollution risks can be 100% mitigated.</p>	<p>Noted. Development Policy 22: Impact of Development on Amenity ensures that development proposals take into account factors including pollution when considering cumulative and individual impacts on the amenity of neighbouring uses.</p> <p>The design of new development should minimise any impacts for the short and long-term.</p>
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon, Planning Specialist, Environment Agency			Support for Development Policy 26	Environment Agency support Development Policy 26 and its accompanying text.	The Council acknowledge the Environment Agency's support for this policy and accompanying text.

**Development Policy 28: Waste Collection and Recycling (was Development Policy 27 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council			On-site refuse container storage facilities	On-site refuse container storage facilities should be located away from the front of properties to reduce impact on the visual amenity.  Road widths to accommodate refuse vehicles should also consider the on-road parking of residents' vehicles.	The Council acknowledge these points made by Watchfield Parish Council.  Criteria iii in Development Policy 27 ensures that recycling and refuse provision appropriately designed and located, whilst considering the impacts of the provision on visual amenity.  This policy also ensure that all development proposals are consistent with the Council's Waste Planning Guidance.  This guidance sets considerations to be taken into account when making a planning application, including access for waste collection vehicles.
1097593	Susan Halliwell, Director for Planning and Place, Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council support for Development Policy 27	Oxfordshire County Council support Development Policy 27, however, consideration should be given to making a statement in the policy to encourage higher recycling and home composting with the associated environmental and financial benefits through avoided processing and treatment.	Noted. The Council consider that Oxfordshire County Council's suggestions help to improve the effectiveness of the policy and to recognise the financial and environmental benefits associated with recycling and home composting.
1097593	Susan Halliwell, Director for Planning and Place, Oxfordshire County Council			Support for Development Policy 27	Support for Development Policy 27	The Council acknowledge Oxfordshire County Council's support for this policy.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Sustainable Waste Management Initiatives	Paragraph 3.203 should list examples of other sustainable waste management initiatives.	Noted.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Wording of Development Policy 27	Penultimate paragraph of Development Policy 27 might be better as a bullet point or numbered item.	Noted.

**Development Policy 29: Settlement Character and Gaps (was Development Policy 28 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			CPRE Countryside/lands cape	The saved Local Plan 2011 policies form an essential clarification of Local Plan 2031: Part 1 and should be retained in Local Plan 2031: Part 2.	The Council consider that Core Policy 44: Landscape in the Part 1 Plan, Development Policy 28: Settlement Character and Gaps in the Part 2 Plan and the Landscape Character Assessment provide sufficient level of detail when deciding on planning applications.
1094394	Arnold Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			Cumulative impact	Comments were received on the cumulative impact of development on narrowing of settlement gaps over time. The comments were supportive of this type of policy but want some provision to be made in the policy to prohibit the sequential narrowing of the gap through incremental development.	In applying Development Policy 28, the Council will take into account Core Policy 44: Landscape in the Part 1 Plan and the Landscape Character Assessment. The Council will take into account the individual effects of the proposal and the cumulative effects of existing and other proposed development when assessing development proposals.
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group					
728489	Mr David Marsh Chairman Harwell Parish Council					
1097830	Graham Ritchie Planning Manager David Wilson Homes Southern			Evidence base justification	Comments were received on the relationship between the evidence base and providing a blanket policy for the whole of the district. Justification for the policy was requested and for landscape areas to be judged.	A Landscape Character Assessment is produced that supports Core Policy 44: Landscape in the Part 1 Plan and Development Policy 28 in the Part 2 Plan The policy in the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan has been refined to take into account recommendations from the Landscape Character Assessment.
902666	University of Oxford, Mr Mark Owen					
1096937	IM Land, Mrs Rebecca Horrocks					
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			More restrictive	Comments were received suggesting that the policy should be strengthened. All three comments suggested using the Local Plan 2011 saved policies as a basis for the proposed policy. It was also suggested that the policy should include no build zones and that gaps are shown on a proposals map.	The Council recognises the importance of safeguarding the separate identity and characteristics of individual settlements and the important role played by the countryside. The saved policy was prepared under a previous planning system, which has subsequently been updated by the NPPF. The policy has been updated to reflect national policy and guidance and evidence contained within the Landscape Character Assessment.
756175	Mr Robin Draper					
756168	Mrs Jane Woolley					
960396	Cumnor Parish Council Parish Councillor Cumnor Parish Council			Support	Comments were received from Sutton Courtenay Parish Council, SPADE, North Wessex Downs AONB, Cumnor Parish Council and CPRE in support of Development Policy 28.	Support noted and welcomed.
1097646	Ian Hepburn Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB					
1095813	Mrs Linda Martin Sutton Courtenay					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
872775 1096204	Parish Council  Strain  Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment					
760211 1094599 1097446	Dr Andrew Pritchard  Mr James Proyer Planner Persimmon Homes (Wessex)  Kier Group Limited, Mr Robson			Too restrictive	Comments were received that stated the policy is too restrictive and could prevent sustainable and suitable sites coming forward and is therefore inconsistent with the NPPF and NPPG. A comment stated that this may restrict clustering of settlements that could make delivery of services viable and another explained that the policy could restrict all development on the edge of every settlement.	The Council considers that the policy is drafted in accordance with the NPPF and NPPG. The Council recognises the need to promote thriving villages and rural communities, whilst also recognising the importance of safeguarding the separate identity and characteristics of individual settlements. Local Plan Part 1 supports the need to promote thriving villages and rural communities, whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character. The Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment that supports Core Policy 44: Landscape in the Part 1 Plan and Development Policy 28 in the Part 2 Plan.
1094583	Dr Youngman			Village specific comment	Wishes to see no less than 1km between Marcham and Abingdon.	Commented noted. The policy seeks to ensure that proposals do not compromise important gaps between settlements. In applying this policy, the Council will take into account Core Policy 44: Landscape in the Part 1 Plan and the Landscape Character Assessment.
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Policy Wording	The Policy should be amended to include a reference to the loss of physical or visual separation between settlements. The details in the Saved Policy N10 should be maintained.	Noted. The Council has considered the comment in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

**Development Policy 30: Watercourses (was Development Policy 29 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
756521	Ms Sally Wallington, Letcombe Brook Project			Letcombe Brooke Project Watercourses: suggested amendments to policy	The Letcombe Brook Project proposes that the Watercourses policy be amended so that no footpaths are allowed within the buffer zone. The Letcombe Brook Project suggests that the policy be amended so that developers must include long term landscape and ecological management plans for the buffer zone.	The Council notes this suggestion and has considered it in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1097646	Ian Hepburn, Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB			North Wessex Downs AONB support for Watercourses policy	North Wessex Downs AONB welcomes the Watercourses policy and suggests that the policy is amended to add a specific reference to the particular importance of chalk stream habitats, their status as a special quality of the AONB, and the need to ensure that the watercourses, their surroundings and groundwater origins are safeguarded effectively.	The Council acknowledges the recommendations made by the North Wessex Downs AONB and has considered them in refining the policy and accompanying text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
827932	Julie Maberley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Wantage and Grove Campaign Group support for Watercourses policy	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group supports the Watercourses policy and suggests an amendment to clarify meaning of 'significant section'.	Noted. The Council has considered this comment in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			Watercourses: The Environment Agency suggested amendments to policy	The Environment Agency has suggested a number of amendments to the Watercourses policy.	The Council acknowledges the recommendations made by the Environment Agency and has considered them in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
872775	Strain			Watercourses: suggested amendments to policy	One respondent suggests removing "or the detrimental impact can be appropriately mitigated" from the policy.	The Council notes the respondent's concern, however the proposed amendment would be inconsistent with national policy and guidance.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Wording clarification	One respondent asked for clarification on the meaning of 'blue spaces'.	Blue Spaces are where green infrastructure includes areas of water such as ponds or watercourses. The Council notes the comment and has considered the this in refining the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the accompanying text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1022242 960396 872775 1100197	Dr David Illingworth, North Abingdon Local Plan Group Cumnor Parish Council Strain Mr Peter Canavan, Senior Planning Policy Officer, South Oxfordshire District Council			Support for Watercourses policy	A number of respondents support the Watercourses policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
1097830	Graham Ritchie, Planning Manager, David Wilson Homes Southern			Objection to Watercourses policy	1 respondent objected to the policy on the grounds that the 10m buffer zone is too wide and would restrict development, and this has not been assessed in the Viability Study.	The Council notes this objection and has considered this for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
756521	Ms Sally Wallington, Letcombe Brook Project			Objection to wording	The Letcombe Brook Project objected to the wording of 'around 200' to refer to 224 chalk streams.	The Council notes this concern, and has considered this in refining the supporting text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

**Development Policy 31: Protection of Public Rights of Way, National Trails and Open Access Areas (was Development Policy 30 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094098	Mrs Cheryl Reeves, Equalities Officer Vale of White Horse District Council			Access for all	The Council should improve access for those with disabilities.	The Council consider the policy provides sufficient flexibility and has been informed by Equalities Impact Assessment.
1022209	Bloor Homes South West	Mrs Helen Tilton	1022208	Alternative Access routes	The comment highlights an issue with clarity over the wording of the policy.	The Council has noted this point and has considered it when refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins, CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			Duty to Cooperate	Offer to continually work with the Council to enhance and develop new networks.	Noted.
727300	Ms Troth Wells, The British Horse Society			Equestrian Use	The British Horse Society requests that the policy should take the opportunity to improve links between footpaths and to ensure that public rights of way have surfaces which are appropriate for horses.	Noted. The Council consider that this level of detail is sufficiently covered in the supporting text of the Part 2 Plan.
1097593	Susan Halliwell, Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Health and Wellbeing	This comments recommends that the health and wellbeing benefits are added to the supporting text.	Noted. The Council has considered this comment when refining the supporting text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Open Access Areas	The comments requests clarity as to what text refers to Open Access Areas.	Noted. The Council agree that this will provide useful clarity and has considered this in updating the supporting text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
960396	Cumnor Parish Council			Supporting the policy	There are two comments that support the policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
1022242	Dr David Illingworth, North Abingdon Local Plan Group					
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council			Transport and Access	Comments highlight the importance of different transport actions including cycle paths and bridleways.	The Council recognise the importance of access to National trails and Open Access areas. Oxfordshire County Council published the Oxfordshire Rights of Way Management Plan 2015-2025 which covers cycle paths and bridleways to National trails and open areas
1094602	Mr Dave Cavanagh, Chair Oxfordshire Ramblers					
874621	Mrs Denise Fletcher					
1097646	Ian Hepburn, Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB					
727300	Ms Troth Wells, The British Horse Society					

**Development Policy 32: The Wilts and Berks Canal (was Development Policy 31 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096984	Mr Graham Banks			Alignment of Wilts and Berks Canal	The historic line of the canal and any deviations necessary to allow continuity should be safeguarded.	The Council notes the issue raised. Development Policy 31 ensures that where the canal is affected by development, the alignment is protected or an alternative alignment is provided.
1012318	Mrs Jane Hennell Area Planner Canal and River Trust			Canal and River Trust support for Development Policy 31	Canal and River Trust support Development Policy 31, but would like to see a requirement in the policy to ensure that new development contributes to the restoration of the canal either via the S106 mechanism or Community Infrastructure Levy funding where such a contribution would meet the legal tests set out in Regulations 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).	The Council acknowledges and welcomes this support, and has considered the proposed amendment when refining this policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1095927	Mr Andrew Lockley			Contributions towards Wilts and Berks Canal	General support for Development Policy 31 in creating opportunities for amenity value, leisure and recreation. Paragraph 3.255 should include the need for developers of housing adjoining the canal to be obliged, or at least encouraged to contribute towards the restoration of the Wilts and Berks Canal either by restoring the relevant section to a navigable condition as part of the development, or through section 106.	The Council acknowledges and welcomes this support, and has considered the proposed amendment when refining this policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins, CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			CPRE support for Development Policy 31	CPRE support the inclusion of Development Policy 31 in Local Plan 2031 Part 2.	Support is noted and welcomed.
727300	Ms Troth Wells, The British Horse Society			Equestrian access	The British Horse Society question the need for the policy to recognise the use of the towpath for equestrian access.	Noted. Development Policy 31 supports proposals that are designed to develop the canal's recreational and nature conservation potential. The requirement for equestrian access is sufficiently covered by this part of the policy.
1096984 1095904 1095323 892555 1094626	Mr Graham Banks Mrs Lynn Coulson Mr Stuart Fisher Mrs Su Lockley Mr Brian Roberts			Support for Development Policy 31	General support for Development Policy 31 in recognition of the opportunities the Wilts & Berks Canal can contribute towards heritage, biodiversity and recreation.	Support acknowledged and welcomed
1096173	Brian Stovold, Chairman: East Vale Branch & Trustee Wilts & Berks Canal Trust			Wilts & Berks Canal Trust support and detailed comments for Development Policy 31	Wilts & Berks Canal Trust support the inclusion of Development Policy 31 in Local Plan 2031 Part 2. Wiltshire, Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership would like to see recognition of the creation of the new Jubilee Junction at Abingdon. The majority of the restoration will be on the historic route for the Wilts & Berks Canal.  In order to provide a contiguous route for the canal restoration, there is a major exception from the historic line to the south of Abingdon.  Minor deviations are planned at the Bourton Road junction with the A420 at Shrivenham and adjacent to Mably Way, Downsview Road, Denchworth area in Grove.	The support and detailed comments are noted and the proposed amendment have been considered in refining the policy and supporting text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					Other practical alternatives will be considered in consultation with the landowners where local conditions make the use of the historic line unacceptable or impracticable.	
872112	Mr Ken Oliver, Project Officer, Wiltshire Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership			Wiltshire, Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership support for Development Policy 31	Wiltshire, Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership would like to see recognition of the creation of the new Jubilee Junction at Abingdon.	Noted. The Council has considered the comments in refining the supporting text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
872112	Mr Ken Oliver, Project Officer, Wiltshire Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership			Wiltshire, Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership support for Development Policy 31	<p>Wiltshire, Swindon &amp; Oxfordshire Canal Partnership would like to see recognition of the creation of the new Jubilee Junction at Abingdon. The majority of the restoration will be on the historic route for the Wilts &amp; Berks Canal.</p> <p>In order to provide a contiguous route for the canal restoration, there is a major exception from the historic line to the south of Abingdon.</p> <p>Minor deviations are planned at the Bourton Road junction with the A420 at Shrivenham and adjacent to Mably Way, Downsvie Road, Denchworth area in Grove.</p> <p>Other practical alternatives will be considered in consultation with the landowners where local conditions make the use of the historic line unacceptable or impracticable.</p>	Noted. The Council has considered the comments refining the policy and supporting text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

**Development Policy 33: Open Space (was Development Policy 32 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Application of Development Policy 32	Comment questioned the dimensions for applying the 15% and whether it will apply to high-rise developments. A further comment questioned whether major applications currently provide space for allotments.	The 15% as stated in Appendix F applies only to the residential area and the provision of public open space such as parks and gardens and amenity green space. The approach has been successful in securing open space for new major development proposals under the existing Saved Policy of the Local Plan 2011.
756175	Mr Robin Draper			Application of Development Policy 32 - Children's Play and Youth Provision	Comment raised concerns for the need to strengthen the provision of children's play areas associated with new development proposals.	Noted. The Council has undertaken an Open Spaces Report in accordance with current best practice and national guidance including the Field in Trust national standards. The Council considers that its approach to the provision of children's play is consistent with national policy and the recommendations set out in the Open Spaces Report. In accordance with Development Policy 32, developers will be required to provide or contribute towards open space, including Children's Play and Youth Provision in line with the Open Space Standards.
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council			Application of Development Policy 32 - SuDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should not be included in the provision of public open space. Open space provision should be accessible to existing residents.	Noted. The Council will apply the criteria set out in the Open Spaces Report (2016) for providing public open space based on best practice. The Report recommends that public open space should not primarily be a playing field, sustainable urban drainage site, roadside verge or landscaping as part of a development. Development Policy 32 ensures that the provision of open space is accessible in line with national standards including Green Flag and Fields in Trust. The Green Flag standards ensure good and safe access to open space, including the need to consider physical routes into, out of and around the site and how these affect the visitors to and residents of the site or its immediate environs.
960396	Cumnor Parish Council Parish Councillor			Cumnor Parish Council support for Development Policy 32	Cumnor Parish Council support for Development Policy 32.	The Council acknowledge Cumnor Parish Council's support for this policy.
827932	Julie Maberley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Deficits in provision - Wantage	No enhancements are made in the policies related to open space provision that address the need to reduce or eliminate the deficit of open spaces in Wantage. This is despite the evidence suggesting that Wantage does not meet the FIT standard for open space and has no access to LEAP provision.	The Council has noted the detailed comments. Development Policy 32 addresses the provision of open space on major development sites by setting out criteria, and addresses the loss of open space in accordance with a different criteria. Proposals may include more open space than the evidence base suggest, however, this cannot be a requirement.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			Definition of useable open space	Policy should provide guidance on the design and quality of public open space and consider accessibility standards for cyclists.	The term public open space is clearly defined in paragraph 3.264 and in Appendix F. Appendix F of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 sets out quantity, quality and accessibility standards for open space. The provision of open space must reflect a quality that is in line with national standards, including Fields in Trust and Green Flag criteria. Further detail is set out in the Open Spaces Report (2016).

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
902666 1094599 1022209	University of Oxford Mr James Proyer, Planner Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Bloor Homes South West	Mr Mark Owen Mrs Helen Tilton	1097195 1022208	Flexibility for local standards	Local Plan 2031 Part 2 approach to open space is too prescriptive. Open space standards should allow for a flexible response to individual characteristics of each site and development proposal.	Noted. The Council has undertaken an Open Spaces Report in line with current best practice and relevant national guidance, including the Fields in Trust standards. Development Policy 32 ensures that major proposals provide or contribute, towards open space provision allowing flexibility for individual circumstances.
861678	Mr Guy Langton, East Hanney Parish Council			Maintenance of open space	East Hanney Parish Council would like to take ownership and maintenance of common areas/open spaces.	Comment noted.
1096948	Haidrun Breith, Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			Natural and informal open spaces	Development Policy 32 primarily focuses on the quantity of formal open space with little consideration for natural and informal open spaces. Such spaces offer an opportunity to deliver ecological gains through design and management. The policy should offer an opportunity to maximise biodiversity within developments.	Noted. Development Policy 32: Open Space ensures major residential developments provide or contribute towards open space in accordance with the standards. The policy requires 15% of the residential area to be provided as public open space, incorporating a combined standard for parks and gardens and amenity green space. Amenity green space is recognised as informal recreational spaces in and around housing developments and village greens that seek to improve and/or enhance the appearance of the local environment.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins, CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			New Development Policy - creation of new accessible natural green space sites within towns	The policy should be enhanced or a new policy introduced to support the creation of new accessible natural green space sites within towns to address deficits in provision.	Noted. Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures a net-gain in Green Infrastructure is sought through on-site provision or off-site contributions. Proposals for new development will need to provide adequate Green Infrastructure (GI) in line with the South and Vale GI Strategy. Core Policy 45 ensures that proposals for major development are accompanied with a statement to demonstrate how they have taken into account the relationship of existing GI assets and how this will be retained and enhanced.
1022242	Dr David Illingworth, North Abingdon Local Plan Group			North Abingdon Local Plan Group support for Development Policy 32	North Abingdon Local Plan Group support for Development Policy 32	The Council acknowledge North Abingdon Local Plan Group's support for this policy.
727300	Ms Troth Wells. The British Horse Society			Open Space - Accessibility	Development Policy 32 should recognise the need to provide safe, attractive, convenient open space that is accessible for all users including equestrians.	Noted. Development Policy 32 ensures that the provision of open space, including public open space and children's play and youth provision in accordance with national standards including Fields in Trust standard and Green Flag Award. These national standards take into account equal access to open space for all users.
1103287	Vale Disability Access Group			Open space requirements	Comment recommends that open spaces in new developments have good lighting, good access for wheelchairs and adequate seating. The comment also requires that children's play areas be secure.	The policy requires that open spaces are included as part of residential development. During the detailed master planning of major development sites the location of that open space will be considered.
827932	Julie Maberley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove			Open Spaces - Wantage	Comment raised concerns that the draft Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Open Spaces Report should be consistent in	Noted. The Council has considered this comment when finalising the Green Infrastructure Strategy and Open Spaces

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Campaign Group				their audit of open spaces in Wantage	Report to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1097593	Susan Halliwell, Director for Planning and Place, Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Health and Well-being	Oxfordshire County Council would like to see reference made in paragraph 3.264 to the benefits of open space in improving health and well-being and increasing opportunities for social interaction.	Noted. The Council agree that the inclusion of 'health and well-being' and 'increasing opportunities for social interaction' in paragraph 3.264 would provide further consistency with national policy.  This amendment would also align with the Council's Strategic Objectives set out in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. In particular, SO 4 and SO 11 by ensuring high quality design standards to improve the health and well-being of Vale residents and to reduce social exclusion.
728489	Mr David Marsh, Chairman, Harwell Parish Council			Policy wording	The policy should state that 15% of the proposed residential area should be provided as open space, as is stated in Appendix F.	The Council consider that a reference to the Open Space Standards and Leisure and Sports Facilities Standards set out in Appendix F is sufficient.  The Plan should be read as a whole and therefore Development Policy 32 and Appendix F will apply to all major residential proposals.
1097495	Vicky Aston, Sport England			Sport England - Policy wording	Sport England would like to see the wording in Development Policy 32 more closely aligned with the wording in paragraph 94 of the NPPF. Currently bullet 3 could result in playing fields being lost to other community uses and not sport or recreation.	The Council acknowledges Sport England's comment on the policy, in particular bullet 3.  The Council agree that the suggested amendment by Sport England would be more consistent with national policy and guidance and has considered this in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan
1097495	Vicky Aston, Sport England			Sport England comments - Local standards and CIL Regulation	Sport England welcomes the intention to ensure that major residential developments provide or contribute towards open space. However, they raise the following key issues:  Sport England has concerns regarding the use of standards.  The use of quantitative standards may no longer be accepted as it would not meet the tests set out in CIL Regulation 122.  Pooling restrictions would limit the scope in the future, to generic infrastructure types.  Pooling restriction can be addressed by identifying appropriate contributions from individual development towards relevant specific projects.  Needs to be a robust evidence base in place that includes appropriate prioritised projects that can meet the needs generated by new developments in the area.  The Playing Pitch Strategy can help to direct S106 payments towards new provision. The plan should be amended to be specific by showing the locations of new sporting infrastructure.  For larger housing allocations the amount of playing field that should be provided on the site should be included in the site allocations.  It is not clear to developers what the on-site commitment towards on-site infrastructure e.g. playing field and ancillary facilities will be.	Noted. The Council has considered Sport England's comments when refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
728489	Mr David Marsh, Chairman, Harwell Parish Council			Typographical error	Typographical error on paragraph 3.265	Noted.

**Development Policy 34: Leisure and Sports Facilities (was Development Policy 33 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1022209	Bloor Homes South West			Appendix F	Standards, as set out in Appendix F, need to be flexibly applied in the determination of future planning applications.	Noted. The Council has undertaken a Local Leisure Facilities Report, Leisure and Sports Facilities Study and Planning Pitch Study in line with current best practice and relevant national guidance, including guidance from National Governing Bodies and Sport England.  Development Policy 32 ensures that major proposals provide or contribute towards leisure and sports facilities, allowing some flexibility for individual circumstances.
1094599  1097495	Mr James Proyer Planner Persimmon Homes (Wessex)  Vicky Aston Sport England			CIL/S106 contributions	Welcomes the intention for Major Development to provide financial contributions. One comment questions how financial contributions will be calculated.  Concerned the Council will convert converted quantitative standards into standardised developer contributions. Sport England is concerned that this quantitative standards approach may longer be accepted as it would not meet the test set out in CIL Regulation 122 and pooling restrictions in Regulation 123.  The Council has completed a Built Facilities Strategy that can help direct S106 payments towards new provision and with regard to the indoor facilities. These new facilities should be located so that they are able to come forward with the relevant housing developments.	The Council's Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy, is a live document which sets a list of infrastructure projects that will be funded through CIL or S106, S278 or alternative measures. The Council's 123 list details which projects will be funded by CIL contributions or S106, S278 or alternative measures.  The Council has undertaken an extensive audit and assessment of the District's Local Leisure Facilities, Open Spaces and Playing Pitches within the District to inform the development of the Local Plan, as a whole. The audit and assessment can be viewed in the following documents: Local Leisure Facilities study (2017), Open Spaces Report, (2017), and Playing Pitch study, (2015).  The studies have been used to inform the development of Development Policy 33 and the Council's Open Space and Leisure and Sport Facilities Standards (Appendix F) The Council has also considered the evidence for existing and future requirements and/or needs in district, which has helped inform the publication of the Council's regulation 123 list and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
1097495	Vicky Aston Sport England			Co-operation	To report future proposals that will result in a loss on any sport facilities, as a result of the draft plan.	Noted.
1097646	Ian Hepburn Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB			External Lighting	Incorporate with DMP20: External Lighting.	In the determination of future applications, including leisure and sport facilities, the Council will consider both Development Policy 20 and Development Policy 33 and relevant policies of the Part 1 Plan.
1094394  861678	Claire Arnold Clerk Watchfield Parish Council  Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Facilities for the Local Community	Facilities should be offered to the local Town/Parish Council first, before being offered to the wider area.	New housing developments will be required to provide or contribute towards local standards, as set out in Appendix F, aligned to Core Policy 32 and detailed in the Council's Open Spaces Report (2017).  The Town or Parish will be invited to consult on all major applications within their area. The Council will then consider any comments, including representations made about the provision of Leisure and Sports facilities in their area.
1097495	Vicky Aston Sport England			Local Green Spaces	Allocating areas/land for local green spaces	This issue has been considered by the Council and is addressed in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and Core Policy 45 of Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			New facilities	What about adequate provision for existing underprovided areas?	The Council has undertaken an extensive audit and assessment of the District's Local Leisure Facilities, Open Spaces and Playing Pitches within the District to inform the

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094555 1098560	Mr Francis Sketch Mummery					development of the Local Plan, as a whole. The audit and assessment can be viewed in the following documents: Local Leisure Facilities Report, (2017), Open Spaces Report, (2017), and Playing Pitch Study, 2015. The studies have been used to inform the development of Development Policy 33 and the Council's Open Space and Leisure and Sport Facilities Standards (Appendix F), in accordance with the strategic policies of Local Plan Part 1. The Council has also considered the evidence for existing requirements and/or needs in district, which has helped inform the publication of the Council's Regulation 123 list and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. These are live documents and will be amended accordingly.
1097495	Vicky Aston Sport England			Objection	The Policy needs to be reworded to closely align to the NPPF.	The Council acknowledges Sport England's comment on the policy. The Council agree that the suggested amendment by Sport England would be more consistent with national policy and guidance and has considered this in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1097495	Vicky Aston Sport England			Relevant and up-to-date evidence	The NPPF, requires LPAs to work with public health leads and organisations - NPPF 'Promoting healthy communities'. Planning Policies must be based on the most up-to-date and relevant evidence. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Request regular updates and meetings to ensure the Council's playing pitch strategy and subsequently Local Plan Policies, are up-to-date and relevant By up to date Sport England means undertaken within the last 3 years for a Playing Pitch Strategy, and within the last 5 years for a Built Facilities Strategy. The Council has undertaken both of these strategies and therefore Sport England is satisfied that the Vale of White Horse has an evidence base for sport.	Support welcomed.
727300	Ms Troth Wells. The British Horse Society			Supportive of the Policy	Must make sure the policy is applicable to equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists, disabled users and all other applicable users.	Noted. The Council consider the policy provides sufficient flexibility and has been informed by Equalities Impact Assessment.
1097830	Graham Ritchie Planning Manager David Wilson Homes Southern			Viability	The standards in appendix F indicated that Children's Plan and Youth provisions are excluded from the 15% of a site allocated for open space. Therefore, onsite provision of all types of Open space will exceed the 15% allowance. The provision for on-site leisure and sports facilities will reduce the area allowed for residential development. DWS do not consider that the Vale of White Horse have adequately appraised the affordability impacts of the Optional Technical Standards in their Local Plan as required by the Planning Practice Guidance.	The 15% as stated in Appendix F applies only to the residential area and the provision of public open space such as parks and gardens and amenity green space. The approach has been successful in securing open space for new major development proposals under the existing Saved Policy of the Local Plan 2011 and has been tested in the Viability Study to support the Part 2 Plan.
1103287 Late entry	Vale Disability Access Group			Supportive of the Policy	Must make sure the policy is applicable to equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists, disabled users and all other applicable users and that builders implement accessibility requirements.	Noted. The Council consider the policy provides sufficient flexibility and has been informed by Equalities Impact Assessment.

**Development Policy 35: New Countryside Recreation Facilities (was Development Policy 34 in Preferred Options)**

<b>Consultee ID</b>	<b>Consultee and / or Organisation</b>	<b>Agent and Organisation</b>	<b>Agent ID</b>	<b>Comment Category</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council			Provisions to stop developer incentives.	Developers are using green/open spaces as a tool to gain planning permission.	To the extent that development plan policies are material to an application for planning permission, the decision must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 – these provisions also apply to appeals).
1097646	Ian Hepburn, Planning Advisor, North Wessex Downs AONB			Supportive of the Policy.	Supportive of the inclusion of the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support noted and welcomed.
727300	Ms Troth Wells, The British Horse Society			Supportive of the Policy.	Must make sure the policy is applicable to equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists, disabled users and all other applicable users.	Noted. The Council consider the policy provides sufficient flexibility and has been informed by Equalities Impact Assessment

**Development Policy 36: Heritage Assets (was Development Policy 35 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
861678	Mr Guy Langton, East Hanney Parish Council			At odds with site allocations	One comment suggested that this policy is at odds with the site allocations to be made.	The comment is noted. The Council has a duty to deliver the most sustainable housing sites across the district in accordance with the SHMA. Future proposals will be assessed against the development plan as a whole.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Clarification of document	Comments requested clarity of wording in the document.	Comments noted.
929661	Mr Martin Small, Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Historic England Rewording for Clarity	Historic England made one comment suggesting that it is sufficient for new development proposals to conserve and enhance the significance of the heritage asset, and that if proposals meet one or more criteria in the proposed policy then they can be much more strongly supported.	Noted. The Council has considered Historic England's comments in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
929661	Mr Martin Small, Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Historic England Support	Historic England made one comment in support of the policy.	Support from Historic England is acknowledged. The Council has considered Historic England's comment in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195	Not in accordance with NPPF and not required because of LPP1 policies	One respondent stated that the policy is not necessary because of Development Policies 36 and 37 of Part 2 Plan.	The Council considers that the policy provides additional detail to support Core Policy 39: Historic Environment in the Part 1 Plan and is consistent with national policy and guidance.
872775	Strain			Policy rewording	One comment suggested rewording the policy to demonstrate where proposals will not be supported.	Noted. The Council has considered the comment in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
929661	Mr Martin Small Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Archaeology: Historic England suggested amendments	<p>Historic England welcomes the Archaeology policy, and suggests the following amendments:</p> <p>1) Paragraph 3.316 needs clarification what is the "presumption in favour" to which the policy refers in favour of Retention in-situ?</p> <p>2) Paragraph 3.309 should be reworded as follows: Some nationally important sites...any works that affect them. Some non-scheduled archaeological sites may demonstrably be of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments and should be considered subject to the policies for scheduled monuments. Other non-designated archaeological assets are protected under the government's policy on non-designated heritage assets (NPPF para 139) and Core Policy 39 in the Part 1 plan.</p> <p>3) Paragraph 3.285 should be reworded: The Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) prepared by Oxfordshire County Council and Historic England forms part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan 2031 and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications 96. The HLC helps to inform our understanding and management of the Vale's historic landscape. The study examines the historical and archaeological processes that have influenced the landscape and helps identify the specific characteristics that make the Vale's landscape locally distinctive. Paragraph 3.286 should be reworded: Developers should refer to sources of information on the historic</p>	Support from Historic England is acknowledged. The Council has considered Historic England's comment in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					environment such as the HLC, the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record, the National Heritage List for England and, where relevant, conservation area character appraisals, early on to ensure their proposals are based on an understanding of the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected. (The reference to conservation area character appraisals can then be omitted from paragraph 3.287)	

**Development Policy 37: Conservation Areas (was Development Policy 36 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094394	Claire Arnold, Clerk, Watchfield Parish Council			Enforcement	One comment referred to the use of planning conditions and enforcement to screen developments within or adjacent to conservation areas.	The Council has considered the concerns. The Council considers planning conditions on each application and takes enforcement very seriously. The Council has an enforcement policy to demonstrate where action will be taken: <a href="http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/planning-enforcement">http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/planning-enforcement</a>
929661	Mr Martin Small, Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Historic England support	Historic England support the policy as part of a positive and clear strategy for the conservation, enjoyment and enhancement of the historic environment.	Support from Historic England is acknowledged. The Council will continue work with Historic England to ensure the policy sets out a clear and positive strategy.
960396	Cumnor Parish Council			Support	One respondent supported the policy because it is important that development makes a special contribution to enhance the character and appearance of the village.	Support noted and welcomed.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins, CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			More detail	One respondent requested more detail to be added to the policy, including a phrase from the previous local plan.	The Council has considered the comment in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
730280	Mr Tim Comyn, Sparsholt Parish Council			Section 71 Duty: Conservation Area Appraisals	One respondent suggested including text to explain when conservation area appraisals will be carried out.	The Council continues to review the district's Conservation Areas and will prepare or update Conservation Area Character Appraisals on a rolling basis. The Council has considered this comment in refining the supporting text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

**Development Policy 38: Listed Buildings (was Development Policy 37 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
929661	Mr Martin Small, Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Listed Buildings: Suggested amendments	<p>Historic England welcomes the policy on Listed Buildings and suggests amendments to the policy. These include:</p> <p>1) Reword paragraph 3.295 as follows: A Listed Building is identified in the National Heritage List for England. Listing registers a building's special architectural and historic interest, and gives it statutory protection so that it can be protected for future generations.</p> <p>2) Reword paragraph 3.300 as follows: Proposals involving the part-demolition of Listed Buildings may be permitted in exceptional circumstances, provided an applicant can demonstrate that its significance would not be diminished and no pertinent details of its appearance or construction would be lost. The total demolition of a grade II listed building may be permitted in exceptional circumstances, and a grade I or grade II* listed building in wholly exceptional circumstances, where unless it can be demonstrated that the loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that loss, or all of the following apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and</li> <li>• no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and</li> <li>• conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and</li> <li>• the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.</li> </ul>	Support from Historic England is acknowledged. The Council will continue work with Historic England to ensure the policy sets out a clear and positive strategy. The Council has considered Historic England's comment in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

**Development Policy 39: Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments (was Development Policy 38 in Preferred Options)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
929661	Mr Martin Small Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Archaeology: Historic England suggested amendments	<p>Historic England welcomes the Archaeology policy, and suggests the following amendments:</p> <p>1) Paragraph 3.316 needs clarification what is the "presumption in favour" to which the policy refers in favour of Retention in-situ</p> <p>2) Paragraph 3.309 should be reworded as follows: Some nationally important sites...any works that affect them. Some non-scheduled archaeological sites may demonstrably be of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments and should be considered subject to the policies for scheduled monuments. Other non-designated archaeological assets are protected under the government's policy on non-designated heritage assets (NPPF para 139) and Core Policy 39 in the Part 1 plan.</p> <p>3) Paragraph 3.285 should be reworded: The Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) prepared by Oxfordshire County Council and Historic England forms part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan 2031 and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications 96. The HLC helps to inform our understanding and management of the Vale's historic landscape. The study examines the historical and archaeological processes that have influenced the landscape and helps identify the specific characteristics that make the Vale's landscape locally distinctive. Paragraph 3.286 should be reworded: Developers should refer to sources of information on the historic environment such as the HLC, the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record, and the National Heritage List for England and, where relevant, conservation area character appraisals, early on to ensure their proposals are based on an understanding of the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected. (The reference to conservation area character appraisals can then be omitted from paragraph 3.287)</p>	Support from Historic England is acknowledged. The Council will continue to work with Historic England to ensure the policy sets out a clear and positive strategy. The Council has considered Historic England's comment in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
730190  872775	Councillor Debby Hallett  Strain			Archaeology: Suggested Amendments	<p>Respondents suggested amendments to the policy and supporting text. These include:</p> <p>1) Clarify the last paragraph (In all cases where, exceptionally, harm to or loss of significance)</p> <p>2) Changing the wording so that "Development will ONLY be permitted where it can be shown..."</p>	The Council has considered the comments in refining the policy for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1022209	Bloor Homes South West	Mrs Helen Tilton	1022208	Objection: Structure of policy	One respondent objected to the structure of the policy and felt it would be awkward to apply in practice.	The Council considers that this policy provides additional detail to support Core Policy 39: Historic Environment in the Part 1 Plan and is consistent with national policy and guidance.

## Chapter 3

### Chapter 3: Building Healthy and Sustainable Communities

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
No comments						

### Chapter 3: Economic Prosperity

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
875920 929685	Daniel Scharf  Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			CPRE - Supporting local food and farmers	CPRE state that a development plan to 2031 cannot claim to be sound and contributing to the achievement of sustainable development if it is silent on the question of supporting local food and fails to plan positively for this to be enhanced. They are state that farmers need support and encouragement to improve biodiversity of and access to the countryside. We should also not forget importance of local food and the potential to link rural and urban populations through farmer's markets, and open farms.	Comments noted. The Council recognises the importance of supporting agriculture and rural worker's, as demonstrated in Development Policy 11: Rural Diversification and Equestrian Developments in the Part 2 plan which supports proposals for rural diversification and buildings in the open countryside.
1097677 1097815	David Wilson Homes (Southern)  Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate			General Comments on Economic Chapter	A few comments highlight the importance of the Science Vale and what the Plan says to highlight the importance in delivering economic prosperity. They also state policies should recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including a poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing, should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances; and plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge drive, creative or high technology industries.	Comments noted.
1097559	MEPC			Support - MEPC	Support of the Local Plan.	Comment noted.

**Chapter 3: Sustainable Transport and Accessibility**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094998	Mr and Mrs Michael & Judith Hosking			A34	A34 at overcapacity and cannot take any more traffic from development.	The Council continues to work collaboratively and proactively with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to investigate and mitigate against the impact of development and to implement a Route Based Strategy for the A34, as detailed in Core Policy 34 of Part 1 of the Local Plan.
1095797	Valerie Broehl					
1096707	Prof James Allan					
1094998	Mr and Mrs Michael & Judith Hosking			A34 Bus Route	Impact of A34 bus lane on Bagley Wood	Whilst land is safeguarded for a bus lane, any proposals would be informed by detailed feasibility work, engagement with land owners, assessment of environmental impacts and appropriate mitigation and individual planning applications following the appropriate process.
1096275	Ms Powell			A415 re-routing	Comments suggest re-routing of the A415. A cheaper and less disruptive solution than the proposed bye-pass might be to re-route the A415 using existing roads, from just east of the A34 through Gozzards Ford to Tubney, to join the A420 west of Kingston Bagpuize.	Comments noted. The Council is guided by the County Council as Highways Authority on matters relating to strategic highway schemes and has safeguarded land within the plan at the request of the County Council and following partnership working.
1096289	Mr & Mrs H. G. Johnson					
875920	Daniel Scharf			Abingdon southern by-pass	The southern-by-pass and new river crossing at the south of Abingdon should be reconsidered as there is no development potential along this route in the open countryside.	The Part 2 plan does not propose housing to the south of Abingdon. The route for the bypass is safeguarded in the Part 1 plan to ensure its longer term delivery is not prejudiced.
875920	Daniel Scharf			Air Quality	Future of the private car is being questioned and a Government inquiry is on hold looking at the future of the car and future emissions. It is likely the use of the car will need to be reduced to reduce emissions. Therefore, car dependent locations will need enhanced sustainable transport links. LPP2 encourages the need to travel and thus air pollution. Air quality is already poor in Abingdon and is being monitored.	The Council are working proactively with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and the relevant key stakeholders to promote and actively seek sustainable modes of transport/travel, as depicted in Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility and Chapter 3 of the Local Plan Part 2. This is consistent with the objectives of the NPPF and the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4, updated 2016.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)					
1094957	Debby Fox					
1094998	Mr and Mrs Michael & Judith Hosking					
763485	Mr Ian Leggett Botley-Eynsham Community Path & Bike Safe			Cycling/Walking	Several comments stating that LCWIPs are now expected to be referenced in statutory land-use plans and that the Plan should mention the production of LCWIPs.  What new Cycle routes are proposed? How do these developments encourage walking? Concern was raised over the provision of cycleways to Wantage and Didcot, and that the current road infrastructure is dangerous to cyclists. The Plan should include a strategic cycle network vision for the promotion of healthy and sustainable lives and modes of transport, and have its costs and benefits evaluated.  Development proposals must explicitly demonstrate compliance with the OCC Design Guide for Cycling and Walking, 2017. The Vale and OCC should work together to seek adequate sources of funding.	Comments noted. Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking in the Part 1 Plan supports the provision of sustainable transport measures to promote the use of public transport, cycling and walking.  The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other key stakeholders to support the provision of new cycling routes where consistent with other policies of this plan.  Development Policy 16: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans of the Part 2 Plan ensures development proposals are supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council guidance including their Walking and Cycling Design Guide.
871494	Mr Noel Newson					
1021056	Mr Richard Harding South Oxfordshire District of CPRE					
1095000	Ms Chantry					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096018	Mr Tucker Chair Oxfordshire Cycling Network					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
1096844	Mr Guy Wilkin Secretary Harwell Campus Bicycle Users Group					
829404	Mr & Mrs Chapman			General Comments	A number of comments detail concerns that new housing developments will increase traffic congestion. Improvements have not eased congestion. Comments reemphasise the importance of the linkages and effective infrastructure in the South-East Vale.	Comments noted. The Council is working proactively with Oxfordshire County Council and key stakeholders to undertake extensive evidence base work in terms of sustainable modes of transport. This includes but not limited to, the Oxford to Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study and the Evaluation of Transport Impact Study using Oxfordshire Transport Model.
871494	Mr Noel Newson					
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England					
1096289	Mr & Mrs H. G. Johnson					
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)					
1098560	Mummery					
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England			Highways England Response	Highways England suggest the Council review their technical note and guide to working matters. They were originally unable to comment on the ETI.	Comment noted.
730294	Mr George Edmonds-Brown Wootton Parish Council			Infrastructure/ road network	New development will only increase the demand on the road network. Concerns over the difficulty integrating with Marcham Village (proposed sites). Marcham needs a bypass before development can be implemented. Flooding on the Marcham site and other infrastructure needed.	Comments noted. The Council is working in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council as Highways Authority. This includes preparing technical evidence to inform plan preparation and to plan for new infrastructure.
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council				How will the DB development affect the existing network? Shippon should be discounted due to extra traffic congestion. Infrastructure should come first. Extra Cyclists cause more traffic congestion and delays.	Development proposed at Marcham in the Part 2 plan has been reduced from 520 dwellings to 90 dwellings, in part, following an objection from the County Council.
1094957	Debby Fox				The B4017 is already at full capacity. Relevant studies need to be made publicly available, asap. Are there adequate resources to provide the adequate infrastructure?	

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094997	Miss Jay Elliott				The road network around Wantage and Grove is unable to cope. When will Grove station come forward? A417 is highly congested. There is no adequate bus services to Didcot station. A need for more and improved cycle lanes. There are no bus routes identified for Didcot, Milton Park and Harwell Campus. Include East West services.	
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
1096890	Mrs Fran Simmons					
1097190	Mr Ian Talbot					
1097814	Gale and Binning					
1097828	Lee Church					
1098097	Mr and Mrs Richardson					
1098629	Mrs H R Cole					
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group					
1097839	Nick Tucker			Infrastructure/ Road Network/ Accidents	There are safety concerns regarding A420 and A34.	Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy in the Part 1 Plan sets out the Council's support to the long-term strategic planning of the A34. The Council will continue to work with Highways England and Oxfordshire County Council and other partners to develop a Route Based Strategy for the A34.  Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility in the Part 1 Plan sets out that the Council will work with Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant stakeholders to promote and support improvements to the transport network to increase safety.
1098086	Mrs SM Collins					
1094998	Mr and Mrs Michael & Judith Hosking			Lodge Hill Interchange	Diamond interchange at Lodge Hill is required	This is already planned and funded and Oxfordshire County Council are working hard to ensure this is delivered early in the plan period.
1051321	Mr Paul Walker Strategic Development Manager Oxford Bus Company			Oxford Bus Company Comment	Oxford Bus Company have provided some context regarding their network.	Comment noted.
1100194 Late entry	Giles Hughes Head of Planning and Strategic Housing West Oxfordshire District Council			Oxford Unmet Need - Accessibility to Oxford	It is important that housing that is intended to contribute towards meeting Oxford City's unmet housing need is accessible to Oxford, with frequent and reliable public transport linkages. This was a key consideration of the work undertaken to agree the proposed apportionment of the unmet need. Otherwise housing sites may not serve the needs of future residents and it may place an additional strain on transport infrastructure.	Comments noted. The Council has updated the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan to ensure that the quantum of unmet need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is allocated to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe sub area and that 'at least' 2200 homes are demonstrably close to and accessible to Oxford.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council Comments	The County suggest the Plan refers to the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway, make more emphasis to encourage more sustainable modes of transport and refer to LTP4 Active and Healthy Travel Strategy. Mention the active and healthy travel steering group.	The Council has considered Oxfordshire County Council's comments in refining the accompanying text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1094998	Mr and Mrs Michael & Judith Hosking			Park and Ride Sites	Concern raised over the park and ride sites proposed at Abingdon and potentially at Marcham.	Comment noted. The Council is guided by the County Council as Highways Authority on matters relating to strategic highway schemes and has safeguarded land within the plan at the request of the County Council and following partnership working.
1095737	Mrs Tilley					
1098052	MS Hazel Abraham			Parking	More public parking spaces for Wantage.	Proposals for improving or replacing the quality of town centre parking provisions will be supported where the proposals complement Core Policy 32, the Vale's Urban Design Guide SPD and Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards.  Development Policy 17: Public Car Parking in Settlements in the Part 2 Plan protects and improves the quality of car parking in appropriate settlements, including within the town centre at Wantage.
871494	Mr Noel Newson			Public Transport	Public transport is only adequate in and around Oxford. The Statement claiming excellent public transport should not be indicative to the whole district (Para 2.20).  The bus service is less frequent. Infrastructure needs to be installed first to enable more frequent public transport service(s).	Paragraph 2.20 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, is not a blanket statement. The statement is referring to 'certain' sites, which will be highlighted in the Plan's development templates, which are close to Oxford and with excellent public transport connectivity - that could contribute towards Oxford Unmet Need.  The Council are working proactively and continuously with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and district's bus operators to help support development, as set out in the Local Plan.
1094997	Miss Jay Elliott					
1095787	Mr Tony Parsons					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment					
1097839	Nick Tucker					
1094983	Mrs Boswell			Tourism	No mention of tourism in the Plan.	The Council encourages and recognises the importance of the visitor economy in supporting the local economy. Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor Economy of the Part 1 Plan supports the visitor and tourism sector across the district. Development Policy 34: Countryside Recreation Facilities supports development proposals of a small scale for recreational facilities in the open countryside.

**Chapter 3: Protecting the Environment and Responding to Climate Change**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			Amendment proposed by Environment Agency	The Environment Agency has requested amendments to the Water Quality section in Chapter 3 regarding the supporting infrastructure, such as the sewage network. They would expect the WCS (as well as any other relevant evidence base documents) to be updated to reflect any recent changes to your proposed site allocations or other changes within the Local Plan that may affect the environment.	Comment noted. The Council has considered Environment Agency's comments in refining the accompanying text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan. The Council has worked collaboratively with Environment Agency and Thames Water to produce a Water Cycle Study to assess the impact of the site allocations on the network. The Water Cycle Study is published alongside the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Amendment proposed by Oxfordshire County Council	Oxfordshire County Council recommend the chapter and design policies include reference to improving health and wellbeing.	Comment noted. Council agree with the importance of improving health and well-being. The Council has considered Oxfordshire County Council's comments in the preparation of the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1097495	Vicky Aston Sport England			Amendment proposed by Sport England	Sport England suggest the Local Plan have regard to Sport England's design guide 'Active Design' by referring to this.	Comment noted. The Council has considered including a reference to Sport England's 'Active Design' guidance in the preparation of the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			CPRE Objection	CPRE has objected to the number of new homes proposed on the grounds that it will harm the adjacent communities, and suggested amendments to retain the Saved policies from Local Plan 2011	The Council consider that Core Policy 44: Landscape in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1, Development Policy 28: Settlement Character and Gaps in the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 and the Landscape Character Assessment will provide a sufficient level of detail when deciding on planning applications.
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Draft Landscape Character Assessment	One comment states the Draft Landscape Character Assessment has omitted permitted development from the Strategy and maps.	Comment noted. The Council has considered this comment in updating the Landscape Character Assessment to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
730190 875920 1096034	Councillor Debby Hallett  Daniel Scharf  Mr Derek Edwards			Objection - Plan will not meet the requirements of climate change legislation.	One respondent has raised objections that the Plan does not adequately address the issues of Climate Change or carbon emission in particular through a lack of policies, and relies on an inadequate assessment of housing needs.	The Examination of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 included testing of the Oxfordshire SHMA in relation to Vale's housing need. It was scrutinised in depth with the Inspector concluding the Vale's housing need is sound. The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 was Adopted at the end of 2016 and thus is considered to be up to date.  The Council considers that the Spatial Strategy and district wide policies that support the Part 1 Plan provide a strong policy framework to address climate change within the Vale.
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Open Space Standards	One respondent states the Open Space Policy does not make reference to the ANGST Standards.	Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure in the Part 1 Plan ensures the appropriate provision of Green Infrastructure through new development and is supported by a Green Infrastructure Strategy that has been informed by a Green Infrastructure Audit that assessed the provision of Green Infrastructure against nationally accepted standards.

## Appendix A: Site Development Templates

### Appendix A: Site Development Templates – General Requirements

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			General Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allocation numbers should be refined in line with masterplanning.</li> <li>- General requirements need to be more flexible in line with requirements for Outline Application.</li> <li>- Walking and cycling should feature on all development templates.</li> </ul>	Further detailed work on the site allocations prior to Reg.19 consultation has resulted in changes to proposed allocations and/or their housing numbers. All allocations are based on a figure which is flexible and is subject to the masterplanning process. Officers consider the matter of improvements to walking, cycling and bus networks are sufficiently addressed in the general requirements section of Appendix A entitled "Access and Highways".
1094557	Ms Beal Economic Development Coordinator OxLEP					
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust					
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England					
1096937	IM Land	Mrs Rebecca Horrocks	1096940			
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council – General Comment	Oxfordshire County Council suggested the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Walking and cycling should feature on all development templates.</li> <li>- The capacity of existing waste recycling centre's should be considered when propping more housing allocations</li> <li>- More incentives are needed to encourage people to catch the bus or to walk and cycle.</li> </ul>	
1096937	IM Land	Mrs Rebecca Horrocks	1096940	Planning Applications	This comment supports the provisions stated in the site templates however it raises concern that it is not flexible for outline applications, Local Development Orders and Permission in Principle.	The Development Site Templates set out the policy requirements necessary for the proposed allocations to come forward to ensure they contribute to delivering sustainable development. Developers will be expected to demonstrate how these requirements are met through their application.
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England			Agricultural Land	This comment would like the Local Plan to safeguard the long term capability of best and most versatile agricultural land as a resource in line with the NPPF	Noted.
929661	Mr Martin Small Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Heritage Assets	This comment welcomes the requirements set out in the development templates in regards to the historic environment and cultural heritage. Character Appraisals are need for the East Hanney and Kingston Bagpuize conservation areas	Noted.
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Character	This comment would like the development templates to express the rural character and nature of villages	Noted.  The Development Site Templates set out the policy requirements necessary for the proposed allocations to come forward to ensure they contribute to delivering sustainable development.

**Appendix A: Site Development Templates – North of East Hanney**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Access	This comment questions the access to the new site through Ashfields Lane. A planning application was submitted for four dwellings where access to this proposed site would be.	The Council considers that suitable access can be provided to the site.
1095766	Andrew and Camilla Symes			Alternatives	This comment requests that other more suitable land that is less congested is considered.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper
865961	Mr David Kirk			Character	This comment states that any development within this area will effect the character and setting of the village.	Development will have to abide by Core Policy 37 and 38 from the Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The Site Development Template includes criteria to ensure the character of the site will be kept within the existing settlement.
725556	Thames Water Property Services			Comments from Thames Water on North West of East Hanney - Water and Wastewater infrastructure	<p>Thames Water has no infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</p> <p>Thames Water has commented that the water network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development.</p> <p>Local upgrades to the existing water network infrastructure may be required.</p>	<p>Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed.</p> <p>The 'General Requirements' ensures development proposals demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or waste water capacity to serve the development.</p> <p>Developers will be expected to enter into discussions with Thames Water as early as possible to agree a way forward. The Council understand, that following discussion with Thames Water, that upgrades will be possible and so does not present a barrier to development.</p>
831944	Pye Homes Pye Homes	Mr Maltman	1096293	Conservation Area	A heritage statement has already been prepared in relation to this site. There are no listed buildings within or adjacent to the site and note that it is not within a conservation area	The Council make note of this point and highlight that any development would need to abide by development policies 35,36,37 and 38 of the Local Plan 2031 part 2.
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Constriants	There are a couple of comments which highlight the constriants linked to this site such as flooding, traffic and infrastructure	The council will continue to work with developers and key stakeholders to ensure the constriants are managed and appropriate infrastructure is provided. Appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 sets out the infrastructure needed to overcome the constraints.
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Deliverability	This comment questions the deliverability of the development and in particular the affordable housing units.	The Council will work with the developers to deliver the development including the affordable housing units inaccordance with Core Policy 24 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1
871191	Mrs P J McCall			Description of Site	There are a number of comments which describe the location and setting of the site. Multiple studies have been conducted to determine the constraints and to provide solutions to overcome the constraints. This site is also not located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	The Council make note of the descriptions of the site and will continue to work with developers to overcome any constraints.. Any development will need to be inaccordance with Core Policy 37 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 to ensure the development fits in with the character and local setting of the village
1096196	Mr W McCall					
874446	Mr Christopher Baker					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
831944	Pye Homes Pye Homes					
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Ecology and Biodiversity	This comment has concern over the loss, deterioration or harm to habitats or species if the development is to happen. Approaching the village from the north on the A338 provides views of the open countryside. This will be diminished if development is planned for the north of the village.	East Hanney is classed as a larger village within settlement hierarchy in accordance with Core Policy 3 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1. Core Policy 46 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 provides policy guidance to preserving and enhancing the biodiversity when considering development. The Development Site Templates have been prepared in consultation with both County and District Ecologist's who have advised where policy requirements are needed for individual sites relating to ecology/ biodiversity.
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Education	This comment raises concern over the current education provisions within the village. The current school would be unable to accommodate the new developments and there are no plans to expand.	Appendix A of the Local Plan sets out the required infrastructure needed to ensure the development plan is sustainable. The Council is satisfied that appropriate provision can be provided.
1095766	Andrew and Camilla Symes			Flooding	There are a number of comments which raise the issue of flooding north of East Hanney. This area is known to flood and development on this site will suffer from flooding issues if the site is continued to be proposed.	The Council have prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and consulted with the Environment Agency and have added appropriate policy requirements to the Site Template. The Council is satisfied the site is developable without increasing the risk of flooding.
1095870	Dr Craig					
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council					
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency					
831944	Pye Homes Pye Homes	Mr Maltman	1096293			
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Noise	This comment expresses concern over the increase of noise and traffic if the development is to take place. Currently the A338 has heavy traffic flows which has impacted the recent development. Homes are currently shaking due to the heavy traffic	The plan has been informed by technical evidence, including assessing highway impacts and has been considered in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council (has Highways Authority). OCC do not raise any concerns surrounding highway impact with the proposed development at East Hanney.  East Hanney is already served by frequent public transport and junction upgrades are proposed for Frilford Junction.
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			Objection	There are a number general objections to this site. The development would be unattractive to the village and there are significant constraints such as flooding. There is no justification as to why another development should be subjected to East Hanney. There is very little community support for this site and the current facilities are struggling to meet the current demand.	The Council note the objections and will continue to work with the community, developers and other key stakeholders to ensure the constraints can be overcome.
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell					
829463	Mrs P J McCall					
1096193	Mr W McCall					
1096911	Alisa Hughes					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
861678  865961	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council  Mr David Kirk					
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	Site Selection Process	The site was not selected through the site selection process and should therefore not be included within the Local Plan. There is inconsistency with the naming of the site in the Appendix and the main document	The Site Selection Topic Paper details the site selection process and the assessment for this site demonstrating it is suitable, available and deliverable. This can be seen in Appendix B on the site Topic Paper. Inconsistency of site naming has been addressed.
831944	Pye Homes Pye Homes	Mr Maltman	1096293	Support	This comment supports this site allocation which will contribute to the housing need. Technical studies have been completed to prevent any delay in delivering the site. The village also have appropriate facilities to ensure the site is sustainable	Noted.
1095766  874446	Andrew and Camilla Symes  Mr Christopher Baker			Traffic Impact	This comment expresses concern over the impact the development will have on traffic in the area and in particular the A338.	The plan has been informed by technical evidence, including assessing highway impacts and has been considered in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council (has Highways Authority). OCC do not raise any concerns surrounding highway impact with the proposed development at East Hanney.  East Hanney is already served by frequent public transport and junction upgrades are proposed for Frilford Junction.
725556	Thames Water Property Services			Waste and Water Network	The water and waste network may not be capable of meeting the demand of the new development. Developers are encouraged to work with Thames Water to ensure the constraint is can be overcome	The council will continue to work with developers and key stakeholders such as Thames Water to ensure the water and waste network can support the current and future need of the village.  Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed.  The 'General Requirements' ensures development proposals demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or waste water capacity to serve the development.  Developers will be expected to enter into discussions with Thames Water as early as possible to agree a way forward.

**Appendix A: Site Development Templates – North East of East Hanney**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Comments from East Hanney Parish Council	<p>East Hanney Parish Council raised the following key issues related to the proposed allocations East of East Hanney and North-West of East Hanney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan should recognise the character of East Hanney as set out in the Inspector's Report for Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</li> <li>• Not appropriate for an urban extension as East Hanney is a rural, not urban, settlement</li> <li>• East Hanney Parish Council would like further input and comment on the proposed allocations if taken forward to the next stage of the Plan.</li> <li>• New development proposals should reflect the historic character of the existing village</li> <li>• Visual impact from all directions should be considered for development proposals, e.g. approaching the Lowland Vale Village of East Hanney</li> <li>• Proposed allocations should bring benefit to the village and community through Section 106 developer contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)</li> <li>• Residents who responded to the Community Survey objected to the proposed allocation East of East Hanney</li> </ul>	<p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that the proposed allocations East of East Hanney and North-West of East Hanney conserve and enhance the historic and rural character of East Hanney through appropriate design and landscaping.</p> <p>The Council has prepared a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) that identifies the key features, including Landscape Character Types and Landscape Character Areas to inform an understanding of the character and local distinctiveness of the Vale's landscape.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates ensures development proposals undertake a Landscape and visual impact assessment to inform the site design, layout, capacity and mitigation requirements.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates ensure that housing allocations are accompanied by Environmental Impact Assessments, Heritage Statements and Conservation Area Appraisals to establish the local character and distinctiveness and the significance of heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates highlight some of the key requirements for development at each site. Core Policy 7 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures new services and facilities are delivered alongside new housing.</p>
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Comments from East Hanney Parish Council - East of East Hanney	<p>East Hanney Parish Council raise the following issues in relation to the proposed allocation East of East Hanney:</p> <p>Relationship with existing village:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is bounded on the West by existing developments that have not been designed or built to provide vehicular or pedestrian access</li> <li>• Site has limited connection to the planning permission to the north of the village for 40 dwellings</li> <li>• Site is on the east of the A338 distant from the village facilities provided to the west and is difficult to cross to access these services</li> </ul> <p>Flooding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is located within Flood Zone 2 and has important ditches that drain neighbouring sites</li> <li>• Historic flooding in East Hanney</li> </ul>	<p>In accordance with Core Policy 38 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1, strategic allocations will be required to undertake a masterplan approach to ensure good urban design principles are incorporated into the development.</p> <p>The masterplan will be prepared in consultation between the Council, the community and key stakeholders and will be prepared in accordance with the Site Development Templates to ensure the proposal achieves a cohesive development that integrates with the existing settlement.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates to support the proposed allocation East of East Hanney ensures the site maximises connectivity through adjacent sites and with the existing core of the village to the west.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work key stakeholders to inform an updated to the Site Development Templates for the Publication Version of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p> <p>The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p>Furthermore, in accordance with Core Policy 42: Flood Risk in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Site Development Templates to support the proposed allocation, developers will be required to</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<p>Access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site can only be accessed by a narrow corridor of land which is isolated from neighbouring developments</li> </ul> <p>Biodiversity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan should recognise that the allocation is located on a nursery, Rosie Bees, that is important to local ecology and biodiversity</li> <li>No proposals to replace the loss of ecologically important land</li> </ul> <p>Housing delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence from Community Survey indicates there is objection to this proposal. Proposed allocation would also impact on the existing infrastructure</li> <li>Number of dwellings should be reduced to a level that reflects what could be delivered as a result of constraints and policy requirements.</li> </ul>	<p>undertake a site specific Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council to explore/investigate access arrangement for the site.</p> <p>The Site Development Template ensures developers consider methods to enhance biodiversity value of the site for the environment and future occupants.</p> <p>Developers will be required to undertake habitat and species surveys in line with relevant best practice and retain important ecological assets or undertaken appropriate mitigation or compensation measures if loss is unavoidable.</p> <p>Furthermore, Core Policies 45 and 46 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensure the appropriate provision of Green Infrastructure through new development and the need to protect and enhance biodiversity.</p>
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Comments from East Hanney Parish Council on East of East Hanney - Appendix A: Site Development Templates	<p>East Hanney Parish Council raise the following key issues in relation to the Site Development Templates for East of East Hanney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional requirement under 'Flood Risk and Drainage' should be included as follows: 'The site is recognised as being subject to flood, resulting in a site wide impact on any development. To consider further if any development is feasible. Detailed analysis with sensitivities modelled at peak flows and flood conditions to ensure protection from flood arising consequentially from development. Tests to be provided to also consider the impact on the surrounding environment and settlement which must not be exposed to additional risk of flood</li> <li>Site Development Template under 'Key Objectives' should recognise East Hanney as a rural village and that an extension to the village of East Hanney would need to be in keeping with the rural setting and character and aligned with the historic character of the existing village</li> <li>Additional requirement under 'Key Objectives' should be included as follows: The site represents the frontage to the village when approaching from Frilford on your left. Key Objective should reflect that the site is not integrated with the centre of the village so residents are not able to easily access existing facilities</li> </ul>	<p>The Council notes East Hanney Parish Council's concerns..</p> <p>The Site Development Templates requires developers to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment/surface water drainage strategy based on information contained in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and liaison with the Local Lead Flood Authority and Environment Agency to support a planning application.</p> <p>In line with Core Policy 42: Flood Risk in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1, developers will be expected to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) into the development to drain surface water.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the need for new development to connect with the historic centre of the village. This is noted in Appendix A : Site Development Templates under headings Key Objectives and Urban Design Principles, which require the new development to integrate and maximise connectivity with the core of East Hanney so residents can access existing facilities.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the need for sympathetic design, and this issue is dealt with in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1, Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the opportunity to work closely with the Parish Council though the more detailed master planning process for the proposed sites, should they go ahead.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional requirement under 'Key Objective' should be included to consider how the proposed allocation can be comprehensively planned to create a sustainable community.</li> </ul>	
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			Comments from Environment Agency on East of East Hanney - Appendix A: Site Development Templates -Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure requirements	<p>Environment Agency recommend that an additional bullet point should be included under 'Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure' to recognise the specific ditch/watercourse that is important to protected species of the water vole.</p> <p>Environment Agency recommend a further bullet point as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide wildlife buffers along all watercourses of at least 10 metres, and enhance existing habitats for protected species including water voles (which have been recorded along this ditch network)</li> </ul>	The Council welcome this suggestion and have updated the Site Template accordingly.
725556	Thames Water Property Services			Comments from Thames Water on East of East Hanney - Water and Wastewater infrastructure	<p>Thames Water has no infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</p> <p>Thames Water has commented that the water network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development.</p> <p>Local upgrades to the existing water network infrastructure may be required.</p>	<p>Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed.</p> <p>The 'General Requirements' ensures development proposals demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or waste water capacity to serve the development.</p> <p>Developers will be expected to enter into discussions with Thames Water as early as possible to agree a way forward. The Council understand, that following discussion with Thames Water, that upgrades will be possible and so does not present a barrier to development.</p>
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	HELAA	This comment states that the site proposed has not been assessed through the site selection process, The HELAA maps are difficult to read due to having no key. The site has not been properly assessed.	The Site Selection Topic Paper details the site selection process and the assessment for this site demonstrating it is suitable, available and deliverable. This can be seen in Appendix B. The HELAA and Site Selection Topic Paper have been updated with Appendices A and B of the Topic Paper providing a summary of the assessment.
874446	Mr Christopher Baker			Landscape	The visual impact will worsen if more development is to take place at East Hanney.	<p>A Landscape Character Assessment and a Landscape Capacity study have been produced alongside the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 to assess the impact the proposed development will have on existing settlements.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with developers and key stakeholders to ensure the impact on the existing visual impact will be protected/enhanced. This is taken into consideration in the Site Development Template.</p>
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	Landscape Evidence	This comment questions the evidence provided to support the landscape impact development will have on the existing settlement.	<p>Noted. The Council has commissioned a professional consultancy to undertake a Landscape Capacity Study to assess the landscape sensitivity, value and capacity for a number of potential housing allocations in the district.</p> <p>The methodology was undertaken in accordance with best practice and national guidance including Natural England's 'Landscape Character Assessment Guidance published in October 2014.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	Objection The sustainability Appraisal and Landscape Capacity Study are not robust enough	Objection The sustainability Appraisal and Landscape Capacity Study are not robust enough	The council considers the approach used in the selection of sites is consistent with national policy and guidance as well as the SA. The Council has commissioned a professional consultancy to undertake a Landscape Capacity Study to assess the landscape sensitivity, value and capacity for a number of potential housing allocations in the district.  The methodology was undertaken in accordance with best practice and national guidance including Natural England's 'Landscape Character Assessment Guidance published in October 2014.
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			Objection to East of East Hanney Objection to North-West of East Hanney	Comments raised general objections to the proposed allocation East of East Hanney.  Key issues raised include:  Settlement Hierarchy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>60% increase in the village since 2011</li> <li>Community services such as schools, shops, pubs, village hall and sports facilities inadequate to support East Hanney</li> </ul>	The general objections have been noted.  The settlement of East Hanney is recognised as a larger village in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The settlement contains a range of services and facilities that make it a more sustainable location for new development. New development will assist in consolidating existing services and facilities while encouraging the emergence of new ones. The emerging Neighbourhood Plan for East Hanney may assist in delivering additional community services or enhancing existing ones.  The Environment Agency have recently updated their flooding maps for East Hanney. The site is not located within an area of Flood Zones 2 and 3.
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452		Site Selection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocation not justified or consistent with national policy</li> <li>Absence of evidence for the proper assessment of the site through the SA process in relation to testing reasonable alternatives</li> <li>Site should be subject to an assessment of landscape sensitivity or landscape capacity</li> <li>Heritage impacts invoke statutory duties with regard to heritage assets contained within the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</li> <li>Increasing housing on the east side of Steventon Road would not relate well the existing village due to presence of A338</li> <li>Associated buffer to development to ensure landscape planting may limit the capacity to accommodate the 50 dwellings proposed.</li> <li>Site is located outside the village envelope and would not reflect the rural character of the village boundary</li> </ul>	The council considers the approach used in the selection of sites is consistent with national policy and guidance and has been informed by detailed evidence including landscape assessment.
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452		Flood Risk and Drainage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Problems associated with foul water drainage and sewage system to meet demand</li> </ul>	The Council welcomes the opportunity to work closely with the Parish Council though the more detailed master planning process for the proposed sites, should they go ahead.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Known historic flooding in East Hanney e.g. A338 and Steventon Road in 2007.</li> </ul> <p>Comments raised objections to the proposed allocation North West of East Hanney:</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site should be subject to a transparent and robust assessment of landscape sensitivity and capacity given the site is situated beyond the existing development to the north of the settlement and forms the boundary of the Conservation Area and settlement edge</li> <li>Area to the north-east of the site lies within Flood Zone that may limit the ability to accommodate the 80 dwellings proposed</li> <li>No heritage assessment has been undertaken in order to comply with SEA Regulations</li> <li>Absence of a Conservation Area Appraisal - unclear how a decision has been arrived that land to the east may have a detrimental impact on the significance of the Conservation Area, a contention that has been dismissed at appeal</li> <li>Traffic impacts on the A338</li> </ul>	
865961	Mr David Kirk			Remove site	This comment would like the site to be removed from the Local Plan	Noted.
874446	Mr Christopher Baker			Seperation of Village	This comment raises concern over the seperation of the new development to the existing settlement	The Council's intention is that the proposed development will be fully integrated with the existing settlement as set out in the Development Template.

**Appendix A: Site Development Templates – East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (Parish of Fyfield and Tubney)**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095981	Mrs Burley			Air pollution from A338	Sand extracted from Besselsleigh has impacted on the health and well-being of existing residents located along the A338. This will become worse if the allocation is allowed.	Whilst this comment is noted, the Council does not consider the proposed development would impact on sand extraction at Besselsleigh.
1095676 1095959	Mrs Rebecca Dougall Professor Burley			Air Quality and Light Pollution	Comments were raised concerning the provision of community services and facilities and the effect of increased traffic on noise, light and air pollution for existing residents of the parish of Fyfield and for local biodiversity.	Noted. The Site Development Template to support the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor ensures that potential impacts on noise and air pollution from the A420 and A415 are appropriately mitigated to offset any adverse impacts. The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders such as Environment Agency to ensure potential impacts of pollution are appropriately mitigated. Developers will also be required to demonstrate through the preparation of a lighting strategy that additional lighting does not impact on local biodiversity, including green corridors.
1097499	Robert Williams			Appendix A - Site Development Templates - Access and Highways	One comment suggested that the Site Development Template - Access and Highways - should seek to restrict through traffic on Abingdon Road, Tubney	All proposals will be required to be of high quality design in terms of access. The site will deliver a new road though the site to help alleviate traffic flows through the existing village and provide new access to the A415 and A420. The council are also in discussions with stakeholders to improve public transport in the area.
1095750 1097839 1097845 1095325	Mr Julian Mellor Nick Tucker Sally Tucker Mr Brian Buchan			Coalescence between existing settlements	A number of comments were concerned that the allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would result in coalescence between the villages of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield.  A number of comments were concerned that the allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is of a scale that is disproportionate to existing village of Fyfield and would result in coalescence between the villages of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	The Council understand the concern and are keen to avoid coalescence between existing villages. However, the site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence, including landscape assessment. Overall, the Council consider that the site relates well to the adjoining settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and that sufficient separation would remain between the new development and Fyfield.  The Development Template requires developers to undertake a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to inform site design, layout, capacity and mitigation.
1095256	Mrs Clothier			Coalescence between existing villages and disproportionate scale		
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb			Community	Concern raised to the impact that the allocation at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would have on the sense of community in Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.	Noted. One of the key objectives set out in Appendix A: Site Development Templates is the need for the allocation to deliver a sustainable urban extension to Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor that is integrated with the village, whilst respecting the local character and distinctiveness of the existing village.
1096823	Dr Kate Shirley-Quirk			Cumulative impact from allocations in Abingdon and Oxford-Fringe Sub-Area	A few comments raised concerns with the cumulative impact of development in the Abingdon and Oxford-Fringe Sub-Area. For example the allocation at Dalton Barrack for up to 1,200 dwellings and the Local Plan	

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096836	Jose Luis Alvarez Bernal				2031 Part 1 allocation at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor for 280 dwellings. The cumulative impacts of these development will harm the rural character and impact on the highway network e.g. A420.	
1024194	Ms Louise Dale Defence Infrastructure Safeguarding			Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Safeguarding Consultation Zones	Defence Infrastructure Organisation commented that the allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor lies within the statutory 91.4m aerodrome height safeguarding consultation zone surrounding RAF Brize Norton and within the statutory birdstrike safeguarding consultation zones.  The DIO would need to be consulted on any SuDS schemes or development, including the creation of balancing ponds. Types of development may have the potential to attract flocking bird species that are a hazard to air traffic safety.	Comment acknowledged. The council will work with DIO to ensure the appropriate actions are taken.
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves			Employment and Community Services and Facilities	Comment raised concerns that the village has no local employment opportunities or community services and facilities e.g. shops.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper  The site is relatively well related to a wide range of employment opportunities, both locally, and across the Sub-Area with good public transport links, particularly between Swindon and Oxford, with further opportunities to enhance the service between Witney and Abingdon-on-Thames
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves			Existing infrastructure	A number of comments raised concerns with the existing infrastructure in the village. Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic and congestion on the A420</li> <li>• Public transport - bus service to local towns e.g. Abingdon and Witney</li> <li>• Medical and health facilities</li> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Community services and facilities</li> </ul>	The council will work with the relevant stakeholders to plan for infrastructure and facilities. Development on the proposed allocations will be supported by a masterplanning process involving the community, local planning authority, developer and other stakeholders. Subject to viability testing, development will be required to deliver the appropriate improvements and work with the relevant stakeholders, including on utilities, access and highways, social and community, environmental health and flood risk.  The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template.
1097450	Jeremy and Edel Roche					
1095753	John & Patricia Healey					
1094354	Keith Budgen					
1095746	Mr John					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095750	Campbell Mr Julian Mellor					
1098018	Mrs Cox					
1096320	Mrs Janet Fraser					
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					
1095872	Sherry Howard					
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall			Flooding	Comment raised a concern with the impact the allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would have on flooding on the eastern side of the Parish.	The council note these comments. Core Policy 42 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Site Development Templates to support Local Plan 2031 Part 2 ensure that developers submit a Flood Risk Assessment in liaison with Environment Agency to support a planning application. Core Policy 42 will apply to all new development proposals to ensure that flood risk is adequately addressed.
1095818	Alison Varney			Flooding - Digging Lane	Comments raised concerns with historic flooding on Digging Lane. The allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor will result in more and prolonged flooding to existing resident's property as natural watercourse is through adjacent low lying land	The council note these comments. Core Policy 42 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Site Development Templates to support Local Plan 2031 Part 2 ensure that developers submit a Flood Risk Assessment in liaison with Environment Agency to support a planning application. Core Policy 42 will apply to all new development proposals to ensure that flood risk is adequately addressed.
1095962	Graham Varney					
1095746	Mr John Campbell			Flooding and Drainage	Comment raised concerns with drainage, sewerage and flooding associated with the proposed allocation as East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.	The council note these comments. Core Policy 42 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Site Development Templates to support Local Plan 2031 Part 2 ensure that developers submit a Flood Risk Assessment in liaison with Environment Agency to support a planning application. Core Policy 42 will apply to all new development proposals to ensure that flood risk is adequately addressed.
1095981	Mrs Burley			Grade 2 agricultural land	Comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation is located on Grade 2 agricultural land.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper
1096223	Nigel Carter				Key issues raised included:	
1098014	Phyllis Corke				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of farmland for food production</li> <li>• New housing allocations should be located on worst agricultural land</li> <li>• The importance of hedgerow trees and plans to minimise pollution</li> <li>• The importance of trees for productive and amenity uses</li> </ul>	

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb			Impact on Conservation Area	Comment raised a concern to the impact the allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would have on the conservation area.	Local Plan Part 2 should be read as a whole and contains policies relating to heritage. Please see DP35, DP36, DP37. Please also see CP39 (LPP1), which sets a framework to ensure proposals conserve and enhance heritage assets in accordance with national policy and legislation.
1096030	Anna Biswas Gladwin			Impact on Fyfield	A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation would have an impact on the community of Fyfield.	The council acknowledges all of the comments regarding the impact on Fyfield. The Council have undertaken a robust assessment of sites including identification of constraints.
1096032	Jai Biswas Gladwin					
1096029	Maya Biswas Gladwin					
1096025	Polly Biswas Gladwin					
1096027	Sumit Biswas					
1096699	Joan & Geoff Prichard			Impact on health and well-being of community	Comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation would increase light pollution and harm the open countryside that is important to the communities' health and well-being.	The impact of proposals on the open countryside and from light pollution will be effectively minimised through good design and by protecting landscapes. Development Policy 21, within the proposed Local Plan Part 2, sets out measures to ensure that development involving external lighting is appropriately designed and located. The council will expect applicants to demonstrate, through preparation of a lighting strategy that they have appropriately considered the design of their scheme, in accordance with Development Policy 20.
1096700	MJ Watson					
1096693	Roy & Margaret Goodey					
1096696	Sheila & Bruce Harris					
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	Impact on heritage	The assessment and inclusion of this site as an allocation, in comparison with the decision reached in respect of our clients land at East Hanney, highlights the substantial discrepancy in the evaluation and assessment procedure followed by the LPA. This is because the harm to the setting of the Grade II* listed Kingston Bagpuize House, and consequently to the Conservation Area have not been assessed satisfactorily.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper  The potential impact on Kingston Bagpuize House and opportunities for mitigating this impact have been considered, including consultation with the Councils Conservation Officer.
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall			Impact on landscape and biodiversity	Comment raised concerns that the proposed allocation is located on Grade 2 agricultural land which is important for local biodiversity, and the impact development has had on the environment for 280 dwellings at Orchard Gate.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095818	Alison Varney			Infrastructure	A number of comments raised concerns that the developer may not fund/contribute towards the provision of infrastructure associated with the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.  The allocation will be built late in the development period which may place a burden on the infrastructure for existing residents.	The council will work with the relevant stakeholders to plan for infrastructure and facilities. Development on the proposed allocations will be supported by a masterplanning process involving the community, local planning authority, developer and other stakeholders. Subject to viability testing, development will be required to deliver the appropriate improvements and work with the relevant stakeholders, including on utilities, access and highways, social and community, environmental health and flood risk.  The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template.
1095962	Graham Varney					
1097450	Jeremy and Edel Roche					
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves			Infrastructure - A420	A number of comments raised concerns that the A420 is inadequate to support this development for local residents and existing commuters.  Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional traffic and access roads would have an adverse effect on environmental health, noise and light pollution.</li> <li>• The proposed roundabout on A420 between Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize will</li> <li>• increase delays and cause further capacity issues on the A420.</li> <li>• The A420 is unsafe to cross for pedestrians.</li> <li>• The proposed roundabout could be perceived to unlock development to the rear of Fyfield linking to the Appleton / Longworth Road.</li> </ul>	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper  The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.  The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to highways/ access and public transport.
1095037	Christopher Smith					
1096657	Mr Newman					
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop					
1098018	Mrs Cox					
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					
730184	Councillor Yvonne Constance Councillor Vale of White Horse District Council			Infrastructure - A420 and A415	A number of comments raised concerns that the allocation at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor may put greater pressure on the A420 and A415.  Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional 600 dwellings will generate more cars that need to travel to work as there are limited opportunities for local employment</li> <li>• Impact that traffic from this site would have on congested roads at capacity at peak times, for example the merger of A415 with A420.</li> </ul>	
1094354	Keith Budgen					
1095750	Mr Julian Mellor					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No plans to increase the capacity for traffic on A420</li> <li>What are the estimated cost for proposed new roundabout on A420.</li> <li>The proposed relief road east of the site serve as no more than an access road to houses on the site adding only congestion to the A420 and to A415.</li> </ul>	
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop			Infrastructure - A420 and A415 and Route 66 Bus Service	<p>Comment raised concerns that the area offers few opportunities for local employment and people will need to commute to employment where there is a lack of public transport.</p> <p>The A420 has one regular bus service - Route 66 - that provides a reasonable daytime service between Oxford and Swindon. The single service cannot cope with the scale of development.</p> <p>Residents commuting to local business parks, schools, college, Science Vale, Didcot railway station or towns such as Abingdon, Didcot, Wantage and Witney will use private cars, placing a strain on the highway network e.g. A420 and A415.</p>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to highways/ access and public transport.</p>
1094959	Amanda Smith			Infrastructure - A420 and Oxford City un-met housing needs	<p>Comment raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor can not help the needs of Oxford City. A420 is also a dangerous road.</p>	<p>The Council does not identify the site as specifically contributing to unmet housing needs of Oxford.</p>
1095746	Mr John Campbell			Infrastructure - A420 and Public transport	<p>Comment raised concern with congestion into Frilford from Kingston Bagpuize and into Marcham.</p> <p>Traffic congestion will get worse from lorries and cars and journey times will increase.</p> <p>Increasing air, noise and light pollution.</p> <p>Public transport links will not support the scale of development.</p> <p>More accidents on dangerous roads and junctions e.g. A420.</p>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to highways/ access and public transport.</p>
1095325	Mr Brian Buchan			Infrastructure - A420 and Public Transport - Route 66 Bus Service	<p>Comment raised concerns with the lack of public transport for current residents of Fyfield or Kingston Bagpuize.</p> <p>Few places of work are in the centre of Oxford and most commute by car.</p> <p>The allocation is distant from the areas where new employment is targeted.</p> <p>Difficult to join the A420, the route out of Fyfield is</p>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					always via Appleton and Cumnor. Too dangerous to cross the A420 at peak times.	relation to highways/ access and public transport.
730184	Councillor Yvonne Constance Councillor Vale of White Horse District Council			Infrastructure - A420 Corridor	<p>Comment raised concerns with the current status of the A420 Corridor, in particular the scale of development and the impact of traffic at peak times.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals ignores the cumulative impact of development on the A420 corridor from the Eastern Villages at Swindon.</li> <li>Vale of White Horse District Council has already approved plans to build 3,000 houses in towns and villages along the A420.</li> <li>Proposal does not present estimates of traffic from this proposed allocation</li> <li>Has proposals for 2 new roundabouts to provide a relief road been accurately costed?</li> <li>500 houses was insufficient to fund one roundabout on A420 at Highworth Rd, Shrivenham</li> <li>A420 roundabout at northern point of the dual carriageway at Kingston Bagpuize will add serious congestion.</li> <li>Increased traffic will not make the site accessible to the City of Oxford.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to highways/ access and public transport.</p>
1098730	Cllr Howell			Infrastructure - A420 Corridor and Western Vale Villages	<p>Comments raised concerns with the current status of the A420 Corridor, in particular the scale of development and the impact of traffic at peak times.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals ignores the cumulative impact of development on the A420 corridor from the Eastern Villages at Swindon.</li> <li>Vale of White Horse District Council has already approved plans to build 3,000 houses in towns and villages along the A420.</li> <li>Proposal does not present estimates of traffic from this proposed allocation</li> <li>Has proposals for 2 new roundabouts to provide a relief road been accurately costed?</li> <li>500 houses was insufficient to fund one roundabout on A420 at Highworth Rd, Shrivenham</li> <li>A420 roundabout at northern point of the dual carriageway at Kingston Bagpuize will add serious congestion.</li> <li>Increased traffic will not make the site accessible to</li> </ul>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to highways/ access and public transport.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					the City of Oxford.	
1095959	Professor Burley			Infrastructure - A420, A415; A338 and Abingdon/ Faringdon Road through Tubney	Comment raised concerns with the short-term and long-term effects of increased traffic on the highway network. Particularly the A420, A415 and A338 and the Abingdon/Faringdon Road through Tubney.	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to highways/ access and public transport.</p>
1096657	Mr Newman			Infrastructure - A420/A415 junction; A420; A415/A34 Marcham Interchange; A415 Frilford Heath Interchange	<p>Comment raised concerns that an assessment should be undertaken to assess traffic noise, traffic pollution and traffic forecasting for the following scenarios:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A420/A415 junction</li> <li>2) A420 including the A34 Botley Road</li> <li>3) A415/A34 Marcham Interchange</li> <li>4) A415 Frilford Heath Interchange.</li> </ol> <p>The A420 should be recommended for Quiet Road Surfacing, and should be resurfaced from the new junction to Tubney and beyond.</p>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to highways/ access and public transport.</p>
1096320 1095981 1095959	Mrs Janet Fraser Mrs Burley Professor Burley			Infrastructure - Crossing the A420	<p>A number of comments raised concerns with the current position of crossing and accessing onto the A420.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The difficulty of crossing the road at peak times prevents people from using the local bus service to Oxford on the A420.</li> <li>• Some residents have taken the bus into Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor to avoid crossing the road.</li> <li>• The proposed allocation will make local residents more isolated as they will be unable to cross the road safely.</li> <li>• Cars can travel up to 80 mph on 50 mph roads.</li> <li>• Some have experienced several accidents while entering or leaving premises on to the A420. 1 fatality from walking across the A420.</li> <li>• Planning for development in the area must involve plans for road systems that are in conjunction with national, country and district plans.</li> <li>• Traffic islands, pedesdrian bridges and tunnels must be considered.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to highways/ access and public transport.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A420 should be established as a dual carriageway with appropriate slip roads.</li> </ul>	
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall			Objection - Highway impact	<p>Comment raised concerns with highway impact associated with the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved crossings of the River Thames would allow improvements to A415 to A40 at Witney.</li> <li>New roundabout will provide a HGV lay-by, petrol station and shop.</li> <li>Nearest existing property lies 197 metres from this junction. New roundabout will lie 420 metres from properties at Digging Lane, main entry point to Fyfield and Netherton.</li> <li>Rat-running through Fyfield, Netherton and Tubney</li> </ul>	
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves			Infrastructure - Education	A number of comments raised concerns that local schools are currently over capacity and there is no secondary school in the area.	The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to education. This would either consist of provision of a new school on site or contributions to expanding the existing school.
1097450	Jeremy and Edel Roche					
1096223	Nigel Carter					
1095325	Mr Brian Buchan			Infrastructure - Education and Health Care facilities	Comment raised concerns that the proposed allocation does not adequately plan for education or medical facilities.	The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to education. This would either consist of provision of a new

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves			Infrastructure - Health care facilities	A number of comments raised concerns that there are no medical or health facilities in the villages of Fyfield, Tubney, Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and neighbouring villages.	school on site or contributions to expanding the existing school.  Contributions will be made towards increased capacity of health care facilities.
1097450	Jeremy and Edel Roche					
1095981	Mrs Burley					
1096223	Nigel Carter					
1095981	Mrs Burley			Infrastructure - Water and wastewater	Comment raised a concern that cumulative impact of development in the Part 1 and Part 2 plan would place a strain on wastewater infrastructure.	The Council has consulted with Thames Water and incorporated requirements to the Development Template to ensure adequate and appropriate infrastructure is delivered.
1097450	Jeremy and Edel Roche			Infrastructure provision	Comment raised concerns that the proposed allocation should be supported by greater detail of how basic infrastructure and services will be provided.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper.  The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template.
1095818	Alison Varney			Isolated community	A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is isolated from Fyfield by the A420 and Kingston Bagpuize by the A415. This would create an isolated community distant from Oxford.	The Council does not identify the site as specifically contributing to unmet housing needs of Oxford.  The site is adjacent to and will be fully integrated with the Larger Village of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.
1095962	Graham Varney					
1095983	Mr David MacElvogue					
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited	Miss Naomi Hubbard	722921	Kingstone Bagpuize with Southmoor: Air Quality Assessment	The proposed development is located adjacent to the A420 and A415 Abingdon Road, which are sources of the key traffic-related air pollutants. Results show that NO2 and PM10 concentrations will not exceed national air quality objectives at either the proposed development or existing receptor locations	Noted.
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb			Landscape and biodiversity impact	A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor will impact on the natural environment and landscape character.  Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Habitat loss - the area is home to Brown Hares that are a Priority Species set out in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan</li> <li>Recreational pressure would create loss or disturbance of habitat and local biodiversity</li> </ul>	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper  The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of landscape impact, landscape character, and Habitats Regulations Assessment. Preparation of the plan has also been carried out in consultation with County and District ecologists.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed allocation would impact on the views of the North Wessex Downs and the Vale.</li> </ul>		
1098018	Mrs Cox			Objection - Impacts on biodiversity	Comment raised concerns that the proposed allocation would remove or disturb local biodiversity.		
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves			Landscape character and visual impact	A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would harm the heritage and landscape character of the Corallian Ridge.	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of landscape impact, landscape character, and Habitats Regulations Assessment. Preparation of the plan has also been carried out in consultation with County and District ecologists.</p>	
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb						
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452				
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop			Objection - Landscape and visual impact	<p>Comment raised doubts that the proposed allocation can be delivered in the short to medium term and meet the housing need.</p> <p>Housing need and targets are overriding the impact the allocation would have on the landscape and neighbouring communities.</p>		
1097839	Nick Tucker			Objection - Landscape character and visual impact; disproportionate scale	A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is of a scale that is disproportionate to the existing village and neighbouring settlements, would harm the rural and distinctive character of Fyfield and would result in the loss of open countryside and agricultural land.		
1097845	Sally Tucker						
1096823	Dr Kate Shirley-Quirk						
1096836	Jose Luis Alvarez Bernal						
1096030	Anna Biswas Gladwin			Landscape character and visual impact - Corallian Ridge and the Ridgeway; Crossing of the A420	<p>A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would harm the landscape character and heritage of the Corallian Ridge, the Ridgeway and the openness between the villages of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield.</p> <p>Crossing the A420 was also raised as a concern.</p>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of landscape impact, landscape character, and Habitats Regulations Assessment. Preparation of the plan has also been carried out in consultation with County and District ecologists.</p>	
1096032	Jai Biswas Gladwin						
1096029	Maya Biswas Gladwin						
1096025	Polly Biswas Gladwin						
1096027	Sumit Biswas						

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096719	Alastair Lambie			Landscape character and visual impact on Fyfield	<p>Comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation is located on Grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>Key issues raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of farmland for food production</li> <li>• New housing allocations should be located on worst agricultural land</li> <li>• The importance of hedgerow trees and plans to minimise pollution</li> <li>• The importance of trees for productive and amenity uses.</li> </ul>	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper
1096823	Dr Kate Shirley-Quirk			Light pollution - Abingdon Road through Tubney	A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, and a new roundabout access onto the A420 would affect light levels.	The impact of proposals on the open countryside and from light pollution will be effectively minimised through good design and by protecting landscapes. Development Policy 21, within the proposed Local Plan Part 2, sets out measures to ensure that development involving external lighting is appropriately designed and located. The council will expect applicants to demonstrate, through preparation of a lighting strategy that they have appropriately considered the design of their scheme, in accordance with Development Policy 20.
1096836	Jose Luis Alvarez Bernal					
1096719	Alastair Lambie			Local employment opportunities	A number of comments raised concern that the area offers limited opportunities for local employment. The proposed housing allocation will encourage people to travel to distant places of work such as Abingdon, Swindon, Oxford, Witney and Harwell Campus or beyond which is not sustainable.	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site is relatively well related to a wide range of employment opportunities, both locally, and across the Sub-Area with good public transport links, particularly between Swindon and Oxford, with further opportunities to enhance the service between Witney and Abingdon-on-Thames</p>
1095818	Alison Varney					
1095962	Graham Varney					
1095951	Meriel Baker					
1095746	Mr John Campbell					
1096320	Mrs Janet Fraser					
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					
1096719	Alastair Lambie			Objection	<p>A large number of comments provided general objections to the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</p> <p>The key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recent survey of parishioners by the Parish Council, 89 households (more than half) responded. All, covering 154 adults, were against the proposed development.</li> <li>• Proposed allocation is justified on an unsound,</li> </ul>	<p>All of the objections and comments have been read and considered.</p> <p>The comments have been addressed in relation to specific points as explained in other parts of this appendix table.</p>
1095818	Alison Varney					
1096030	Anna Biswas Gladwin					
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1098381	David & Martina McNulty				<p>selective and biased evidence base.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of development is destroying the rural character and heritage of the area</li> <li>• Coalescence between existing villages e.g. Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</li> <li>• The need for housing to meet Oxford City's un-met need has not been made explicitly.</li> <li>• Limited opportunities for local employment in the area.</li> <li>• Unsustainable development and incompatible with the Local Plan's Spatial Strategy.</li> <li>• Existing companies are finding it difficult to attract and retain qualified staff, problem will be exacerbated if Swindon, Reading, Oxford and Cambridge plans proceed.</li> <li>• The allocation lies within the parish of Fyfield.</li> <li>• Moving the A415/A420 junction will enable further expansion of new developments into the fields adjacent to the A420.</li> <li>• It is currently unsafe to cross the A420.</li> <li>• A420 and A415 are under pressure during peak times, requires time to exit Fyfield onto the A420 and is unsafe to turn west.</li> <li>• Increased traffic onto the A420 will cause more use of Nethererton and Fyfield as a rat run during busy periods.</li> <li>• Noise and light pollution will be made significantly worse, in particular lighting from the new junctions.</li> <li>• Local amenities such as drainage would not be able to cope with the scale of development.</li> <li>• No community facilities and services e.g. schools.</li> <li>• Lack of medical facilities in the area.</li> <li>• The proposed allocation is inconsistent with current and emerging local policy and objectives including the Settlement Hierarchy.</li> </ul>	
1094681	Derek Evans					
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council					
1097610	Emma Atamney					
1095962	Graham Varney					
1096032	Jai Biswas Gladwin					
1098023	Janine Elton					
1096806	Jason Hemmings					
1096699	Joan & Geoff Prichard					
1095753	John & Patricia Healey					
1096249	M Huggins					
1095947	Maria Cruttenden					
1098254	Martha Kibaris					
1096029	Maya Biswas Gladwin					
1095951	Meriel Baker					
1096700	MJ Watson					
1095258	Mr Cox					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096657	Mr Newman					
1095983	Mr David MacElvogue					
1095750	Mr Julian Mellor					
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					
1071740	Mr Richard Clothier					
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall					
1095981	Mrs Burley					
1098018	Mrs Cox					
1095711	Mrs Anne Walton					
1094699	Mrs Nicola Williams					
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					
1096223	Nigel Carter					
1096025	Polly Biswas Gladwin					
1095959	Professor Burley					
1096310	Robin Smith					
1096693	Roy & Margaret Goodey					
1096814	Sandra					
1096696	Sheila & Bruce					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096027	Harris					
1096251	Sumit Biswas					
	Susan Hargreaves-Jones					
1095951	Meriel Baker			Objection - Air and Light pollution in Fyfield	Comment raised an objection that the allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and the proposed roundabout will increase pollution and emissions from lorries and cause light pollution.	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of transport impacts and was prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template including in relation to highways/ access and public transport.</p> <p>The impact of proposals on the open countryside and from light pollution will be effectively minimised through good design and by protecting landscapes. Development Policy 21, within the proposed Local Plan Part 2, sets out measures to ensure that development involving external lighting is appropriately designed and located. The council will expect applicants to demonstrate, through preparation of a lighting strategy that they have appropriately considered the design of their scheme, in accordance with Development Policy 20.</p>
1095983	Mr David MacElvogue			Objection - Coalescence between existing settlements	<p>A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation will cause urbanisation into the countryside harming the rural character and local distinctiveness and reducing the gap of open countryside between Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will also impact on the rural nature of the Corallian Ridge.</p> <p>Expanding development east between Fyfield and Tubney will further increase sprawl.</p>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence including an assessment of landscape impact, landscape character, and Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p>
1098028	Mr James Holmes					
1095746	Mr John Campbell					
1097547	Sarah Daley					
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves			Objection - Coalescence between existing villages	<p>A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation will cause urbanisation into the countryside harming the rural character and local distinctiveness and reducing the gap of open countryside between Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will also impact on the rural nature of the Corallian Ridge.</p> <p>Expanding development east between Fyfield and Tubney will further increase sprawl with significant loss</p>	
1094354	Keith Budgen					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					of open countryside.	
1095325	Mr Brian Buchan			Objection - Consultation with Parish Council	Comment raised a concern that Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council were not consulted on the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.	Noted. The Council has undertaken an extensive consultation programme in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (2016).
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves			Objection – Disproportionate scale	A number of comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is of a scale that is disproportionate to the existing village of Fyfield, Fyfield Wick, Tubney and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper
730184	Councillor Yvonne Constance Councillor Vale of White Horse District Council					
1095037	Christopher Smith					
1095798	Dimitrios & Gail Hatzis					
1097450	Jeremy and Edel Roche					
1095753	John & Patricia Healey					
1094354	Keith Budgen					
1095947	Maria Cruttenden					
1098254	Martha Kibaris					
1098028	Mr James Holmes					
1095746	Mr John Campbell					
1095750	Mr Julian Mellor					
1098018	Mrs Cox					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					
1097499	Robert Williams					
1098018	Mrs Cox			Objection - Public Transport connectivity	Comment raised a concern that there is a lack of connectivity to public transport in the village.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
1094959	Amanda Smith			Objection - Settlement Hierarchy	<p>A few comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is of a scale that is disproportionate to the village. Fyfield has limited community services and facilities, for example and church and a pub.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is located within Fyfield which is stated in Core Policy 3 as being in open countryside. The selection of this site is not consistent with Core Policy 3 and relevant policies in the Local Plan 2031.</p> <p>Site is within open countryside and would only become a natural extension to Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor as a result of recently granted planning permission from 280 dwellings to the east of the village.</p>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop					
1095951	Meriel Baker			Objection - Site Selection	<p>A number of comments raised objections to the methodology of selecting the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The allocation is outside the settlement area of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, is unsustainable and contrary to local policy and the core principles of sustainable development set out in the NPPF.</li> <li>• Site is in open countryside and would lead to loss of gap between settlements contrary to local policy.</li> <li>• Site is located on Grade 2 agricultural land</li> <li>• Proposal is in conflict with local policy - CP4, CP3 and DC11 in Local Plan 2011 and national policy.</li> <li>• Proposed allocation is located within the Corallian Ridge protected by Saved Policy NE7 of the Local Plan 2011.</li> <li>• Proposed allocation is contrary to Saved Policy NE10 and emerging Development Policy 28 in the draft Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop					
1095983	Mr David MacElvogue					
1075705	Mr Graham Thomson					
1095746	Mr John Campbell					
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed allocation is contrary to policies DC9 and DC10 of the Local Plan 2011.</li> <li>Biased and impartial analysis of sites are presented in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</li> <li>Inadequate heritage response to the significant harm which can be expected to be caused to the Grade II* countryhouse.harm to the listed building, and consequently to the Conservation Area have not been assessed satisfactorily. Harm to a Grade II* building carries greater weight than that to a Grade II listed building or to a Conservation Area (Framework paragraph 132).</li> </ul>	
1096699	Joan & Geoff Prichard			Objection - Sustainable Development	<p>A number of comments raise concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is unsustainable.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed allocation is not compliant with national and local policy (Local Plan 2031 Part 1). It is contrary to the Strategic Objectives SO3, SO8 &amp; SO9 of the Part 1 Plan in directing growth to sustainable locations,</li> <li>The proposed allocation will be distant from existing shops and facilities and will encourage people to travel by car to Southmoor and Frilford to meet day to day needs.</li> <li>Proposed allocation does not provide sustainable public transport for residents.</li> <li>The proposed allocation will reduce the gap between Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield.</li> <li>Proposed allocation will create a dormitory conurbation to Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
1096700	MJ Watson					
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop					
1095983	Mr David MacElvogue					
1096693	Roy & Margaret Goodey					
1096696	Sheila & Bruce Harris					
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop			Objection - Viability	<p>Comment raised a concern that the proposed allocation is not sufficiently viable to sustain the infrastructure necessary to support development.</p>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The site selection process has been informed by detailed technical evidence.</p> <p>The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken a Viability Study to support the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. The Study concluded that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is viable, having considered policy and infrastructure requirements.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096719	Alastair Lambie			Objection - Within the Parish of Fyfield	A large number of comments objected to the proposed allocation being named as East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor as it is located within the Parish of Fyfield.	Noted. The Council will ensure that the Publication Version of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 makes appropriate reference to the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor being located within the Parish of Fyfield and Tubney.
1094354	Keith Budgen					
1095951	Meriel Baker					
1095746	Mr John Campbell					
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council	<p>A number of comments raise concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is unsustainable.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed allocation is not compliant with national and local policy (Local Plan 2031 Part 1). It is contrary to the Strategic Objectives SO3, SO8 &amp; SO9 of the Part 1 Plan in directing growth to sustainable locations,</li> <li>• The proposed allocation will be distant from existing shops and facilities and will encourage people to travel by car to Southmoor and Frilford to meet day to day needs.</li> <li>• Proposed allocation does not provide sustainable public transport for residents.</li> <li>• The proposed allocation will reduce the gap between Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield.</li> <li>• Proposed allocation will create a dormitory conurbation to Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise an objection to the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize as the assessment of the site is contrary to the emerging Development Policy 28: Settlement Character and Gaps, Saved Policy NE10 of the Local Plan 2011 and the Strategic Objectives of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</p> <p>Proposed allocation is located on agricultural land. The plan makes no analysis of the sustainability of building</p>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<p>on this land.</p> <p>The proposed allocation would reduce the gap between Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor. Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise an objection that the evidence base supporting the proposed allocation in the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 is consider unsound, selective and biased.</p>	
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Education	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is unsustainable.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Place a burden on existing infrastructure such as schools</li> <li>• The proposed allocation is not compliant with national and local policy (Local Plan 2031 Part 1). It is contrary to the Strategic Objectives SO3, SO8 &amp; SO9 of the Part 1 Plan in directing growth to sustainable locations,</li> <li>• Expansion of existing primary school would be inadequate to support the scale of new development proposed.</li> <li>• Question funding for a new school and contributions towards funding land for off-site secondary school and SEN capacity at same time as making space for the by-pass and proposed roundabouts.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Employment	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise the following objections to the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor in relation to employment:</p> <p>Generate increased traffic to key employment sites at Oxford, Swindon, Harwell and London via distant rail links.</p> <p>A420 is at capacity, proposed allocation will increase traffic congestion and pollution.</p>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Heritage and Landscape	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise the following objections to the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor in relation to heritage and landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the strategic gap between Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</li> <li>• Fyfield is located in attractive open countryside along the North Vale Corallian Ridge. The core of the built up area is the conservation area. Buildings date back to the medieval area.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over a kilometre of open countryside between Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</li> <li>Proposed allocation is disproportionate to the scale of the present village and not in keeping with the historic and rural character</li> </ul>	
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Housing Needs	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise concerns that this allocation is not needed to meet the Council's total housing requirement.	Noted.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Impact on Fyfield village	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise the following objections the impact of the proposed allocation on Fyfield village:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed allocation at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is located within the Parish of Fyfield and Tubney and not Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor</li> <li>Fyfield and Tubney is a small historic settlement – the proposed allocation is of a scale that is disproportionate to the village.</li> <li>Proposed allocation is unsustainable and will become an isolated dormitory separate from the village and occupied by commuters.</li> <li>Proposed roundabout will bring light pollution. Disproportionate effect on traffic noise and air pollution associated with HGVs – no mention of this in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</li> <li>Proposed allocation is distant from the rural nature of the existing village and to the Corallian Ridge.</li> <li>Difficult to exit the village at peak times or cross the A420 safely.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Infrastructure	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise the following objections to the proposed allocation in relation to infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed allocation is unsustainable and will become an isolated dormitory separate from the village and occupied by commuters.</li> <li>Inappropriate to meeting housing needs – minimal community services and facilities e.g. medical facilities, schools, shops and minimal employment opportunities.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Landscape Capacity Study	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise objections to the analysis in the Landscape Capacity Study.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<p>Key issues raised on the Study include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ignores the site's position in the heart of the Corallian Ridge.</li> <li>• Claims consistency with settlement pattern of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor but ignores inconsistency with the parish.</li> <li>• Claims that the effective gap between Fyfield and the next settlement ends at the A420 (300m) rather than Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (more than 1km)</li> <li>• Ignores the views over the Lowland Vale to the Downs</li> <li>• Ignores proximity to Fyfield Conservation Area</li> <li>• Understates the distinctiveness of the site.</li> <li>• Under estimates the rural and agricultural impact of the site on people using the bridleway.</li> </ul>	
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Oxford City un-met housing needs	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise a concern that the proposed allocation was ruled out by the Oxfordshire Growth Board on the grounds that it was distant from Oxford and the existing highway infrastructure is inadequate.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal notes that the site is relatively distant from Oxford and the Science Vale that is absent from the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Settlement Hierarchy	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is of a scale that is disproportionate to the village. Fyfield has limited community services and facilities, for example and church and a pub.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is located within Fyfield which is stated in Core Policy 3 as being in open countryside. The selection of this site is not consistent with Core Policy 3 and relevant policies in the Local Plan 2031.</p> <p>Site is within open countryside and would only become a natural extension to Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor as a result of recently granted planning permission for 280 dwellings to the east of the village.</p> <p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise the following objections in relation to the settlement hierarchy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is located within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney.</li> <li>• The Council give the impression that the site is more or less a natural extension of the sustainable larger village of Kingston Bagpuize with</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<p>Southmoor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are two isolated house outside the built up area of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor bordering the site.</li> </ul>	
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Site Selection	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raised the following objections to the methodology of selecting the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation is outside the settlement area of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, is unsustainable and contrary to local policy and the core principles of sustainable development set out in the NPPF.</li> <li>Site is in open countryside and would lead to loss of gap between settlements contrary to local policy.</li> <li>Proposed allocation is located within the Corallian Ridge protected by Saved Policy NE7 of the Local Plan 2011.</li> <li>Proposed allocation is contrary to Saved Policy NE10 and emerging Development Policy 28 in the draft Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</li> <li>Absence of saved policy NE7 North Vale Corallian Ridge in the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Sustainable Development	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise the following objections to the proposed allocation in relation to infrastructure:</p> <p>Proposed allocation is unsustainable and will become an isolated dormitory separate from the village and occupied by commuters.</p> <p>Inappropriate to meeting housing needs – minimal community services and facilities e.g. medical facilities, schools, shops and minimal employment opportunities.</p>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			Objection from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council - Transport Infrastructure	<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council raise the following concerns with the existing highway network and infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Congestion on the A420 to Oxford at peak hours</li> <li>A415 to Abingdon and the south, and north to Witney are constrained at peak times.</li> <li>Oxfordshire County Council has identified the A420/A415 roundabout as exceeding its capacity.</li> <li>In Tubney, A420 runs through an historic built area.</li> <li>Proposed new roundabout would cause additional</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					delays.	
730263	Mr David Groves Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council			Objection from Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council	<p>Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council object to the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</p> <p>Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council raise the following concerns with the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor in relation to impacts on the highway network</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion on the A420/A415 roundabout</li> <li>• Traffic calming measures along Faringdon Road and crossings on Witney Road should be implemented.</li> <li>• Faringdon Road should include crossings and road restrictions e.g. 20mph speeds, entry/exit rumble strips.</li> <li>• Between the current A420 roundabout and the new bypass traffic restrictions should be in place for those coming into the village, particularly heavy vehicles.</li> <li>• Route 66 bus service is caught in traffic at peak times along the A420 and only serves the route from Swindon to Oxford.</li> <li>• Route 15 bus service from Witney to Abingdon is supported by s106 contributions but can be withdrawn by operator if it fails to make a profit.</li> <li>• A420 Swindon to Oxford and A415 Witney to Abingdon lack a transport strategy to cope with current and future growth.</li> <li>• Full details on planning and funding of the bypass re-routing the A415 should be secured.</li> <li>• Condition should be placed to ensure that it is constructed and in use before any houses are built.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730263	Mr David Groves Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council			Objection from Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council - Disproportionate	<p>Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council raise concerns with the scale of development that has occurred within the parish over the last 5 years.</p> <p>Represents a 70% increase in housing with minimal improvements to infrastructure and facilities.</p> <p>Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor has lost or is losing facilities including two public houses and bus services.</p> <p>The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor represents a significant contribution to Oxford City's un-met need.</p>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					Gross extension of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor to the east to become continuous with the separate settlement of Fyfield. It is a disproportionate expansion of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor which is contrary to the Plan's Spatial Strategy.	
730263	Mr David Groves Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council			Objection from Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council - Infrastructure	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council raise a concern that the foul drainage infrastructure will be unable to cope with the proposed scale of development.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730263	Mr David Groves Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council			Objection from Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council - Settlement Hierarchy	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council raise concerns that the proposed allocation is located within the parish of Fyfield.  Fyfield is categorised as open countryside under Core Policy 3 and therefore development will not be appropriate unless specifically supported by other policies.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730263	Mr David Groves Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council			Objection from Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council - Site Selection	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council raise an objection to the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize as the assessment of the site is contrary to the emerging Development Policy 28: Settlement Character and Gaps, Saved Policy NE10 of the Local Plan 2011 and the Strategic Objectives of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.  Proposed allocation is located on agricultural land. The plan makes no analysis of the sustainability of building on this land.  The proposed allocation would reduce the gap between Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
730263	Mr David Groves Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council			Objection from Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council - Transport Infrastructure	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council raise the following concerns with the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor in relation to impacts on the highway network  Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion on the A420/A415 roundabout</li> <li>• Traffic calming measures along Faringdon Road and crossings on Witney Road should be implemented.</li> <li>• Faringdon Road should include crossings and road restrictions e.g. 20mph speeds, entry/exit rumble strips.</li> <li>• Between the current A420 roundabout and the new bypass traffic restrictions should be in place for</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					<p>those coming into the village, particularly heavy vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Route 66 bus service is caught in traffic at peak times along the A420 and only serves the route from Swindon to Oxford.</li> <li>Route 15 bus service from Witney to Abingdon is supported by s106 contributions but can be withdrawn by operator if it fails to make a profit.</li> <li>A420 Swindon to Oxford and A415 Witney to Abingdon lack a transport strategy to cope with current and future growth.</li> </ul>	
730263	Mr David Groves Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council			Objection from Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council – Unsound Site Selection	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council raise an objection that the evidence base supporting the proposed allocation in the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 is consider unsound, selective and biased.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
1094684	Catherine and Simon Hargreaves			Oxford City un-met housing need	<p>A few comments raised concerns that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bapuize with Southmoor would fail to meet Oxford City's un-met housing need as employment is in the eastern side of Oxford contributing to traffic problems.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is also unlikely to improve the supply of affordable housing for Oxford.</p> <p>The allocation is also distant from Science Vale and Oxford. The allocation at Dalton Barracks can accommodate the housing need without the additional sites in Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Marcham.</p>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					
1098730	Cllr Howell					
1097450	Jeremy and Edel Roche					
1096657	Mr Newman					
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall					
1095737	Mrs Tilley					
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council comment - Community Services and Facilities	A local centre will need to be provided on site to help reduce the need to travel by car to the site.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire			Oxfordshire County Council comment - Public Transport and A420 Corridor	Proposed allocation at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor could help to strengthen the business case for accelerating investment in remote Park and Ride/Rapid Transit services and to improve bus services	Noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	County Council				on the A420 corridor.	
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council comments - Accessibility	<p>Pedestrian and cycling infrastructure required on-site and off-site.</p> <p>Access to existing village amenities, access to local centre, shops and school from the existing village, and from dwellings within this site will need to be included.</p> <p>Infrastructure for pedestrian and cycle access to and from Fyfield will be required.</p>	Noted. The Council continues to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure the Development Templates reflect advice, as far as possible, from County officers.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council comments - Education	<p>Proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor needs to be considered in the context of significant scale of development permitted for Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</p> <p>Key issues raised by Oxfordshire County Council include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion of John Blandy to 2 form entry can be facilitated through acquisition of adjacent playing field owned by the Parish of relocation of adjacent pre-school into new accommodation elsewhere in the village.</li> <li>• Proposed allocation would trigger the need for a new school to be review at the planning application stage.</li> <li>• New school may not be sustainable depending on demographics, further expansion of John Blandy would be more appropriate.</li> <li>• Significant risk that cumulative housing growth in this area exceeds the potential capacity of John Blandy Primary School without making a new school sustainable</li> <li>• If a school is required, the development would be expected to fully fund, or directly deliver, a scale of primary school proportionate to its generation, which is likely to be 1 form entry (although this would need to be confirmed following full assessment of population generation).</li> <li>• This school would include nursery provision. The development would also be expected to contribute towards additional off-site secondary and SEN school capacity, as well as towards off-site primary and nursery school capacity if a new school is not triggered.</li> </ul> <p>Oxfordshire County Council are interested in the location of a potential future primary school on site, a bus service through the site and re-provision of lost laybys on the</p>	Noted. The Council continues to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure the Development Templates reflect advice, as far as possible, from County officers.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					A420.	
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council comments – Education – suggested ammendment to text	Appendix A - Site Development Template - Social and Community: delete "...in the Faringdon/Abingdon area or amend to "in the Faringdon/Botley/Abingdon area" to maximise flexibility for where additional second school capacity will be created.	Noted. The Council continues to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure the Development Templates reflect advice, as far as possible, from County officers.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council comments - Minerals and Waste	Geological mapping indicates site is underlain by deposits of soft sand and lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Policy M8) of submitted Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 Core Strategy.  Site is also located within the Corallian Ridge area from Oxford to Faringdon strategic resource area - a principal location for aggregate minerals extraction in Policy M3.  Uncertainty as to whether the mineral deposits within the site are of potential commercial interest for mineral working.  Likely that no objection will be made on minerals sterilisation grounds.	Noted.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council comments - Public Transport	Loss of layby provision should be addressed by the developer by providing comparable facilities on site or nearby.  Development should contribute towards bus service enhancements, including potential enhancements on Route 15 from Abingdon to Witney and the Route 66 from Swindon to Oxford.  School drop-off parking should be located so as not to impede the bus route.  Bus infrastructure including flags, poles and Real Time Information will be required.	Noted. The Council continues to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure the Development Templates reflect advice, as far as possible, from County officers.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council comments - Traffic	Access should be provided from A420 by a new roundabout.  Access should be provided from A415 by a new roundabout linking with the business park.  Opportunity for the roundabouts to be joined through the site via a high quality link road.  Traffic calming measures will be required on A415 through the village.  Traffic impact on junctions requires thorough assessment including A420/A415, A420/A417, A420/A338, Faringdon Road/A415, Frilford Lights, Marcham Interchange and Botley Interchange.	Noted. The Council continues to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure the Development Templates reflect advice, as far as possible, from County officers.
1098028	Mr James Holmes			Rat-run - Digging Lane Rat-running through	Comment concerned with the impact the proposed allocation would have on the small A and B class roads	Noted.  The plan has been informed by technical evidence, including

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095947	Maria Cruttenden			Netherton/Fyfield along Digging Lane and through Appleton; Safe crossing of the A420	that are busy at peak times. Digging Lane will become used as a rat-run to avoid access on to the A420.	Evaluation of Transport Impacts and Sustainable Transport and the site provides opportunity to maximise public transport use.  The Development Template includes provision for providing appropriate access and planning for the site will be informed by a comprehensive approach involving the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This will involve more detailed design of highway mitigation.
1097450	Jeremy and Edel Roche		Rat-running through Tubney on Abingdon/Faringdon Road (A338), Fyfield and Longworth.	Comment concerned with rat-running through Netherton/Fyfield along Digging Lane and through Appleton and the safety of crossing the A420 for bus passengers.		
1095959	Professor Burley		Rat-running via Netherton Road, Noise and light pollution; crossing of the A420			
1098018	Mrs Cox			Comments concerned with the increased rat-running. Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rat-running through Tubney on Abingdon/Faringdon Road</li> <li>• Drivers ignore speed restrictions</li> <li>• Sand carriers degrade road surface</li> <li>• Junction with Abingdon Road and the A338 unsafe</li> <li>• Rat-running through villages of Fyfield and Longworth to avoid A420/A415 junction.</li> <li>• Cumulative impact on the A34</li> </ul> Comment concerned with the crossing of the A420 and rat-running along Netherton Road.		
1095818	Alison Varney			Traffic - Digging Lane	Several comments relate to concerns over traffic along Digging Lane and its condition.	
1095962	Graham Varney					
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	Mr Jon Waite	874466	Safe vehicular access	A few comments are concerned with the need to deliver safe vehicular access/exit that is yet to be established. Exiting the site to the north would mean joining the A420.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
1097648	Frilford Heath Golf Club	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
1097369	Trustees of Kemp Accumulation and M	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	Soundness	The allocation is neither justified, nor consistent with national policy because of the absence of a heritage assessment and lack of statutory duties (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990) being considered.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited	Miss Naomi Hubbard	722921	Support - Archaeology and Heritage	There are no designated heritage assets, such as scheduled monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within the site. As such, the development will comply with the statutory duties laid out in s66 and s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	Noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited	Miss Naomi Hubbard	722921	Support - community benefit	Comments highlights opportunities for community benefit, including the potential provision of a new adult size playing field and access to green space.	Noted.
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited	Miss Naomi Hubbard	722921	Support - no environmental or technical constraints	Comments state that the work undertaken as part of the preparation of these local representations demonstrates that there are no environmental or technical constraints that would prevent the residential development of the site in the plan period.	Noted.
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited	Miss Naomi Hubbard	722921	Support for East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	Support for proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.  Comments support the proposed allocation at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor. Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is one of the most sustainable larger villages with well established sustainable transport links to Oxford.	Noted.
1096895	MBC Estates Ltd	Mr Maltman	1096293			
1096823	Dr Kate Shirley-Quirk			Sustainable transport and accessibility	Comments raised concerns with cumulative impact of developments along the A420 and the A338 on the existing highway network. Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient workplace parking spaces in Oxford, proposed allocation predicated on notion of a car-based commuter community.</li> <li>• Developments along A420 (from Swindon, through Shrivenham and Faringdon) and along the A338 (Hanneys) will create a road-based transport corridor.</li> <li>• No transport links along the A420</li> <li>• Delays at the A338/A415 intersection, A34 and Didcot</li> <li>• Rat-run through Tubney along Abingdon Road</li> <li>• Increase in noise and dust pollution associated with the A420, impact on health and well-being.</li> </ul>	Noted.
1096836	Jose Luis Alvarez Bernal					
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					
725556	Thames Water Property Services			Thames Water - Comments on Wastewater infrastructure	The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipate from the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.  Local strategic water supply infrastructure upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure may be required.  Developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered.	The council note these comments and will work with the developer and Thames Water in planning for the site.
730226	Councillor Elaine Ware Councillor Vale of White Horse District Council			Traffic - A420 Corridor and Western Vale Villages	Several comments relate to concerns over the A420 Corridor and the cumulative impact on Western Vale Villages. Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 600 dwellings proposed at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor along with 3000</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to similar topic matters.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730197	Councillor Simon Howell Councillor Vale of White Horse District Council				<p> dwellings that have been approved in towns and villages along the A420 will increase capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few proposals to improve route between Swindon and Oxford</li> <li>• Cumulative impact from development in Swindon (Eastern Villages) on the A420</li> </ul>	

**Appendix A: Site Development Templates – North East Marcham**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	NE Marcham Objection	There were many comments which provide general objection to the Marcham sites. These objections raise concerns over; schools, roads, facilities, air pollution and the amount of housing proposed.	Noted. Please refer to responses relating to specific points set out below.
1095989	Mr and Mr J and W Duffield and Cumber Mr J Duffield and W Cumber and Son (Theale) Limited					
1095519	Mr Lee Jackson					
1095992	Mrs Dunford					
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council					
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	NE Marcham Objection - Air Pollution	A comment stated the AQMA within Marcham highlights that any new development will significantly impact the air quality within Marcham. Currently there is no funding for the bypass	Whilst the Council still consider Marcham to be a sustainable location for development, following consultation the Council has proposed removing this site from the Publication Version of the plan. This is principally to minimise impact on the AQMA located within Marcham village.
1094583	Dr Youngman			NE Marcham Objection - Biodiversity	Comments that highlight the need for corridors for wildlife and plants. There is also a need for an extensive flood risk assessment to protect any Fens	Noted.
1094990	Mrs Alica Narramore					
929140	Dr Judith A Webb					
1095671	Mr Manfred Brod			NE Marcham Objection - Education	Comments highlight the need for a new primary school to be built (or existing one to be expanded) to support the growth in Marcham  Comments highlight the need for a new school and for transport routes to be improved to support the new development in Marcham	Noted.
1096275	Ms Powell					
1095748	Mrs Michelle Taylor					
1095064	Jessica Brod			NE Marcham Objection - Education and Transport		
1093046	Mrs Claire Flint			NE Marcham Objection - Flooding	Comments expressing the risk of flooding in Marcham and in particular, the North East of the village. A flood risk assessment would be required before any development starts.	Noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095519	Mr Lee Jackson					
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	NE Marcham Objection - Heritage	There is a scheduled settlement site to the north of Cow Lane. If development was to take place here, then it would be in conflict with LPP1 core policy 39 and LPP2 Development Policy 38.	Noted
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	NE Marcham Objection - Landscape	Comment states that the number of dwellings proposed to be built should be reduced to reflect the landscape sensitivities as stated in the evidence provided.	Noted.
1095748	Mrs Michelle Taylor			NE Marcham Objection - Provision of Facilities	Comments highlighting the lack of facilities in the village with mention of shops, school, police station, GP surgery's and recreational facilities.	Whilst the Council still consider Marcham to be a sustainable location for development, following consultation the Council has proposed removing this site from the Publication Version of the plan. This is principally to minimise impact on the AQMA located within Marcham village.
1094647 1095319	Ellie Flemming  Miss Joanna Stokes			NE Marcham Objection - Recreation	Comments which raise the concern over lack of open space that will be available if development takes place for recreations uses such as walking and using the allotments	The nearby development at Dalton Barracks will include a Country Park of at least 80 hecatares, thus providing access to significant new Green Infrastructure locally.
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	NE Marcham Objection - Site Selection Process	Comments discuss how the Marcham sites have been selected. Topic paper 2 is discussed and infrastructure needs to be better planned for. Also highlights the size of the sites proposed in Marcham which could potentially hold more than the allocated housing	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper
1095653 1094990 1095671 1097677 1095880 1095915 1095748	Bernard Cole  Mrs Alica Narramore  Mr Manfred Brod  David Wilson Homes (Southern)  Mr Thomas Byrne  Mr David Clark  Mrs Michelle Taylor			NE Marcham Objection - Transport	Comments raise general concerns over the impact of traffic if there is more development in Marcham. The main concerns are surrounding the A415, A35 and the amount of traffic the development will produce  This comment raises concern over the existing traffic and air quality in the village. The access to the proposed site will mean that people will travel by car to enter the village rather than foot. There is not a commitment to expand the existing school t  Comments raises concern over the lack of facilities and the difficulties surrounding the village in regards to transport.	Whilst the Council still consider Marcham to be a sustainable location for development, following consultation the Council has proposed removing this site from the Publication Version of the plan. This is principally to minimise impact on the AQMA located within Marcham village.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095791	Dr Jim Asher Chairman Marcham Community Group					
1095797	Valerie Broehl					
1096961	Robin Knight					
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452			
892620	Mr Bob Anderson					
737198	Mr David Walton	Mr David Walton	724845	NE Marcham Objection - Transport and Education		
1095922	Mrs P Hoath			NE Marcham Objection - Transport and Provision of Facilities		
1095748	Mrs Michelle Taylor			NE Marcham Objection - Village Character	By developing new housing, the population will increase which will then effect the village atmosphere.	Noted.
725556	Thames Water Property Services			NE Marcham Thames Water - Waste and water Capacity	The current waste and water network may not be capable to support the demand the development will bring. It may need updating. Developers are encouraged to work with Thames Water when submitting a planning application	Noted.
1096903	Miss Alex Simmons			Objection - Air Pollution	Air pollution will rise which will effect people's health	Whilst the Council still consider Marcham to be a sustainable location for development, following consultation the Council has proposed removing this site from the Publication Version of the plan. This is principally to minimise impact on the AQMA located within Marcham village.
1096890	Mrs Fran Simmons			Objection - Air Quality and Transport	Comments recognise that future development will effect the transport and therefore effect the air quality. The funding for the bypass is not yet determined and the Marcham AQMA has also been mentioned.	
1096893	Miss Beth Simmons					
1094451	Mr Iestyn Davies			Objection - Infrastructure	Comments provide a general concern over infrastructure within Marcham and the impact more housing will have on roads, schools, air quality and wildlife.	Noted
1094679	Mr Keith Higgs			Objection - Insufficient infrastructure to	Comments which provide general objection to the Marcham sites.	

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				support extra housing at Marcham	These objections raise concerns over; schools, roads, facilities, air pollution and the amount of housing proposed.	
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Minerals	There are two comments that raise the concern regarding minerals within the Marcham Area. One site may contain soft sand which is protected within policy M8 of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1. There are however no current minerals in	Noted.

**Appendix A: Site Development Templates – South East Marcham**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095064	Jessica Brod			Allocation and Bypass	This comment highlights the map for the bypass and the allocation overlap.	Noted. The site boundary has been amended to reflect this and consequently the level of proposed development is reduced from 120 to 90 accordingly.
1094583 1094905 1095691 1095748 10952992 1095997 730272 1096315 1097176 1096915	Dr Youngman Mr Barney Stevens Mr Manfred Brod Mrs Michelle Taylor Mrs Alison Youngman Mrs Dunford Mrs Smithson Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council Mr Derek Robinson Mrs Rosemary Stone Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd		1022452	Marcham: Air Quality Impacts	There are several comments that recognise that future development will affect the transport and therefore affect the air quality. The funding for the bypass is not yet determined and the Marcham AQMA has also been mentioned.	The Council consider Marcham to be a sustainable location for development. However, following consultation the Council has proposed removing the North East Marcham site from the Publication Version of the plan, and due to overlapping with the proposed area safeguarded for a future bypass, reduce the level of development on this site to 90 from 120. This is a reduction from 520 to 90 and is principally to minimise impact on the AQMA located within Marcham village.
1095653 730272 730272	Bernard Cole Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council Miss Beth Simmons			Objection - Flooding	There are comments expressing the risk of flooding in Marcham and in particular, the North East of the village. A flood risk assessment would be required before any development starts.	A strategic flood risk assessment has been undertaken and has informed the Plan, which is reflected in the Site Development Template.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
7098629	Mrs H R Cole					
1094964	Anna Hillis			Objection - Provision of Facilities	There are a couple of comments highlighting the lack of facilities in the village with mention of shops, school, police station, GP surgery's and recreational facilities.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper
1096289	Mr & Mrs H G Johnson					
1095748	Mrs Michelle Taylor					
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council					
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	SE Marcham - Site Selection Process	This comment discuss how the Marcham sites have been selected. Topic paper 2 is discussed and infrastructure needs to be better planned for. Also highlights the size of the sites proposed in Marcham which could potentially hold more than the allocated h	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper
1095997	Mrs Smithson			SE Marcham Objection - Biodiversity	There are several comments that make note to preserving and reinstating hedgerow and mature trees when developing greenfield land.	Core Policy 44 within Local Plan 2031 Part 1 provides policy guidance for landscaping when a planning application is submitted. The council's design guide SPD will also be used when determining planning applications. Preserving Hedgerows and mature trees are considered within the Landscape Character Assessment, produced as evidence for the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 which is reflected in the Site Development Template.
1095997	Mrs Smithson			SE Marcham Objection - Drainage	There are several comments that question whether the existing wastewater network can cope with additional development and whether there will be commitment to increase capacity	Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed.  The 'General Requirements' ensures development proposals demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or waste water capacity to serve the development.  Developers will be expected to enter into discussions with Thames Water as early as possible to agree a way forward. The Council understand, that following discussion with Thames Water, that upgrades will be possible and so does not present a barrier to development.
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council					
1095748	Mrs Michelle Taylor			SE Marcham Objection - Education	There are number of comments which highlight the need for a new primary school to be built (or existing one to be expanded) to support the growth in Marcham	The Council are aware that further education provision will be required which is reflected in the Site Development Template which requires the new school provision, either through expanding the existing school or contributing to new provision at the nearby proposed development at Dalton Barracks.
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council			SE Marcham Objection - Housing for Ageing Population	This comment raises the issue regarding meeting the housing need for the ageing population.	Local Plan 2031 Part 1 addresses the requirement to meet the housing need of the ageing population. Core Policy 26 looks to address the current and future needs. The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders and developers to help ensure that the need is met appropriately.
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council			SE Marcham Objection - Infrastructure	This comment highlights the need for more infrastructure to support the proposed growth in Marcham. A comment also makes note of the financial risk if not all dwellings are built which will effect the delivery of infrastructure	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper  The site will contribute to a range of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the Development Template.
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council			SE Marcham Objection - Integration with Village	Lack of integration of new development with village	The Council will continue to work with developers, parish councils and other key stakeholders through masterplanning to ensure the development is incorporated within the village settlement and to ensure there is appropriate access to infrastructure. The Site Development Template includes a requirement to ensure development achieve this.
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	SE Marcham Objection - Landscape	This comment highlights the lack of Landscape studies conducted to assess the impact this site would have on the open countryside. This conflicts with what the Topic paper which states. Development would need to be of a size, scale, density and design to reflect	The Landscape Capacity study discusses the impact the South East Marcham site has on the landscape including the open countryside. The council are continuing to work with developers and relevant stakeholders to ensure the masterplan of the site reflects the location of the development.
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council			SE Marcham Objection - Sustainability	The site does not conform with the SA or Core Policy 1 in regards to sustainability. This is due to conflict within documents in regards to this site.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	SE Marcham Objection - Transport	There are a number of comments which raise general concerns over the impact of traffic if there is more development in Marcham. The main concerns are surrounding the A415, A35 and the amount of traffic the development will produce	
1095064	Jessica Brod					
1095992	Mrs Dunford					
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council					
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd					
725556	Thames Water Property Services			SE Marcham Thames Water - Wastewater Capacity	Comments question whether the existing waste water network can cope with additional development and whether there will be commitment to increase capacity	Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed.  The 'General Requirements' ensures development proposals

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						<p>demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or waste water capacity to serve the development.</p> <p>Developers will be expected to enter into discussions with Thames Water as early as possible to agree a way forward. The Council understand, that following discussion with Thames Water, that upgrades will be possible and so does not present a barrier to development.</p>
1095863	Mrs Frere			Support SE Marcham	Support for SE Marcham Site	Noted
874612	Mr Grant Stevenson Catesby	Taylor Cherrett	1096086			

**Appendix A: Site Development Templates – Dalton Barracks**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1098046	Anna Clarke St Helen Without Parish Council			Dalton Barracks - General comment	<p>A number of general comments were received in relation to the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. More than one comment was received in relation to each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A bridleway should be provided through the country park or on the edge of the site.</li> <li>• The country park should act as a buffer between the new development and the existing villages nearby.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to appropriate infrastructure for the site, including transport education and health.</li> <li>• The site should link with a new park and ride at the Marcham Interchange.</li> <li>• A strong network of footpaths and cycleways are required which will reduce traffic.</li> <li>• The site should deliver more than the projected 1,200 dwellings in the plan period.</li> <li>• ECO principles, such as those seen at Bicester Ecotown, should be used alongside the Garden Town/Village Principles.</li> <li>• Employment should be provided on site.</li> <li>• Some Garden Town/Village Principles are absent, including land value capture for the benefit of the community and community ownership of land and long term stewardship of assets.</li> <li>• Garden Town/Village Principles need to be upheld.</li> <li>• Site should replace the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 allocations at Abingdon, Radley and Kennington.</li> <li>• Other general comments include</li> <li>• Higher densities should be sought (CPRE)</li> <li>• There are small areas of Flood Zone 2/3 on the edge of the site. Suggest redrawing the boundary to exclude these (Environment Agency)</li> <li>• Masterplanning of the site should have regard to 'Active Design' (Sports England)</li> <li>• A number of comments received transport assessment and provision, education, footpaths and cycleways (Oxfordshire County Council).</li> <li>• Unsure of the impact on the local water and waste networks. Studies will be required. (Thames Water)</li> <li>• The local community should be given advance notice before development begins on the site.</li> <li>• Plots should be sold for self-build.</li> <li>• Conservation area of nearby villages should be protected.</li> <li>• A concern about light pollution arising from development of the site.</li> <li>• • The runway should be used a bypass for a Cothill.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper</p> <p>The proposed development is supported by Policy, which advocates a comprehensive approach to planning for the site, and Development Template, which sets out important requirements to inform planning for the site and necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>The comments have been noted and considered in line with the requirements for the site and updated accordingly.</p> <p>The Policy sets out a commitment to develop a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for this site, which will facilitate a partnership approach to masterplanning and planning for infrastructure with key stakeholders including the community. On this basis, it is considered that there will be further opportunity for masterplanning detail to be addressed through preparation of the SPD. On this basis, there is scope for many of the points raised to be addressed.</p> <p>The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 sites are allocated and this site is required to be delivered alongside those allocations.</p>
1095656	Catherine Webber					
1095649	Charles Jones					
1094583	Dr Youngman					
873089	Dr Andrew Turner					
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group					
1095856	Dr Janet Banfield					
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield Vice-Chair Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee					
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)					
1097648	Frilford Heath Golf Club	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
879120	Gow Family	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Wildlife Trust					
1097828	Lee Church					
1095782	Michael Page					
1095233	Miss Summersbee					
1096314	Mr Cousins					
1095970	Mr Cross					
1095757	Mr and Mrs Warwick					
873873	Mr and Mrs Ann and Clive Fewins					
874446	Mr Christopher Baker					
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency					
1095928	Mr David Wright					
1095718	Mr Dennis Walton					
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council					
1096618	Mr John Roberts					
871494	Mr Noel Newson					
1096225	Mr Richard Bahu					
1097184	Mr Rod Stone					
1094885	Mr Sonke Adlung Senior Editor					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095787	Oxford University Press Mr Tony Parsons					
1094497	Mrs Alden					
1094550	Mrs Buckmaster					
1094553	Mrs Imbush					
1095253	Mrs Summersbee					
1095737	Mrs Tilley					
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Director Oxford Preservation Trust					
1095697	Mrs Linda Walton					
1094118	Mrs Liz Osbourn					
1097176	Mrs Rosemary Stone					
729283	Mrs Victoria Talbot					
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England					
830457	Peter and Susan Clare					
1022473	Rosconn Group	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			
725556	Thames Water Property Services					
1097369	Trustees of Kemp Accumulation and	Mr Jon Waite	874466			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
902666	M University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195			
1097495	Vicky Aston Sport England					
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Oxfordshire County Council suggests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cycling, walking and bus routes need to be explored. Potential for new bridges over the A34 should also be considered.</li> <li>- The frequency of bus services need to be explored and the potential for an additional park and ride service at Cumnor could increase travel time into the city centre.</li> <li>- An assessment of local junctions will need to be carried out and further work is required to consider the effects on Marcham AQMA</li> <li>- The development template should state "Retain, improve and / or appropriately divert existing public footpaths and byways, unless otherwise specifically agreed"</li> <li>- Prior to the submission of the plan, they seek to understand whether the amount of development proposed in the plan period is realistic given the redevelopment proposals have not yet been prepared.</li> <li>- The land has capacity to support 3000 plus dwellings and the planning of the site for the amount proposed should be carefully planned to take into account the extra capacity the site has.</li> <li>- An on-site primary school will be required on a site of 2.22ha. A further primary school may be need to accommodate the extrat capacity the site has post 2031.</li> <li>- The site could contribute towards Oxford's Unmet housing need.</li> </ul>	
1098046	Anna Clarke St Helen Without Parish Council			Dalton Barracks - Objection	<p>A number of objections were received in relation to the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. More than one objection was received in relation to each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The allocation would merge the settlements of Shippon and Whitecross</li> <li>• There is significant traffic congestion in the area, both on local roads and also the A34.</li> <li>• There is a lack of infrastructure, including no A-Roads, Schools, or Health Provision.</li> <li>• Site is unlikely to deliver 1,200 dwellings in the plan period. There is a lack of evidence demonstrating how this will be achieved.</li> <li>• Contamination on the site is likely to delay delivery further.</li> <li>• The cumulative impact of development here and in Marcham will be significant.</li> <li>• Development of the site should be strictly limited to the existing brownfield land. There should be no need to release the site from the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Development of the site will negatively impact upon the nearby</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed development site is amended to retain the openness between the proposed development and Whitecross and so that Whitecross remains washed over within Green Belt.</p> <p>The MOD have confirmed the availability of the site for development, which is not contingent on the Logistics Regiments moving, although it is understood that they will do so by 2026. The Council is satisfied the site is deliverable within the plan period.</p> <p>The development will be largely restricted to brownfield land, although some areas of the airfield will also be included to ensure the potential for sustainable development in the longer term, and ability to support infrastructure delivery is reaslied, but only where there is minimal harm to the Green Belt purposes. The openness between Shippon and Abingdon-on-Thames, the proposed development and Whitecross, and the proposed development and Wootton will all be maintained. Much of the airfield will remain in the Green Belt and be developed as a significant area (at least 80 hectare) of country park.</p> <p>The site will be planned in accordance with a comprehsnive</p>
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505			
1095815	Carole Page					
1095656	Catherine Webber					
1095649	Charles Jones					
1097479	David Hutchinson					
1097677	David Wilson	David Murray-	1097679			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
741327	Homes (Southern) David Wilson Homes Southern	Cox Mr Jon Waite	874466		Special Area of Conservation, SSSI and local nature reserves. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local wildlife near the barracks will be destroyed, incl. on agricultural land in the allocation.</li> <li>The agricultural land between the Barracks and Whitecross should not be included in the allocation.</li> <li>Oxford City should be challenged further to develop brownfield sites there.</li> </ul>	framework approach, guided by preparation of an SPD and to ensure infrastructure delivery is secured.
1097403	Douglas C B Bond Woolf Bond Planning LLP				Other objections include:	
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield Vice-Chair Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parish Council – Inappropriate Scale. Development will erode gap and local distinctiveness. Evidence submitted from the local residents survey also.</li> <li>There will be a deterioration in air quality</li> <li>The barracks should be revered back to its previous use, and reinstate any footpaths, bridal paths and the original farm house (Pewit House)</li> <li>Such a large allocation should have been addressed through Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</li> <li>A number of developers seek additional site allocations to allow further time for Dalton Barracks to come forward.</li> <li>• Site delivery is overoptimistic (Oxford City Council)</li> </ul>	
929140	Dr Judith A Webb					
1096823	Dr Kate Shirley- Quirk					
1097814	Gale and Binning	Mr Kenneth Dijksman	724542			
879120	Gow Family	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust					
1096937	IM Land	Mrs Rebecca Horrocks	1096940			
1022463	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	Mr Steven Pickles	724498			
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd					
1096836	Jose Luis Alvarez Bernal					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792			
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments					
1096314	Mr Cousins					
1095667	Mr Lakeland Chairman Blewbury Parish Council					
1095942	Mr Spiero					
1098059	Mr and Mrs Anderson					
1098097	Mr and Mrs Richardson					
1096698	Mr and Mrs Nigel Burton					
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency					
1096802	Mr Conroy Jones					
1096052	Mr Geoff Fitzgerald					
1096177	Mr John Samways					
1094885	Mr Sonke Adlung Senior Editor Oxford University Press					
851677	Mr T W Law					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095787	Mr Tony Parsons					
1096714	Mrs Claudia Roberts					
874621	Mrs Denise Fletcher					
1096804	Mrs Meg Jones					
1096899	Mrs Pearl Lewis					
729283	Mrs Victoria Talbot					
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman Group Land Planning Manager Bovis Homes Limited					
1096872	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services Oxford City Council					
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452			
1022473	Rosconn Group	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			
1097369	Trustees of Kemp Accumulation and M	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702			
1099225	Welbeck Strategic Land Ltd					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095815	Carole Page			Dalton Barracks - Support	<p>A number of comments of general support were received in relation to the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. Within these comments, the following points were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of comments supporting the country park.</li> <li>• Site is an opportunity for a new innovation village.</li> <li>• A number of suggested ideas were put forward in relation to the masterplanning of the site.</li> <li>• Site has no designated heritage assets, but there may be sites of possible historic interest. Suggested changes to the policy. (Historic England)</li> <li>• Comment on principle that if there was anywhere which should be removed from the green belt, Dalton Barracks would be the most sensible option.</li> <li>• General comment of support of the policy and site requirements from the Defence Infrastructure Organisation.</li> <li>• Site is well related for commuters to large employment site in the area.</li> <li>• General comment of support from Highways England, provided development comes forward in line with the site specific requirements identified in Appendix A.</li> <li>• Natural England welcome the country park as an opportunity to offset the impact on the SAC. Request the council to liaise with BBOWT and the National Trust. Seek further clarity on what uses are intended for the country park. There is a need to buffer high quality habitats, including the potential for extension of existing nature reserves. Project level transport and air quality calculations should be included in the requirements.</li> <li>• • BBOWT welcome the provision of recreational open space, but needs to be carefully considered in terms of size, design and connectivity with the wider countryside, in a manner that takes people away from Cothill Fen SAC.</li> </ul>	Noted
729502	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	Ms Lois Partridge	976501			
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group					
1095970	Mr Cross					
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment					
1095983	Mr David MacElvogue					
1095737	Mrs Tilley					
730237	Mrs Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council					
1024194	Ms Louise Dale Defence Infrastructure Safeguarding					
1096067	Sophie Jamieson					

**Appendix A: Site Development Templates – North West Grove**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
756493 1096196 929685 1097677 758199	Mr Graham Mundy Clerk Grove Parish Council  R M Burson EM Burson and Sons  Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)  David Wilson Homes (Southern)  John Richards Dandara Ltd			Delivery of Site	Several comments welcomes the coordinated planning of the sites around Grove however concerns are raised over how in reality the link road will be delivered by the three sites. Concerns the site is not deliverable within the plan period, especially as it is dependent on the delivery of Monks Farm and Grove Airfield which may not be delivered by the end of the plan period. One comment considers this site is not needed to assist the delivery of the link road as there are already sufficient amount of housing planned to pay for it. Concern that the GNLR may never be completed as a through route and instead propose an alternative link to Denchworth Road.	The Council's Site Selection Topic Paper demonstrates a robust assessment has been undertaken. Appendix A provides a summary of the detailed testing of this site concluding it is suitable and deliverable. The Council consider the delivery of this site will assist with ensuring the link road is delivered in its entirety and the masterplanning of this site can help to ensure all three sites are integrated.
758065	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	Mr Andrew Raven	758063	Leisure Requirements	The lack of clarity in relation to what provision is required on site is significantly hampering the development of the scheme, furthermore, the requirements for some elements appears to be over and above the demand generated by the proposed development. For example, the June 2016 Local Leisure Facilities document identifies the continuing lack of clarity and changing evidence base is causing some confusion for master planning of the site, and in cases it is questioned whether the requirements meet the legal tests. It is recommended that your IDP is updated to ensure it complies with the requirements set out in your evidence base.	The comment does not relate to the proposed Local Plan Part 2 allocation.
725556	Thames Water Property Services			NW Grove - Thames Water - Wastewater network	Wastewater network may be unable to cope with new development and developer is encouraged to work with Thames Water	Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed.  The 'General Requirements' ensures development proposals demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or waste water capacity to serve the development.  Developers will be expected to enter into discussions with Thames Water as early as possible to agree a way forward. The Council understand, that following discussion with Thames Water, that upgrades will be possible and so does not present a barrier to development.
1095588 1097814 1097677	Mr Peter Fox  Gale and Binning  David Wilson Homes (Southern)  Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)	Mr Kenneth Dijkman David Murray Cox	724542  1097679	Objection	A respondent objects to the North West of Grove site allocation on the grounds that too many houses are being built in the Vale, more infrastructure and parking is needed to support the homes and trees are being lost to make room for homes	The site is proposed to assist with delivering infrastructure and a more coordinated/ comprehensive approach to planning for this area of Grove. The site will be bounded by the railway line to the north and development to the south and east.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council Comments - Access and Highways	Final bullet under Access and Highways should refer to providing footpaths and cycleways, connecting the development to Grove village, Grove Airfield, Monks Farm and the potential Grove Rail Station.	Noted.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council Comments - Link Road	We do not oppose allocating a site to the North West of Grove given that for some time it has been identified that the Wantage Northern Link Road will progress through it. The boundaries of the site and its future use need to be carefully considered given the adjacent railway line, Denchworth Road and the narrow road bridge. It will likely be necessary to install traffic lights on the bridge to enable a one-way system.	Noted.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council Comments - Station	The additional new housing in the plan period would help build the business case for a rail station at Grove. The case for the station and even further bus service improvements would be strengthened if there is significant housing growth post 2031.	Noted. The Council strongly supports the future provision of a railway station at Grove and will continue to work in partnership with the County Council and other bodies to assist with bringing this forward.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council Comments - Education	The new primary schools (including nursery provision) and secondary school planned for Grove Airfield should be able to accommodate the pupil generation from this location, and the development would be expected to contribute towards the cost of those schools. The development would also be expected to contribute towards additional SEN school capacity. If this development were to proceed ahead of the Grove Airfield development, expansion of existing schools would be explored, but there is a possibility that the only suitable primary school solution would be a new school within the development, which is unlikely to be viable. The timing of this development is therefore crucial.	Noted.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Consideration should be given to signalling Brook Lane Railway Bridge. 3 8. Improvements to the PROW network through the area will be expected. 39. Pedestrian and cycle paths into Grove Airfield will be expected. 4 0. The existing bus services are the X30 / 31 through Grove (Main Street). Its impossible to know at this stage what the level of service will be through the various developments in Grove and Wantage. It will consist of some combination of X30, 31, and the future connector frequency routes. Which buses will serve which developments will depend on a combination of what is possible in terms of development build out and bus operators choice. Some buses will continue to serve Main Street as now its highly unlikely that a route on Main Street could also serve North West of Grove without making the route unattractive to those not using it from North West of Grove. It could be that the parts of the North West Grove site are too remote from a bus service and that consideration should be given to other uses than residential on those parts of the site.	Noted. The Council recognise the opportunities presented by planning for Grove comprehensively and so ensuring the this site, the Monks Farm site and the northern section of Grove Airfield can be planned together, both from a masterplanning and infrastructure delivery perspective.
756493	Mr Graham Mundy Clerk Grove Parish Council			Site Specific Concerns	1) Grove Parish Council welcome the fact that development on the eastern side of the A338 has been excluded from the local Plan 2) Provision should be made to expand the Grove Cemetery to take into account the 300+ dwellings proposed for this development 3) S106 contributions should also be earmarked for existing community buildings 4) Provision of more open space, allotments and play areas should be included in the planning for this proposed development. 5) Footpaths and cycleways must be planned in advance and link into existing routes 6) Extensions of existing bus routes (with buses) must be planned in advance of development and link into existing routes 7) Major upgrade of the sewage and treatments works are required 8) More s106 monies should be made available to protect the expansion of the Mably Way Health Centre in Grove which serves Grove, Wantage	1) The Council acknowledges and welcomes Grove Parish Council's support 2) The Council notes the concern and will consider the issue 3) The Council notes the concern and will consider the issue 4) This issue is addressed in Development Policy 32:Open Space 5) Footpaths are already addressed in Appendix A: Site Development Templates under heading "Access and Highways" and cyclepaths under Development Policy 15: Access 6) This issue is already addressed in Appendix A: Site Development Templates under heading "Access and Highways" 7) This issue is already addressed in Appendix A: Site Development Templates under heading "Utilities" 8) This issue is already addressed in Appendix A: Site Development Templates under heading "Social and Community"

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					and the surrounding areas 9) SUDS should be included in the development. Following heavy rain this area floods and the run off tends to breach the Denchworth Road therefore we have concerns about its suitability for housing	9) This issue is addressed by Core Policy 42: Flood Risk
755900	Mr Keith Roberts Persimmon Homes Wessex Ltd  Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	Mr Andrew Raven	758063	Support	Welcome and support the North West of Grove site allocation	Noted.

**Appendix A: Site Development Templates – Harwell Campus**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1022990	Magnox Limited and the NDA	Mr Ben Lewis	1022989	Decommissioning of Land	Comments support the allocated site but feel it would be beneficial to support the decommissioning and site remediation activities and uses. They understand that this would take time but believe it could be done within the plan period.	Comments have been noted. The council will continue to support the decommissioning of land at Harwell Campus to ensure that additional land will be made available for development in the short, medium and long term, including beyond the plan period of 2031.
1097815	Turley Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	Hannah Bowler	1097816	Ecology	This comment highlights Harwell Campus is relatively unconstrained in terms of ecology considerations.	Comment is noted. The council is keen to protect and where possible enhance the ecology on Harwell Campus. The site selection process has considered ecology which is shown in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
1096211 1022361	Mr Farrell Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England			Engagement	Comments would welcome the inclusion of the public and statutory organisations to help design the development, especially the transport and landscape.	Comments have been noted. The council has engaged with the statutory bodies as well as key prescribed bodies in relation to the policy wording and site requirements for Harwell Campus. The council will continue to work constructively with these and other bodies as the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 evolves.
730242	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			Enterprise Zone Boundary	There are comments that note that the allocated site lies within an enterprise zone. The adopted policies map may need correcting if this site is taken forward.	Comments have been noted. The Adopted Policies Map will be updated accordingly to reflect the final allocations set out in the plan.
1095843	Dr James Wickens			Existing Use	Comment raises the issue of developing on a previous radioactive site. They question if the NDA are aware of the proposal and the potential hazards to residents and children if this site is developed. They also make note of the style of housing and school, asking if it would fit in with the surrounding commercial buildings.	Comment is noted. The council are aware of the licensed site. The Liquid Effluent Treatment Plant is currently in the process of remediation and significant progress has been made on this to date. It is expected to be released in a timely manner alongside the proposed residential area at Harwell Campus.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Enterprise Zone Funding	Comment questions what financial aid is given to LEPS and how this benefits the residents of vale.	The role of the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership is to strengthen the local economy. Funding is provided by Government, county and district councils, businesses and academia.
1097677 1096211	David Wilson Homes (Southern) Mr Farrell	David Murray-Cox	1097679	General Comment	Would not like the development to take place as it would feel as if it is a suburb of Didcot. They also have concerns over the wellbeing of the existing wildlife and plants. Another comment states development should cater to the needs of the campus and not to the needs of Vale district or Oxford's un met housing need.	Comment is noted. Development of the site is limited to land which is already within the ownership of Harwell Campus and which is already allocated for employment use. The Council has engaged with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders on matters relating to the natural environment. The Council's HELAA and Site Selection Topic Paper demonstrate that biodiversity has been taken into account.
1101804 1095843 1097815	Alex Chandler Dr James Wickens Gallagher Estates and The Crown	Hannah Bowler	1097816	General Objection	There are several general comments which disagree with the proposed allocation at Harwell Campus. Some urge the council to reconsider and to consider the impact on wildlife, natural environment and the services and amenities within the area	Comments have been noted. The council believe that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
758199	Estate John Richards Dandara Ltd					<p>the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall.</p> <p>The Council has engaged with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders on matters relating to the natural environment, including wildlife.</p> <p>Harwell Campus contains a range of services and facilities that are comparable to that available in a larger village.</p>
829404	Mr & Mrs Chapman					
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull East Hendred Parish Council					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
831122	Pamela Dothie					
725556	Thames Water Property Services			Harwell Campus Thames Water - Wastewater Network Capacity	The current waste water network in this area may not be able to support any new development. Encourages developers to submit a detail drainage strategy and to work with Thames Water	Comment is noted. The Council will continue to engage with Thames Water in relation to ensuring the necessary infrastructure is a requirement in the Site Development Template
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Impact of Brexit	This comment questions when the study from CBRE was undertaken and if organisations were asked about the expected impact the withdrawal from the EU will have? Leaving the EU will effect Growth Targets.	<p>Comment is noted.</p> <p>The process of leaving the EU is still in the process of negotiating at present, and it is unclear on the exact effects of the process impacting upon growth in the district.</p> <p>The study from CBRE, along with evidence commissioned by the Council represents the most up to date evidence informing the proposed allocation at Harwell Campus in Local Plan 2031 Part 2 at this time.</p>
1096035	Mr Evans			Impact on AONB	Comments which highlight the damage this development would have on the AONB, including; cycle paths, bridleways, fields and trees.	<p>Comments have been noted.</p> <p>The council believe that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall. The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstance study which demonstrates this.</p> <p>A dedicated policy for the whole of Harwell Campus, including the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document will ensure future development of the site will be informed by detailed principles and a masterplan.</p>
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096050	Mr Ben Barber			Impact on Bridleway	This comment highlights an ancient bridleway which will be destroyed if this development goes ahead. They recommend either removing the allocation or reduce the number of dwellings.	Comment is noted. The council are keen to protect the existing bridleway at Icknield Way. There is a requirement for development to contribute towards improvements of NCN route 544 (Icknield Way)
1097814	Gale and Binning	Mr Kenneth Dijkman	724542	Impact on Enterprise Zone	There are a number of comments which highlight the lack of evidence and justification to lose employment space for housing. By allocating the site for housing, it undermines the SHMA, LPP1 and the governments aim for employment growth. The land should be safeguarded for employment reasons only or evidence should be provided to justify the allocation.	Comments have been noted. The council considers that there is sufficient land remaining at Harwell Campus, including within the EZ, to meet the planned economic growth on the site. The Inspector's Report into Local Plan 2031 Part 1 concluded that there is a surplus of employment land available to meet future employment needs. Additional land is expected to be released from the licenced (nuclear decommissioning) part of the site during the plan period. The council believe that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstance study which demonstrates this.
1097815	Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	Hannah Bowler	1097816			
1097830	Graham Ritchie Planning Manager David Wilson Homes Southern					
1096054	Miss Sandra Yates			Impact on Existing Residents	There are a number of comments which highlight the impact this development will have on the existing houses including; noise, crime, views from bedrooms. They also highlight the loss of green open space if there is development at Harwell campus.	Comments have been noted. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall. Sufficient open green space will be provided in line with the relevant policies of the Local Plan 2031 along with principles contained within the accompanying SPD. The Council's Site Selection Topic Paper demonstrates the robust assessment undertaken on sites.
1096050	Mr Ben Barber					
1096118	Mrs Farrell					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
1095843	Dr James Wickens			Impact on Landscape	There are a number of comments relating to the impact development at Harwell Campus will have on the AONB including, landscapae, wildlife and historic assets. There is also a lack of regard to the removal off two sites at Harwell campus within LPP1. Any more development will need to regard the exsiting buildings, residents, wildlife and the economy as there is a difference that the impact housing development and employment development have on the landscape.	Comments have been noted. The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will result in a reduced impact overall. The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstance study which demonstrates this. The Council has engaged with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders on matters relating to landscape and the natural environment. We have also considered the response received from Historic England in relation to the policy wording and site requirements. It is important the development of the whole of Harwell Campus is cohesive and respects the site's sensitive setting in the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
1097646	Ian Hepburn Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB					
1096058	Mr Burdall Chairman The Friends of The Ridgeway					
1096035	Mr Evans					
1096211	Mr Farrell					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097419	Mr & Mrs Stuart & Tracy MacDonald					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568			
1097814	Gale and Binning	Mr Kenneth Dijkman	724542	Inspector's Report on Local Plan 2031 Part 1	There are a number of comments which highlight the inspectors report from LPP1 which highlight his views on affordable housing, work-live-play idea and the lack of evidence to support development within the Harwell Campus Area.	Comments have been noted. The council believe that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstance Study to demonstrate this.
1097646	Ian Hepburn Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB					
1022426	ptarmigan Land Ltd	Carolyn Organ	1097350			The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall.
990787	Anonymous	Alan Divali	904562	Lack of Evidence	There are a number of comments which discuss the lack of evidence provided by the council to support Harwell campus for development and does not respond to the inspectors reasoning within LPP1, who had concerns over development in the AONB. There is also concern over the live/work environment and how the additional housing will help with this.	Comments have been noted. The council consider that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is currently allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstances Study to demonstrate this.
1096678	Barberry Developments Ltd	Mr John Pearce	1098025			
1095843	Dr James Wickens					
1097815	Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	Hannah Bowler	1097816			
1097830	Graham Ritchie Planning Manager David Wilson Homes Southern					
1097646	Ian Hepburn Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB					
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096054	Miss Sandra Yates					
1096058	Mr Burdall Chairman The Friends of The Ridgeway					
1096035	Mr Evans					
1097419	Mr & Mrs Stuart & Tracy MacDonald					
1096050	Mr Ben Barber					
1096026	Mr Philip Sawyer					
1095499	Mrs Leanne Parry					
730242	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council					
1022426	ptarmigan Land Ltd	Carolyn Organ	1097350			
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568			
829404	Mr & Mrs Chapman			Misleading Information	One comments states a meeting held on 20th March was misleading from the Council and developers providing a message that the site already had planning permission. This is misleading, dishonest and untrue leading to not promoting positive relations.	Comment noted. The Council held a public meeting on the 20th March 2017 to provide the community an opportunity to discuss the draft Plan and the proposals for Harwell Campus. To clarify, the site is currently allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land therefore already exists.
1095843	Dr James Wickens			No Commitment to Link Housing to Employees at the Campus	There are a number of comments which highlight the lack of commitment to link the housing to employees only. This does not comply with the NPPF and will cause issues to traffic and the infrastructure in the surrounding area. The loss of AONB is not justified	Comments have been noted. The council believe that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall. The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstances Study to demonstrate this.
1096035	Mr Evans					
831122	Pamela Dothie					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						<p>A dedicated policy for the whole of Harwell Campus, including the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document will ensure future development of the site will be informed by detailed principles and a masterplan.</p> <p>The council believes that the approach taken towards Core Policy 15b is consistent with National Policy.</p>
1096069	Ms Jones Redcliffe Homes Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055	No Exceptional Circumstances	<p>There are a number of comments which highlight the lack of exceptional circumstances for why this site should be allocated. The majority of the comments refer to the inspectors report from LPP1 and have stated that these exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated. The comments also make reference to the effect the development will have on the AONB</p>	<p>Comments have been noted.</p> <p>The council believe that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists.</p> <p>The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstances Study to demonstrate this.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall.</p>
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)					
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments					
1096035	Mr Evans					
1096211	Mr Farrell					
728489	Mr David Marsh Chairman Harwell Parish Council					
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull East Hendred Parish Council					
831122	Pamela Dothie					
1095741	Miss Shugar			Objection - Biodiversity	<p>There are a number of comments which raises concern over wildlife and the trees living within the area for proposed development, including protected species. They also question previous actions from Harwell Campus and have lost confidence from Harwell campus to follow through with what they have stated.</p>	<p>Comments have been noted. The site selection process has considered biodiversity which is shown in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council has engaged with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders including specialist ecology and tree officers on matters relating to biodiversity the natural environment.</p> <p>A dedicated policy for the whole of Harwell Campus, including the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document will ensure future development of the site will be informed by detailed principles and a masterplan.</p>
1094231	Miss Kim Pringle					
1096054	Miss Sandra Yates					
1096211	Mr Farrell					
1097419	Mr & Mrs Stuart & Tracy MacDonald					
1096050	Mr Ben Barber					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096118	Mrs Farrell					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
1097824	Ms Susan James British Hedgehog Preservation Society					
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull East Hendred Parish Council			Objection - Development on Employment Land	This comment highlights that the proposed allocation at Harwell Campus contradicts the policies within LPP1	Comment is noted. The council considers that there is sufficient employment land remaining at Harwell Campus to meet the employment needs of the district up to 2031 and beyond. The Inspector's Report into Local Plan 2031 Part 1 highlighted that there is a surplus of employment land currently available to meet these needs. The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstances Study that demonstrates this.
1096054	Miss Sandra Yates			Objection - Icknield Way Footpath	Comments make note of the existing footpath which runs across Icknield Way and questions what provisions will be made to protect the historic monument.	Comments have been noted. The Council has engaged with Historic England in relation to the policy wording and site requirements. There is a site specific requirement for development to contribute towards improvements of NCN route 544, Icknield Way.
1096058	Mr Burdall Chairman The Friends of The Ridgeway					
1096211	Mr Farrell					
1095741	Miss Shugar			Objection - Infrastructure	Comments highlight the need for more infrastructure which include schools, doctors surgeries and shops within the area if more development is to take place.	Comments are noted. Infrastructure requirements, both on site and off site, are set out in the site requirements for Harwell Campus contained in Appendix A of Local Plan 2031 Part 2. New infrastructure must be implemented in a timely manner alongside growth as per the requirements of Core Policy 7 of Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
1096054	Miss Sandra Yates					
1096118	Mrs Farrell					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)			Objection - Landscape and Biodiversity	This comments recognises the need to conserve and enhance the hitstoric environment and to protect the AONB and existing wildlife within the area.	Comments have been noted. The council believe that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall. The Council has engaged with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders on matters relating to

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						landscape and the natural environment. We have also considered the response received from Historic England in relation to the policy wording and site requirements.
1095741 1096118	Miss Shugar Mrs Farrell			Objection - Local Character	Comments question how the new housing can be sympathetic to the existing housing and countryside. The design and charm of the area should be preserved.	Comments have been noted. The council believe that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall. A dedicated policy for the whole of Harwell Campus, including the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document will ensure future development of the site will be informed by detailed principles and a masterplan.
1096050	Mr Ben Barber			Objection - Provision of Facilities	This comment recognises that the existing facilities are struggling and that new facilities are needed to support the growth within the area. This includes, schools, shops and existing transport routes.	Comment is noted. Harwell Campus contains a range of services and facilities equivalent to that available in a Larger Village. New infrastructural requirements have been informed by detailed evidence and are set out in the site-specific requirements for Harwell Campus, contained in Appendix A of Local Plan 2031 Part 2. New infrastructure will need to be delivered in a timely manner alongside growth in accordance with Core Policy 7 of Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
1096118	Mrs Farrell			Objection - Recreation	This is a safe environment for young families and dogs and if any new development should go ahead, it should reflect this and ensure it stays the same safe environment	Comment is noted. All new developments should adhere to the principles of the district's Design Guide, which includes elements relating to safe access, road layouts and design to reduce crime.
929685 1097815 1096054 1096050 1022361	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee) Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate Miss Sandra Yates Mr Ben Barber Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England	Hannah Bowler	1097816	Objection - Site Selection Process	There are a number of comments which question the effect the Harwell campus site has on the AONB and some ask why the alternative sites would effect the AONB but the Harwell Campus site would not. This includes Natural England. Two comments state that the impact the alternative sites in Rowstock and Milton have on the AONB is false. More evidence is needed on the impact the alternative sites and the Harwell Campus site would have on the AONB.	Comments have been noted. The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall, when compared to the impact of employment development. Alternative sites on the edge of the AONB are predominantly green field and likely to have a greater impact on the setting of the AONB through redevelopment. The Site Selection Topic Paper demonstrates a robust assessment has been undertaken. New evidence or information submitted through the consultation has been taken into account regarding sites.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096211	Mr Farrell			Objection - Transport	This comment and the comment by OCC regarding bus services highlights the need for improved public transport services within the area. More development will have more impact on traffic in the area and so future transport schemes are needed to provide to help with the long term.	Comment is noted. The site specific requirements for Harwell Campus seeks contributions towards improved bus services in the area. This forms part of the transport strategy for Science Vale, as set out in Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
1095843	Dr James Wickens			Objection to Land North of Ickneild Way	There are a number of comments which disagree with the development of housing north of Ickneild Way. They feel it is wrong to develop greenfield land which is in the AONB and wish for it to be developed as a Country Park	Comments have been noted. The council believe that through new evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. The land north of Ickneild Way is already allocated for employment through Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will likely result in a reduced impact overall.
1097863	Karen Harrison					
871969	Michael Morrow					
1095677	Mr and Mrs Hunter					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
1095499	Mrs Leanne Parry					
730242	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council					
1097865	Paul Harrison					
1095499	Mrs Leanne Parry			Objection to Land North of Ickneild Way and No Publicity of Events	This comment states that there was a lack of advertisement for the public event and that many people who wished to attend could not change prior commitment to attend due to the short notice. This consultee is also against the development to the land north of Ickneild way and states that the wildlife and plant habitats should be preserved	The comment is noted. The council has sought to reach out to as many members of the public using conventional advertisements in newspapers, leaflet handouts, email notifications, and more modern approaches such as advertisements on social media in order to maximise the publicity of the events held in the district.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull East Hendred Parish Council			Objection to LDO	They are against the idea of an LDO due to the site being within the AONB. An EIR would be needed before any development took place and seeking planning permission will ensure that development will not have an adverse effect on the AONB	Comment is noted. The council will consider the appropriateness of an LDO as part of the development framework for Harwell Campus.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Bus Service	This comment and the comment providing an objection to transport, highlights the need for improved public transport services within the area. More development will have more impact on traffic in the area and so future transport schemes are needed to provide to help with the long term.	Comment is noted.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and			Oxfordshire County Council - Education	OCC recognises a need for a primary school to be built if development was to take place and the funding would need to be provided by the developers.	Comment is noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Place Oxfordshire County Council					
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - No Objection	Two comments from OCC highlight no objection to the development in principle as long as the loss of land from a EZ would not impact the scale of Job growth and that CP15 should be expanded to ensure that funding for a new school will be provided by the developers.	Comment is noted. The council consider that there is sufficient employment land remaining on the site to meet the planned economic growth up to 2031 and beyond. The provision of a new school on site will form part of the masterplanning work informing the site's allocation.
730242	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			Policy Wording and Supporting Text	There are a number of comments which request rewording the text within the development template and the wording within Core Policy 15b to provide clarification. These vary from minor wording amendments to more indepth wording and information. Some examples include; More clarification needed in regards to the numbers mentioned in the supporting text and the numbers in the policy. Expansion over existing wording is needed as well as mention to the SPD document within the Policy.	Suggested changes have been noted. The council have considered the requested changes in updating Core Policy 15b, its supporting text, and the site specific requirements contained in Appendix A of Local Plan 2031 Part 2.
728489	Mr David Marsh Chairman Harwell Parish Council			Site Development Template Wording	This comment wants the wording changed from exemplar to better, more quantifiable word. They believe the work exemplar is hard to measure. Natural England commented that the wording in the Site development template needs to be corrected to state the adverse impacts on the setting of the AONB. They also advise that the design principles should aim to deliver a holistic approach to GI including Biodiversity and landscape enhancement	Comment is noted. The council consider the use of the work exemplar is appropriate and will seek to clarify the meaning in refining the Plan.
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England					
1097815	Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	Hannah Bowler	1097816	Support Harwell Campus	There are a number of comments that support the allocated site at Harwell Campus. Some believe that more evidence is still need but agree with the idea of a work-live-play concept. Some believe that the numbers need to be reconsidered in regards to both increasing and decreasing. The SPD concept is well received and some organisations would like to offer their input.	Comments of support are welcome and have been noted. The council have prepared new evidence in partnership with Harwell Campus to justify the site allocation in Local Plan 2031 Part 2.
1097487	Harwell Campus Partnership	Steven Sensecall	1097490			
1022990	Magnox Limited and the NDA	Mr Ben Lewis	1022989			
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England					
1022426	ptarmigan Land Ltd	Carolyn Organ	1097350			
1022990	Magnox Limited and the NDA	Mr Ben Lewis	1022989	Support LDO Process	This comment requests that the NDA site should be included within the boundaries of the LDO to help with the decommissioning and remediation process. They also have their on Decommissioning and waste management strategy	Comment is noted. The council will consider the appropriateness of including the licenced sites within the campus as part of any future LDO on the site. This process will be separate from the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account			Sustainability Appraisal - Crime	Questions the Vale on how they will keep the crime rate low in an area that already have some of the lowest crime rates in the country.	Comment is noted. Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness (criteria ix and x)

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Manager M3 (EU)					seeks high quality design that creates safe communities and reduces the likelihood and fear of crime.
1096211	Mr Farrell			Waste Treatment Plant	No mention of the Waste Treatment plant currently being decommissioned.	Comment is noted. The council will consider making greater reference to the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Maxnox's role in the decommissioning of the licenced site at Harwell Campus.

**Appendix A: Site Development Templates – West Harwell Village**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
728489	Mr David Marsh Chairman Harwell Parish Council			Comments from Harwell Parish Council to West of Harwell Village	<p>Harwell Parish Council raise the following concerns to the proposed allocation West of Harwell Village:</p> <p>Local policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No justification for Part 2 allocation - contrary to footnote on page 123 of adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1</li> <li>• Concept of an urban extension is inappropriate as Harwell is a rural village</li> <li>• Site extends the village by distorting the village envelope</li> <li>• Site selection contrary to Development Policy 35 in the emerging Local Plan 2031 Part 2 regarding historic field patterns</li> </ul> <p>Site Development Templates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to achieve access to existing facilities as the proposed site is adjacent to Grove Road which is under construction</li> <li>• Site at Grove Road has not been designed to allow for expansion on the western edge, or footpaths allowing residents easy access to existing facilities</li> <li>• Need to provide clarity in the Site Development Template on how the site will contribute towards infrastructure in the Science Vale Area Strategy set out in the Local Transport Plan 4</li> <li>• Need to provide clarity on the 'gateway feature' in the Site Development Template under 'Urban Design'</li> <li>• Grove Road and junction with the A4130 will need to be improved as Grove Road has a width restriction - not clear how safe access can be achieved</li> </ul>	Whilst the Council consider Harwell Village to be a sustainable location for development being located within the heart of the Science Vale area, benefitting from good public transport and being close to Didcot, which is now designated as a Garden Town, following consultation, the Council is proposing to remove this site from the Publication Version of the plan, principally due to issues in securing effective access to the site.
1024194	Ms Louise Dale Defence Infrastructure Safeguarding			Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Safeguarding Consultation Zones	<p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation has commented that the proposed allocation at West of Harwell Village falls within a statutory aerodrome height safeguarding zone surrounding RAF Benson and within a statutory birdstrike safeguarding consultation zone.</p> <p>The DIO would need to be consulted on any SUDs schemes or development including the creation of balancing ponds. As these types of development may have the potential to attract flocking bird species hazardous to air traffic safety.</p>	Noted.
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			Environment Agency - Green Infrastructure and biodiversity requirements	<p>Environment Agency would like specific mention in the Site Development Template for the ditch/drainagechannel/ordinary watercourse that is partially culverted and runs through the centre of the site.</p> <p>Under 'Green Infrastructure and biodiversity' requirements it is suggested that reference to the channel be made to form an important open space/landscaping.</p>	Noted.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			Objection to West of Harwell Village	<p>A number of comments raised objections to the proposed allocation West of Harwell Village.</p> <p>Key issues raised include:</p>	Noted. See further comment above about proposal that this allocation will not be included within the Publication Version of the plan.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094231	Miss Kim Pringle				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No justification for Part 2 allocation - contrary to footnote on page 123 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1</li> <li>Site extends the village into open countryside by distorting the village envelope and the site is located poorly with the existing form of the village and will impact on the wider landscape</li> <li>Lower density compared to the allocation West of Harwell Village in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1</li> <li>No evidence to suggest that housing delivery would not be maintained if alternative sites were identified at the high order settlements, such as Grove, particularly if sites could be identified which are not subject to constraints on delivery.</li> <li>Grove Road junction with Harwell High Street is dangerous for pedestrians - will become worse with recent permissions at Grove Road and Talbot Close.</li> </ul>	
756130	Mr Norman Staples					
756168	Mrs Jane Woolley					
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679			
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	Mr Jon Waite	874466			
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Objection to West of Harwell Village - Oxfordshire County Council	The proposed development would have issues regarding access. Additional development in this location may be unable to be catered for on Grove Road due to its alignment, width and junctions. Necessary improvements, if possible, may not be able to be reasonably funded by development. We note that the Inspector referred at paragraph 130 to the Part 1 allocation as representing the appropriate scale of development at Harwell village and consider that an additional allocation in this location is not justified.	Noted. Whilst the Council consider Harwell Village to be a sustainable location for development being located within the heart of the Science Vale area, benefitting from good public transport and being close to Didcot, which is now designated as a Garden Town, following consultation, the Council is proposing to remove this site from the Publication Version of the plan, principally due to issues in securing effective access to the site.
1094616	Dr Graham Sumner			Objection to West of Harwell Village - Traffic	A number of comments object to the proposed allocation West of Harwell Village because of concerns about increased traffic or road safety	Noted. See further comment above about proposal that this allocation will not be included within the Publication Version of the plan.
1094231	Miss Kim Pringle					
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Education	Oxfordshire County Council comment that the proposed allocation West of Harwell Village will not require on-site school provision, but would be expected to contribute towards any necessary additional off-site nursery, primary, secondary and SEN school capacity in the area.	Noted.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Traffic impacts and access	<p>Oxfordshire County Council object to the proposed allocation West of Harwell Village for the following reasons related to traffic impact and access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing vehicle flows at Grove Road/High Street Junction</li> <li>Segregated footways not possible in space available</li> <li>Providing new access is difficult</li> <li>Issues with landownership on the southern side</li> <li>No potential for a high frequency direct bus service between Harwell Village and Oxford.</li> <li>Should there be a direct Harwell Campus to Oxford service, changing buses at the Campus to reach Oxford would become another option.</li> </ul>	Noted. See further comment above about proposal that this allocation will not be included within the Publication Version of the plan.
1095824	Mr Harry Aubrey-Fletcher Managing Director Buchanan (H) Ltd	Mr Harry Aubrey-Fletcher	1095820	Support for allocation West of Harwell Village	Support for allocation West of Harwell Village	Noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England					
725556	Thames Water Property Services			Thames Water - Water and Wastewater infrastructure	Thames Water has no infrastructure concerns regarding water supply capability in relation to this site. Thames Water has commented that the wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support demand. Local upgrades to existing drainage infrastructure may be required. Developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required	Noted.

**Appendix D: The Saved Policy from Local Plan 2011 Regarding Grove Airfield**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1024194	Ms Louise Dale Defence Infrastructure Safeguarding			MOD support	The remaining site Grove Airfield falls outside of statutory safeguarding zones therefore the MOD has no safeguarding concerns.	Support acknowledged.
1094562	Dr Les Clyne			Delete Saved Policy on Grove Airfield	It is suggested that the Saved Policy should be deleted as the development is unreliable due to significant delays in bringing the planning application forward.	The Council considers that despite delays, the site remains deliverable and that it is appropriate that policy H5 continues to be saved.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Lack of Delivery	Three comments raise concerns over this site contributing to the Council's housing supply due to significant delay in bringing the Planning Application forward.	The site has now progressed and now has Outline Planning Permission.
1096196	R M Burson EM Burson and Sons					
1097814	Gale and Binning					
1050211	Mrs Anne Lankester Locality Co-ordinator for the SE & SW of Oxfordshire Oxfordshire CCG			Health Facilities	One comment states that there is no mention of making provision for health facilities in the Saved Policy.	The Council consider there is no need to update the policy as the site has Outline planning permission. The Saved Policy will be able to assist in determining reserved matters applications. Development at this site will need to accord with the whole of the Development Plan which includes the Part 1 plan, Core Policy 7 and the provision of infrastructure which makes reference to provision of health care facilities.
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			Green Infrastructure	One comment states there is no mention or need to provide green infrastructure included within the original policy and that this should be added to the policy.	The Council consider there is no need to update the policy as the site has Outline planning permission. The Saved Policy will be able to assist in determining reserved matters applications. Development at this site will need to accord with the whole of the Development Plan which includes the Part 1 plan, Core Policies 45/46 and the provision of green infrastructure.
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)			Delivery of Grove Link Road	One comment raises concerns over the delivery of this site in relation to the need and phasing of the delivery of the Grove Link Road. In particular, there is doubt whether this road can be delivered in its entirety due to the constraints of the Byway Open to all Traffic at Monks Farm.	The Council has granted Outline planning permission for this site which includes the delivery of the Link Road. The Council are proposing to allocate a site at North West Grove to assist with the delivery of this road. The Council does not consider the BOAT to be a constraint to the delivery of Monks Farm or the link road.

## Other Categories

### General Comments on the Local Plan 2031 Part 2

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group			Abingdon area	North Abingdon Local Plan Group have raised issues concerning job projection figures; SHMA figures; Government targets; Lodge Hill site; and the Lodge Hill Park and Ride. They support an additional A34 lane; the Dalton Barracks site; would prefer a Park and Ride at Marcham A34 junction; and many of the policies for the North Abingdon site.	Noted. There are already sites allocated at Abingdon-on-Thames, and within Radley Parish at Radley and South of Kennington that contribute around 1660 dwellings as part of the Council's contribution to unmet need for Oxford. Further development at these locations would lead to harm to the separation between Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford, Radley and between Radley and Kennington, would be harmful to the Oxford Green Belt and, in some instances, would be likely to lead to intervisibility between Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford.
741313	Radley College	Ms Gemma Care	741289		Comment from Radley College states that the College's sites lie within sustainable locations which provide good transport links to Oxford and the surrounding areas. It is considered that Radley and Abingdon can play an important role in helping to meet the housing needs for the district and unmet needs from Oxford City, whilst also providing a future sustainable and attractive place for families to live.	Please refer to separate comments relating to the Oxfordshire SHMA. Land is safeguarded for Strategic Highway Schemes at the request of Oxfordshire County Council, who as Highways Authority, are responsible for these matters. These proposals have been informed by detailed assessments undertaken by the County Council.
1096211	Mr Farrell			Accessibility of plan	Comments stating that:	Noted. The Council always endeavour to make information available and easy to understand. The Council is investigating alternative online systems to manage consultation process to assist with making documents more accessible.
851677	Mr T W Law				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The information in the plan is difficult to locate.</li> <li>There are a lot of documents to read and attempt to understand.</li> <li>Some respondents had difficulties submitting comments.</li> </ul>	
1020916	Ms Eleanor Owens					
1096961	Robin Knight					
875920	Daniel Scharf			Alternative development assistance	Comment criticises plan for not giving sufficient assistance to other forms of development including self-build, co-housing and local food systems. The responder feels these development types greatly improve quality of life.	Please refer to Development Management Policy section relating to Housing. The Plan is amended to include a policy promoting Self Build.
1097646	Ian Hepburn Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB			AONB - Countryside/ landscape/ green space	North Wessex Downs AONB suggested that their Management Plan could be acknowledged in the introduction and further areas of the plan to emphasize how weight should be given to landscape conservation and scenic beauty.	Noted. The Council considers that CP44 provides sufficient guidance on protecting landscape, including the North Wessex Downs AONB.
1096961	Robin Knight			Brexit	Plan should not be based on pre-Brexit economic forecasts.	Noted.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Countryside/ landscape/ green space	Comments are centred around the following themes: concern with large housing estates linked to strains on infrastructure and having to lose countryside; and draft strategies (green infrastructure and landscape character assessment) that need to be examined and/or adopted before weight is given to them.	The site allocations in the Part 1 plan and proposed allocations in the Part 2 plan are made up of sites of different size, type and geography and follow expert guidance to ensure housing delivery.
928324	Mr Geraint Apps					The Part 2 plan is informed by a comprehensive suite of technical evidence, including relating to leisure and Green Infrastructure (GI). The plan policies, Development Templates and IDP all help to ensure appropriate leisure and GI is planned for.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			CPRE - Impact on Landscape	<p>Comments raising concern for impact on landscape, including key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The important feature of the Corallian Ridge needs specified protection. Policy NE7 Development should not be permitted unless there is an overriding need for the development and steps are taken to minimise the impact on the landscape.</li> <li>Conservation of Oxford's landscape setting will take priority when considering proposals for development in areas within view of the city. The 2011 view cones on the proposals map would again need specifying clearly.</li> <li>Development in the lowland Vale will not be permitted if it would have an adverse effect on the landscape</li> <li>Proposals for development within or affecting areas of damaged or compromised landscape, in particular those areas defined for landscape enhancement on the proposals map, must provide a landscaping scheme which enhances the appearance of the area. Development which would further erode or damage the character of the landscape will not be permitted. A proposals map should specify damaged or compromised landscapes where enhancement should be a priority.</li> <li>Development within the community forest, as shown on the proposals map, must, wherever possible, make a positive contribution towards the creation of a diverse woodland environment appropriate to the landscape character of the area. Proposals which would prejudice the aims and objectives of the great western community forest will not be permitted. A proposals map should specify protected environments</li> </ul>	<p>The plan is informed by a Landscape Character Appraisal and Landscape Assessment of proposed development sites. This evidence has helped to inform selection of proposed sites and the Site Development Templates. Importantly, the largest two sites are predominately made up of brownfield land.</p> <p>No sites have been identified for development that would harm the setting of Oxford, although it is noted that several sites closer to Oxford were promoted for consideration.</p>
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			CPRE - monitoring framework	The CPRE for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse wanted to ensure implementation and monitoring of the plans were thorough to prevent affecting the environment and population wellbeing.	Noted. The plan will be accompanied by a monitoring framework consistent with the approach to the adopted Part 1 plan.
1021056	Mr Richard Harding South Oxfordshire District of CPRE			CPRE Sites/ development	The CPRE for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse wanted to ensure implementation and monitoring of the plans were thorough to prevent affecting the environment and population wellbeing.	
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			Environment Agency - Water	Reference to River Ock requested in landscape features list.	Noted.
1021056	Mr Richard Harding South Oxfordshire District of CPRE			Farming	Comment urges Council to support and encourage the positive impact that farmers and landowners can have on access to countryside, linking rural and urban populations, biodiversity and the rural economy.	Noted.
73019	Councillor Debby Hallett			Formatting/ wording	General comments regarding formatting and wording of sentences.	Noted. The policies have been updated to improve clarity wherever possible.
875920	Daniel Scharf				One comment suggests wording of policies should be made clearer to aid interpretation by interested parties; there are	

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730280	Mr Tim Comyn Sparsholt Parish Council				instances where 'must' is more appropriate than 'should' and that there are other wording examples that are insufficiently proscriptive	
1095593	Mr Simon Dackombe Strategic Planner Thames Valley Police				Thames Valley Police request that "safe" is added to the title of Chapter 3 "Building Healthy and Sustainable Communities".	
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Wording	Para 2.59 should state "Highways England" and not "Highways Agency"	
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Growth	One comment felt that constraints to growth are a lack of affordable housing and an over capacity A34.	Noted. The Part 1 and Part 2 plans make provision for the Objectively Assessed Need for the Vale in full, along with the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale. This ensures that the affordable housing need for Vale is met in full.
1097815	Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	Hannah Bowler	1097816	Harwell Campus	Comment states that there is a need for VoWH to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the longer term direction of employment/housing and infrastructure growth for Harwell Campus</li> <li>Incorporate flexibility with the emerging policy CS14A and CS14B to meet an unanticipated job and housing growth that will influence the Campus.</li> </ul>	Noted. The comprehensive framework approach will ensure a holistic approach to planning for the campus is taken. The Campus includes sufficient land to support significant employment growth beyond the current plan period.
797986	Mr John Moran HM Specialist Inspector of Health and Safety (Risk Assessment)			HM Specialist Inspector of Health and Safety - General comments	Comment concluded that they have no representation to make on this occasion. This is because the land allocated in your consultation document does not appear to encroach on the consultation zones of major hazard establishments or MAHPs. If there is no encroachment HSE does not need to be informed of the next stages in the adoption of the Local Plan Part 2 document.	Noted.
874446	Mr Christopher Baker			Housing	Concerns raised with leaseholds and developers and that leasehold schemes should be declared during the Planning application process.	Noted. This matter does not relate directly to the Part 2 plan.
875920	Daniel Scharf			Lack of reference to sustainable development	The plan contains no policies to mitigate emissions from new buildings. It is not flexible in the sense that it would need substantial change to be contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.	The Council consider that this is a matter for national policy.
1095064	Jessica Brod					
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	Local Plan requirements	General comments both agreed and disagreed with LPP2 meeting Local Plan requirements of the NPPF. Some wanted further development of the plan's detail and some disagreed with a number of ideas and principles. For example, comments centred around the following themes: asking for evidence about the plan being realistic and deliverable; requiring greater clarity on the relationship between LPP1 and LPP2; improving places and taking account of needs of communities; managing growth through public transport, walking and cycling; the ability of the plan to sustainably meet its full objectively assessed need; and ensuring it meets the 4 NPPF tests – being positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy (some did not feel it was 'effective').	The Council considers that the plan represents an appropriate strategy, is fully consistent with national policy and guidance and is consistent with the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy. The approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett					
1097815	Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	Hannah Bowler	1097816			
1096937	IM Land	Mrs Rebecca	1096940			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments	Horrocks			Two developers were in broad support of LPP2, wanting it to secure sustainable long term growth that is deliverable. One person felt that LPP2 was supposed to be focused on small sites and non-strategic allocations and that the Oxford unmet need and duty to cooperate had distorted this and therefore the current draft did not fit the original purpose of LPP2 and did not fit with figure 4.1 of LPP1.	
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702		Two people were unhappy that an Issues and Options consultation did not take place, feeling that this prevented earlier engagement with local people and organisations and referred to the Statement of Community Involvement's focus on early involvement. It was felt key decisions had been made too early.	
1097814	Gale and Binning	Mr Kenneth Dijkman	724542		One developer felt assessing the plan against the NPPF made it unsound, saying that the housing market area needs were not met, that reasonable alternatives should be considered, they questioned the site selection method and did not feel it would deliver sufficient housing or reflect the NPPF or Housing White Paper.	
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd,			LPP2 unsound	The representations demonstrate that the LPP2 is unsound due to the proposed housing allocations not representing the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives and being unable to deliver the number of new homes required by the Plan to address housing need up to 2031. The representations demonstrate that the proposed LPP2 housing allocations are not in accordance with the spatial strategy or settlement hierarchy established within the LPP1.	The Council considers that the plan represents an appropriate strategy, is fully consistent with national policy and guidance and is consistent with the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy. The approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Map	Two requests for a map of Science Vale for reference, to show what boundaries are meant by the name. 1 request for maps to be generally on display in Council and community offices.	Noted.
1098560	Mummary					
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Neighbourhood Plans	Query regarding whether NPs will be assessed for compliance with LPP2 and how this will work.	Planning Applications will be determined in accordance with the up to date Development Plan at the time the application is determined. Neighbourhood Plans should demonstrate conformity with strategic policies, as set out in the Local Plan Parts 1 and 2, however, this does not make updating an existing Neighbourhood Plan a necessity. Any out of date policies would simply be superseded by the Local Plan, or National policy, that replaces it.
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195			
725573	Ms Barbara Morgan Network Rail			Network Rail - Support	Support from Network Rail as preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to protection and enhancement of Network Rail infrastructure.	Noted.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Noise/ air quality	Comment suggesting that the targets on p102 for DP24 and 25 are aligned/harmonised.	Noted. The DM policies have been reviewed and updated to reflect consultation responses and improve clarity.
875920	Daniel Scharf			Objection - general	General opposition to Local Plan.	Noted.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095951	Committee) Meriel Baker					
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council					
1096177	Mr John Samways					
1094377	Mr Peter Willerton					
1096310	Robin Smith					
829498	Ms Clarissa Strain					
1097839	Nick Tucker					
875920	Daniel Scharf			Objection - housing our ageing population	Plan should address the need for smaller houses to allow for downsizing	Local Plan Part 1 sets out the Council housing policies for size, types and mix, which should be in accordance with the up to date Oxfordshire SHMA, but provides flexibility to support more up to date evidence where this is available.
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Director Oxford Preservation Trust			OPT - Countryside/landsca pe/ green space	Wish for Oxford's historic character and setting to be protected.	Noted. There are no sites proposed for development that would impact on the historic setting of Oxford.
1021394	David Burson JPPC			Policy for Agricultural Sites	Request for a policy related to redevelopment of agricultural sites as it is felt the benefits would include windfall sites and sustainable development.	This matter is adequately covered by proposed DM policies and by national policy.
1097369	Trustees of Kemp Accumulation and M	Mr Jon Waite	874466	Relationship to LPP1	The adopted LPP1 has been accepted as a sound development strategy for the District by the Examination Inspector. It is therefore important that LPP2 provides an effective mechanism to deliver it.	Noted.
1021394	David Burson JPPC					
1099225	Welbeck Strategic Land Ltd					
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679	Ring fence	Acknowledgement of ring-fence approach.	Noted.
1094964	Anna Hillis			Sites/ Development	General comments centred around: too few sites being selected so that sites are still quite large and strategic next to villages; a rural way of life being threatened; the idea that Oxford City should grow, rather than villages; younger generations losing the rurality of their environment; a request	The Council considers that the plan represents an appropriate strategy, is fully consistent with national policy and guidance and is consistent with the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy. The approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
1095874	Caroline Ball					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1021394	David Burson JPPC					
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792		to halt continual building/growth to protect heritage and the countryside; a request for detailed policies supporting and enhancing rural areas including the provision of new homes; a concern that last minute decisions would be made regarding the plan without a strategy; and a suggestion that a new village/town could be built instead of developing in villages.	
1093164	Miss Bryony Goulding Mew				There was a request for an index of documents and a more central index area on the website. It was felt there would be issues accessing all of the documents.	
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency				SPADE emphasized that development should only be where evidenced local need has been identified and would not adversely affect the environment/quality of life. They supported the use of brownfield and previously developed land for affordable homes co-located with employment opportunities.	
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				They carried out parish research and a public meeting in order to provide their comments. A further person expressed their support of SPADE's comments.	
1094284	Mr James Greenman				Comments raised regarding Land to the West of Wantage. Comment states that site was excluded from consideration due to concerns regarding the deliverability of the WWLR and the sensitivity of the landscape, none of which were supported by evidence. Comment seeks to demonstrate that land to the West of Wantage is able to viably deliver approximately 800 new homes.	
1095787	Mr Tony Parsons				Radley College has land interests within the district and is keen to work collaboratively with the District Council in taking the Plan forwards in a positive and proactive manner.	
1098052	MS Hazel Abraham				South West Strategic Developments raised concerns regarding the current form of the plan, including:	
1096707	Prof James Allan					
1097845	Sally Tucker					
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The windfall calculation is too high in respect to the projected housing delivery targets within the Western Vale, and as such this should be lowered and allocations be made within the Local Plan Part 2 to provide greater certainty in respect to housing delivery</li> <li>To address this problem specific allocations should be made in the Western Vale, which should include land that is within a sustainable location such as the settlement of Uffington.</li> <li>As such, further allocations should be made including land to the east of Fernham Road as part of the Local Plan Part 2, to ensure there is choice and competition in the market for land and provide flexibility in the housing supply should other sites not come forward.</li> </ul>	
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd					
1098254	Martha Kibaris					
829404	Mr & Mrs Chapman					
871494	Mr Noel Newson					
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533			
1096985	Nathan McLoughlin					
741313	Radley College	Ms Gemma Care	741289			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096928	South West Strategic Developments	Mr Matthew Kendrick	1096929			
1098046	Anna Clarke St Helen Without Parish Council			St Helen Without Parish Council - general comments	Comment states the Parish Council's response to the consultation process and the action they have taken to engage with the community.	Noted
911353	Mr Geoff Fitzgerald St Helen Without Parish Council					
1100194	Giles Hughes Head of Planning and Strategic Housing West Oxfordshire District Council			Support	Support for new houses. West Berkshire Council has no comments to raise.	Noted.
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited	Miss Naomi Hubbard	722921			
1094997	Miss Jay Elliott					
730274	Mr Alan Stone North Hinksey Parish Council					
1094599	Mr James Proyer Planner Persimmon Homes (Wessex)					
1094532	Ms Fiona Campbell Fraser	Mr Mike Robinson	1094537			
729061	Unknown West Berkshire Council, Planning and Transport Policy					
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan Senior Planning Policy Officer South Oxfordshire District Council			Support - South Oxfordshire District Council	Comments emphasise the continued close working between our two Councils particularly in relation to Didcot Garden Town and Wantage, but also in other cross border evidence gathering for infrastructure requirements and projects such as the Green Infrastructure Strategy. SODC look forward to future joint work that recognises the potential opportunities, and mitigates where necessary, any adverse cross border impacts of development growth.	Comment acknowledged. Vale of White Horse District Council continues to work collaboratively with SODC to recognise the potential opportunities, and mitigate where necessary, any adverse cross border impacts of development growth.
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Town and Village Facilities Study (2014) is out-of-date.	Town and Village Facilities Study (2014) is out-of-date. Since then a number of the key community services and facilities within each settlement have been lost.	The Town and Village Facilities Study will be updated to inform a future Local Plan. The Local Plan Parts 1 and 2 set the Council's strategy for development up to 2031. Supporting development in sustainable larger villages will support the provision of new services and facilities and help to ensure

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						existing facilities become more sustainable.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Updating Core Policies	Further explanation required regarding Core Policies.	Noted.
1103287	Vale Disability Access Group			Vale Disability Access Group - general comments	<p>Vale Disability Access Group raised general comments which highlighted the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be adequate parking space and a bay for visitor parking.</li> <li>• There needs to be good road links for the new development at Dalton Barracks. The group felt the proposal to have a bus lane on A34 at Lodgehill to Hinksey interchange made sense.</li> <li>• The group would like to see social housing built as not everyone can afford to buy.</li> <li>• Concerns were raised about the proposals in Local Plan Part 1 to build 900 houses north of Abingdon and the resulting construction traffic. It was felt that the infrastructure should be developed before the new homes are built.</li> <li>• It is important that dropped kerbs are installed opposite each in any new developments.</li> </ul>	Comments noted and welcomed. The plan has been subject to Equalities Impact Assessment and consultation with the Council's Equality Officer.
874446	Mr Christopher Baker			Villages	Define the terms large and small villages.	This is established by Core Policy 3 within the Part 1 Plan. The two documents should be read together.
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			WAGCG Sites/ development	WAGCG felt that some of the sites allocated in LPP1 are not required.	The Council is seeking to meet the Objectively Assessed Need for the district and the agreed quantum of unmet housing for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale in full.
1096906	Mr Clark Gordon Planning Specialist Environment Agency			Water Environment Agency - Water	Water Quality accompanying text supported.	Noted.
1094642	Glynn Davies			Water usage and recycling	Comment questions provision for improved water usage and recycling in new housing stock.	Noted. These matters are addressed by Core Policy 40: Sustainable Design and Construction and Core Policy 43: Natural Resources set out in the Part 1 plan.
730237	Mrs Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council			Western Vale	Comment received from Bourton Parish Council supporting no further housing sites being proposed in LPP2, due to their allocation from LPP1. Points were made about the increasing housing in Faringdon and Shrivenham already and that this will impact on the A420, along with development proposed in Swindon.	Noted. The Part 2 plan does not propose any additional site allocations in the Western Vale Sub-Area as this area does not relate well to either Oxford, or Science Vale, which form the main focus of the document.

**The Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) – Childrey**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095874	Caroline Ball			HELAA - CREY	A large number of comments were received with respect to sites included in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) but not allocated in Local Plan 2031 Part 2. These principally related to the settlements of Ashbury, Baulking, Blewbury, Childrey, Chilton, East Challow, East Hanney, Kingston Lisle, Sparsholt, Steventon, Uffington, Upton, West Challow, and West Hanney.	<p>The Council has considered the comments received in relation to the HELAA.</p> <p>The HELAA is a technical evidence base document that informs the local plan. It is a high-level audit of developable land across the district and preliminary assessment which helps us to consider the possible options in relation to meeting future needs for housing development. It has been prepared in accordance with National Guidance. National Guidance requires an assessment of sites in the district where they have been submitted to the Council through a call for sites process and which are capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings.</p> <p>The sites suitable for consideration should not be taken to imply that the Council will allocate them for housing development, nor that they would be approved if submitted as a planning application. This is further detailed in the main HELAA report and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The Council has revised these documents to provide further explanation in response to these comments.</p>
1095226	Clare Pinkney					
1096654	Deborah Scattergood James					
1095967	Dr & Mrs Bryan & Patricia Winsley					
1097661	Dr Clive McCarthy					
1096120	Dr Michael Down					
1097663	Dr Sarah McCarthy					
1097430	Emma & Jeremy Snell					
1095642	Hilary Boardman					
1097409	James Reid					
1096056	James Richardson					
1096695	Jane & Tim Bardell					
1097200	Jane Susan Worth					
1096198	M Hadley Chairman Childrey Parish Council					
1094581	Marion & Ian Flower					
1098393	Mike Jones					
1096687	Mr & Mrs Jeremy & Anne Wilkinson					
1095973	Mr & Mrs John & Sarah Noviss					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095043	Mr and Mrs J.E Martin					
1094863	Mr and Mrs Philip & Elizabeth Hinton					
1095751	Mr Christopher Hodgson					
1096210	Mr Jim Gilroy					
1095359	Mr Robert Soames					
1095779	Mr Roger Dolan					
1096103	Mrs Elizabeth Rutter					
1095647	Mrs Linda Soames					
1096114	Mrs Lucy Fishburn					
1095786	Mrs Miranda Marsh					
1096125	Ms Nicole Kaeuper					
832194	Ms Tania Watson					
1096653	Paul James					
1094505	Peter and Elizabeth Cook					
1095811	Residents of Childrey	Mr Hugo Marsh	1095809			
1096194	Robert Parkin					
1096968	Simone Hunter					
1097686	Will Watson					
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council					

**The Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) – Sparsholt**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1094569	Jenny Giles			HELAA - SPRS	A large number of comments were received with respect to sites included in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) but not allocated in Local Plan 2031 Part 2. These principally related to the settlements of Ashbury, Baulking, Blewbury, Childrey, Chilton, East Challow, East Hanney, Kingston Lisle, Sparsholt, Steventon, Uffington, Upton, West Challow, and West Hanney.	<p>The Council has considered the comments received in relation to the HELAA.</p> <p>The HELAA is a technical evidence base document that informs the local plan. It is a high-level audit of developable land across the district and preliminary assessment which helps us to consider the possible options in relation to meeting future needs for housing development. It has been prepared in accordance with National Guidance. National Guidance requires an assessment of sites in the district where they have been submitted to the Council through a call for sites process and which are capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings.</p> <p>The sites suitable for consideration should not be taken to imply that the Council will allocate them for housing development, nor that they would be approved if submitted as a planning application. This is further detailed in the main HELAA report and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The Council has revised these documents to provide further explanation in response to these comments.</p>
1096113	Nick and Isobel Price					
1096170	Mr Ian Barnes					
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)					
1094569	Jenny Giles					

**The Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) – General**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096910	Mrs Kate Watkins Chair Person Ashbury Parish Council			HELAA - ASHB	<p>A large number of comments were received with respect to sites included in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) but not allocated in Local Plan 2031 Part 2. These principally related to the settlements of Ashbury, Baulking, Blewbury, Childrey, Chilton, East Challow, East Hanney, Kingston Lisle, Sparsholt, Steventon, Uffington, Upton, West Challow, and West Hanney.</p> <p>Adopted policies map correction</p>	<p>The Council has considered the comments received in relation to the HELAA.</p> <p>The HELAA is a technical evidence base document that informs the local plan. It is a high-level audit of developable land across the district and preliminary assessment which helps us to consider the possible options in relation to meeting future needs for housing development. It has been prepared in accordance with National Guidance. National Guidance requires an assessment of sites in the district where they have been submitted to the Council through a call for sites process and which are capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings.</p> <p>The sites suitable for consideration should not be taken to imply that the Council will allocate them for housing development, nor that they would be approved if submitted as a planning application. This is further detailed in the main HELAA report and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The Council has revised these documents to provide further explanation in response to these comments.</p> <p>Adopted Policies map is incorrect and will be updated in due course.</p>
1097478	Mr Cliff Davis Chairman Ashbury Parish Neighbourhood Plan					
1095874	Caroline Ball			HELAA - BLEW		
1094505	Peter and Elizabeth Cook			HELAA - CREY		
1096056	James Richardson					
872775	Strain			HELAA - EACH		
1095874	Caroline Ball					
756629	Ms Julia Evans Clerk East Challow Parish Council					
832194	Ms Tania Watson					
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679	HELAA - East of Grove (Grove Park) Alternative Site		
825516	Mr Keith Diment			HELAA - EHAN		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council					
1094956	Debbie Lewis-Pryde Clerk Kingston Lisle and Fawler Parish Council			HELAA - KLIS		
1097403	Douglas C B Bond Woolf Bond Planning LLP			HELAA - NOHI		
1097634	Hugo Jacobs Director Lumley Jacobs			HELAA - SPRS		
1094642	Glynn Davies			HELAA - STEV		
1095874	Caroline Ball			HELAA - UFFI		

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095874	Caroline Ball			HELAA - UPTN		
872775	Strain			HELAA - WECH		
1095743	Colin Powell					
1095763	James and Penelope Vaughan-Fowler					
1095874	Caroline Ball					
832194	Ms Tania Watson					
1096716	Debbie Lewis-Pryde Clerk West Challow Parish Council					
1096808	Mr Timothy Strain					
829498	Ms Clarissa Strain					
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	Site Selection Topic Paper	The Site Selection Topic Paper would benefit from a key to distinguish between surrounding sites.	Noted. The Council will consider this point when updating the Site Selection Topic Paper to support the Publication Version of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.
851677	Mr T W Law			SSTP - Gen	A number of general comments relating to the HELAA were also received. These are summarised as follows:	The Council has considered the comments received in relation to the HELAA.
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some or all of the existing Local Plan polices are not considered in the assessment.</li> <li>• The HELAA should consider sites unsuitable where they have been discounted at later stages</li> <li>• HELAA should consider all sites to be unsuitable in the Western Vale sub area as Local Plan 2031 Part 2 does not seek to allocate there.</li> <li>• The HELAA Appendices should be clearly labelled and easier to navigate.</li> <li>• A single map showing all of the HELAA sites would be helpful</li> <li>• Information in paragraph 2.16 is incorrect.</li> <li>• The 9 sites discounted at the earliest stage should be listed in the main report.</li> <li>• The 9 sites discounted should be clearly evidenced.</li> <li>• Paragraph 2.27 should refer to adopted, instead of "emerging"</li> <li>• Other constraints should be considered more in the exclusion of sites at this stage.</li> <li>• Sites discounted through Local Plan Part 1 should not be considered again.</li> <li>• Density should be greater than the stated 25 dwellings per hectare on land closer to Oxford.</li> </ul>	The HELAA is a technical evidence base document that informs the local plan. It is a high-level audit of developable land across the district and preliminary assessment which helps us to consider the possible options in relation to meeting future needs for housing development. It has been prepared in accordance with National Guidance. National Guidance requires an assessment of sites in the district where they have been submitted to the Council through a call for sites process and which are capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings.  The sites suitable for consideration should not be taken to imply that the Council will allocate them for housing development, nor that they would be approved if submitted as a planning application. This is further detailed in the main HELAA report and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The Council has revised these documents to provide further explanation in response to these comments.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
102224	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group			SSTP - Site 10 (North of Abingdon)	They support the Council's decision to not include site 10 in Abingdon into the plan for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contributes to the green belt.</li> <li>- Access to the site would be problematic</li> <li>- Would have significant impact on the landscape</li> <li>- Existing Listed Buildings on site</li> <li>- Contrary to Development Policy 15</li> </ul>	Noted.
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment					
1075705	Mr Graham Thomson  Mrs Fisher  Dr John Guy Morgan  Mr Sean Quiggin			SSTP - Site 29 (West of Kingston Bagpuize)	They support the Councils decision to not include site 29 in Kingston Bagpuize into the plan for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inappropriate location for development</li> <li>- Impact on the road network and safety</li> <li>- Impact on educational provision</li> <li>- Impact on medical facilities</li> <li>- Conflicts with NPPF, Local Plan 2011 and Local Plan 2031 Part 1</li> <li>- Site is in an elevated position</li> <li>- Past Planning History</li> </ul>	Noted

## Alternative Sites

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097531	Mr Tim Davis	Mr Paul Jenkins	1097533	Alternative Green Belt release – Land at Appleton House	<p>A number of alternative sites have been promoted to the Council through the most recent consultation. These range in size and location across the district.</p> <p>A large number of comments were received with respect to sites included in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) but not allocated in Local Plan 2031 Part 2. These principally related to the settlements of Ashbury, Baulking, Blewbury, Childrey, Chilton, East Challow, East Hanney, Kingston Lisle, Sparsholt, Steventon, Uffington, Upton, West Challow, and West Hanney.</p>	<p>The Council has considered the alternative sites submitted through the consultation including any more up to date information. Further details of this is set out in the updated Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council has considered the comments received in relation to the HELAA.</p> <p>The HELAA is a technical evidence base document that informs the local plan. It is a high-level audit of developable land across the district and preliminary assessment which helps us to consider the possible options in relation to meeting future needs for housing development. It has been prepared in accordance with National Guidance. National Guidance requires an assessment of sites in the district where they have been submitted to the Council through a call for sites process and which are capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings.</p> <p>The sites suitable for consideration should not be taken to imply that the Council will allocate them for housing development, nor that they would be approved if submitted as a planning application. This is further detailed in the main HELAA report and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The Council has revised these documents to provide further explanation in response to these comments.</p>
1097403	Douglas C B Bond Woolf Bond Planning LLP			Alternative Green Belt release - Land west of Lashford Lane		
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	Alternative Site - South of Radley		
879120	Gow Family Gow Family	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353	HELAA - APPT01 Alternative Site		
1094532	Ms Fiona Campbell Fraser	Mr Mike Robinson	1094537	HELAA - Back Drive, Colliers Farm Alternative		
1097339	Mr R Fiedorowicz	Phillip Pryse	1097341	HELAA - Blackhorse Lane, Cothill Alternative Site		
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			HELAA - Cumnor Park and Ride Alternative Site		
865961	Mr David Kirk			HELAA - Davies Yard, East Hanney Alternative Sites		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council					
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull East Hendred Parish Council			HELAA - Didcot Garden Town Alternative Site		
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments			HELAA - Didcot Road Harwell Alternative Site		
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman Group Land Planning Manager Bovis Homes Limited			HELAA - EACH02 Alternative Site		
1096101	Drivewalk Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055	HELAA - EACH06/07 Alternative Site		
1096681	Mr King Hills Homes Developments Ltd	Mr Gary Llewellyn	1096683	HELAA - East Hanney Davies Transport Alternative Site		
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702	HELAA - East of East Hanney Alternative Site		

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452			
1097677	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	David Murray-Cox	1097679	HELAA - East of Grove (Grove Park) Alternative Site		
1096678	Barberry Developments Ltd	Mr John Pearce	1098025	HELAA - East of High Street East Hendred Alternative Site		
1097666	Catesby Estates Ltd	Louise Steele	1097667	HELAA - East of Wootton Alternative Site		
1096069	Ms Jones Redcliffe Homes Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055	HELAA - EHEN01 Alternative Site		
1096082	Jason Slocock Robert Vernon Heber-Percy Will Trust	Taylor Cherrett	1096086	HELAA - FARI09 Alternative Site		
1098095	Anthony Watson	Taylor Wimpey	1098083	HELAA - Fernham Road, Faringdon Alternative Site		
1098101	Blomley	Taylor Wimpey	1098083			
1098098	Joy Wilson	Taylor Wimpey	1098083			
1098092	Martin Lever	Taylor Wimpey	1098083			
1098084	Mrs M Herman	Taylor Wimpey	1098083			
1098047	Taylor Wimpey					
1097648	Frilford Heath Golf Club	Mr Jon Waite	874466	HELAA - Frilford Heath Golf Club Alternative Site		
1095824	Mr Harry Aubrey-Fletcher Managing Director Buchanan (H) Ltd	Mr Harry Aubrey-Fletcher	1095820	HELAA - further land at Milton Heights		
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195	HELAA - Hazel Road, Botley, Alternative Site		
1022463	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	Mr Steven Pickles	724498	HELAA - Honeybottom Lane, Land at Lansdowne Road, Wootton Alternative Site		
1096854	RH Systems	Liz Alexander	1096857	HELAA - Land adjacent to		

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				Townsend Road, Shrivenham Alternative Site		
1096928	South West Strategic Developments	Mr Matthew Kendrick	1096929	HELAA - Land at Fernham Road Alternative Site		
1097369	Trustees of Kemp Accumulation and M	Mr Jon Waite	874466	HELAA - Land at Hurst Lane, Cumnor Alternative Site		
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702	HELAA - Land at Longcot Alternative Site		
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702	HELAA - Land at Longworth Alternative Site		
1097491	Summix (Chilton) Development LLP	Peter Frampton	1097488	HELAA - Land at Lower Road, Chilton Alternative Site		
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702	HELAA - Land at Shellingford Alternative Site		
1097415	Simon Alden Director Adkin			HELAA - Land at Whitecross, Alternative Site		
1097527	Ruth Vigor-Hedderly			HELAA - Land near Petwick Farm, West Challow Alternative Site		
976422	Mr Mark Robertson			HELAA - Land off Beatlands Alternative		
1095870	Dr Craig			HELAA - Land off Fernham Road Alternative		
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568	HELAA - Land off Fernham Road, Faringdon Alternative Site		
1097446	Kier Group Limited	Mr Robson	1097448	HELAA - Land off Main Street East Hanney Alternative Site		
1097403	Douglas C B Bond Woolf Bond Planning LLP			HELAA - Land west of Lashford Lane, Wootton Alternative Site		
1096196	R M Burson EM Burson and Sons			HELAA - Monks Farm - Alternative		

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				Site		
1096815	CEG	Ian Gillespie	1096817	HELAA - North of Abingdon Alternative Site		
990787	Anonymous	Alan Divali	904562	HELAA - North of East Hendred Alternative Site		
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195	HELAA - North of Hazel Road, Allotment Site west of Tilbury Lane, Botley Alternative Site		
902666	University of Oxford	Mr Mark Owen	1097195	HELAA - North of Kennington Alternative Site		
1096895	MBC Estates Ltd	Mr Maltman	1096293	HELAA - North of Spring Hill Southmoor Alternative Site		
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments			HELAA - North of Steventon Alternative Site		
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments			HELAA - North of Townsend Road, Shrivenham Alternative Site		
741313	Radley College	Ms Gemma Care	741289	HELAA - Radley Road Abingdon Alternative Site		
1097814	Gale and Binning	Mr Kenneth Dijkman	724542	HELAA - Rowstock Alternative Site		
776299	Tom Smailes Planning Manager Linden Homes			HELAA - South of East Hanney Alternative		
1096701	WebbPaton	Adam White	1096702	HELAA - South of Hanney Road, Steventon Alternative Site		
1097815	Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	Hannah Bowler	1097816	HELAA - South of Harwell Campus Alternative Site		
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	HELAA - South of Radley Alternative Site		

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097814	Gale and Binning	Mr Kenneth Dijkman	724542	HELAA - South of Rowstock Alternative Site		
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	HELAA - South of Steventon Road, East Hanney Alternative Site		
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	Mr Jon Waite	874466	HELAA - South of Wootton Alternative Site		
858458	Mr Paul Butt Paul Butt Planning			HELAA - UFFI01 - Alternative Site		
858458	Mr Paul Butt Paul Butt Planning			HELAA - UFFI02 Alternative Site		
843219	Mr Simon Handy Senior Planner Strutt & Parker LLP			HELAA - Upper Farm Road and Hagbourne Hill alternative		
1096329	Blanchard Enterprises	Mr Simon Handy	1096331	HELAA - West of Kbag Alternative Site		
1096312	Kathryn Sidpra					
1022473	Rosconn Group	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353	HELAA - West of Parish Church WOOT21 Alternative Site		
1096657	Mr Newman			HELAA - West of Southmoor - Alternative Site		
1021394	David Burson JPPC			HELAA - Westcot Farmyard Alternative Site		
1096582	Mr Arthurs Keble Homes Limited	Mr Julian Philcox	831404	HELAA - WHAN - The Meads Alternative Site		
776299	Tom Smailes Planning Manager Linden Homes			HELAA South of East Hanney Alternative Site		
1097654	Landowners of Land South of Cumnor	Mr David Burson	850792	HELAA SSTP South of Cumnor (Site 16) Alternative Site		
1096915	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452	SSTP - East of East Hanney Alternative Site		
1096870	Mr Gloag Merton College	Mr Davies	1096871	SSTP - Site 15 South West of Botley		

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
				Alternative Site		
1099245	Doris Field Charitable Trust			West of Wantage Alternative Site		
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd					
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd,			West of Wantage Alternative Site		
1094956	Debbie Lewis-Pryde Clerk Kingston Lisle and Fawler Parish Council			HELAA - KLIS		
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd			West Wantage Link Road	Comments and further information provided on the delivery of the West Wantage Link Road in relation to the alternative site at West of Wantage. The comments and information state the road is viable and could be delivered with the development of around 800 homes.	Noted. The site in question has been examined as part of the site selection process. The details of this process are set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd			Landscape Impact - Alternative Site at West of Wantage	One respondent has made comments referring to the landscape impact from an alternative site at West of Wantage. They suggest there is no justification or evidence that the landscape sensitivity of the area limits the development potential of the site. Due to a combination of the topography of the site, existing built development and boundary vegetation and careful masterplanning to maintain a meaningful countryside gap between East Challow and any new development, there would be no perception of amalgamation between the proposed development and East Challow which would remain as a stand-alone village within the Vale.	No action is considered necessary.
1097815	Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	Hannah Bowler	1097816	Land South of Harwell Campus: Air Quality assessment	This comments highlights the work undertaken by Jubb and highlights that within an alternative site location, air quality was within acceptable limits.	Comment is noted.
1097815	Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	Hannah Bowler	1097816	Alternative Site - South of Harwell Campus	This comment highlights that the noise produced by developing this site, would be similar to recently consented schemes and a technical note was prepared for one of these schemes submitted by their clients.	Comment is noted.

## Sustainability Appraisal

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman Group Land Planning Manager Bovis Homes Limited			East Challow	The Oxfordshire Growth Board ruled out potential sites in Western Vale sub-area using RAG scoring system, as the Western Vale is relatively poorly linked to Oxford (Interim SA Report, para. 6.2.15). Bovis Homes appreciates that, beyond East Challow, settlements might be remote from Oxford; however, East Challow is within walking distance of Wantage, which is included within the South East Sub-Vale, and thus potentially suitable for additional housing and is therefore a reasonable alternative.	Site options to the west of Wantage are examined closely within the SA Report and site assessment process.
1096069	Ms Jones Redcliffe Homes Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055	East Hendred	East Hendred as a site option does not appear to have been considered for as a potential additional site allocation at all in the Sustainability Appraisal other than in the description of the South East Vale Sub-Area.	The SA Report examines a range of site options (see Appendices III to V). It does not examine any site options at East Challow (but does examine two site options at 'West of Wantage'.
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	Green Belt	One comment states that it seems clear that the sites have been selected principally on the basis that they are beyond the Oxford Green Belt.	Noted.
1022463	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	Mr Steven Pickles	724498		Another comment states that there are sound reasons for excluding the Lansdowne Rd site identified on the attached plan LO1A from the Green Belt.	
1097815  829404	Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate  Mr & Mrs Chapman	Hannah Bowler	1097816	Harwell Campus	<p>Respondent is supportive and agrees that there is a specific need for housing to accommodate the needs of employees of the Campus and that the most appropriate location for this will be directly adjacent to the campus itself. This said, VoWH need to ensure that by progressing with an allocation that will result in the loss of 28 ha of the Enterprise Zone that it will not undermine the potential for economic growth of the area. The evidence base to Part 1 was not dependent on the entire Enterprise Zone to deliver on the required economic growth to 2031, albeit VoWH should be considerations any associated longer term implications beyond 2031.</p> <p>Respondent is supportive of the approach to deliver a Comprehensive Development Framework for the Campus to ensure that development comes forward in the most appropriate way especially given the relationship of the site to the North Wessex AONB.</p> <p>Another comment states that the Local Plan 2 will affect the biodiversity, within the rural and unspoilt landscape surrounding Harwell Campus. This inappropriate and not in agreement with Oxfordshire's Biodiversity Action Plan. The Local Plan 2 does not meet the Sustainability Appraisal Objective to; Conserve and enhance areas of sensitive landscape including AONB and Green Belt, Conserve and</p>	The SA Report is clear that there are some biodiversity issues at the North of Harwell Campus site, associated with some limited on site (non-designated) habitat. However, the implication is not necessarily that development of the site is therefore 'inappropriate'. Development would result in a range of benefits, and there is good potential to mitigate any biodiversity impacts.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					enhance the district's open spaces and countryside Improve access to, and enjoyment, understanding and use of cultural assets and PRoW Protect and enhance biodiversity	
929661	Mr Martin Small Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Historic England response	The section on Heritage in Part 2 of the Draft Sustainability Appraisal does not give any indication that the archaeological potential or interest of the proposed housing sites has been considered, with reference to the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record and/or Historic Landscape Character Assessment. The comment states that the Council should have undertaken its own assessment of archaeological potential on these sites.	Appraisal findings (relating to site options, reasonable alternatives and the draft plan) give consideration to a range of heritage assets, including archaeological notification areas.
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Housing allocation	The report raised the possibility of allocating in the region of 1,400 homes to support Science Vale and Didcot Garden Town objectives. Our understanding of this report was that the Inspector was referring to allocating this number of homes from within the overall figure of 20,560 from the SHMA not in addition to this.	This matter is explained within Sections 3 and 6.2 of the SA Report, as well as within the plan document. The 1,400 figure is additional.
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd			Infrastructure	Wantage is located at the western extent of the Science Vale, and the site is some way distant from the town centre. Large scale growth would likely necessitate a Wantage Western Relief Road, and there is also an opportunity to upgrade the canal as a cycle route. Development would erode the important settlement gap to East Challow.	Noted.
1094583 760211 1095064 928815	Dr Youngman  Dr Andrew Pritchard  Jessica Brod  Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England			Lack of consideration for infrastructure	The Local Plan must take proper account of the Sustainability Appraisal. Lack of infrastructure is as much of a constraint as the green belt or the flood plain if there are no realistic plans to provide it before new houses are occupied.  Only one of the proposed sites (Harwell) addresses the objective to reduce the need for travel as these sites are placed around larger and smaller villages where there are very limited employment opportunities, no supermarkets, GP surgeries and very limited school places. Any site around a town must create better opportunities for reducing car travel with facilities within easy walking or cycling distance and better access to bus services.  The need for the evaluation of transport impacts of the Clusters mentioned on p.17 and illustrated on p.63 is referred to in para 10.4.9. Topic paper 5 shows that almost all of these have negative effects on congested roads, but no solutions are proposed.  Highways England recognises that impacts to the SRN have been caveated by the Development Template within Appendix A of the Part 2 plan which requires a transport	Noted.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					assessment to be submitted with any planning application for a housing site in order to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for any harmful transport impacts. We would therefore welcome the opportunity to work with the VoWHDC in order to mitigate these traffic impacts on the SRN.	
1097403	Douglas C B Bond Woolf Bond Planning LLP			Lashford Lane, Wootton	It is not clear how the identified objectives of "heritage" and "landscape" could, at a more detailed level, be associated with the land west of Lashford Lane, Wootton. This too reinforces the merits of the site and the case for its release through the Part 2 Local Plan process.	Consideration has been given to site options at Wootton, with one site ('South of Wootton') taken forward for detailed examination. The process of considering site options (and then alternative combinations of site options, i.e. 'reasonable alternatives') is explained within Part 1 of the SA Report.
1094583  730272	Dr Youngman  Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council			Marcham	<p>Option 1 is stated as achieving the greatest number of objectives, so why is this not the preferred option. Only the preferred option places such a high demand for houses on Marcham where all other options place a lesser strain on Marcham's infrastructure.</p> <p>Options 2 and 3 are stated as performing poorly as building of houses south of Abingdon ahead of new bypass would worsen traffic in Abingdon and adversely affect air quality. However this is also true for Marcham, a new bypass is planned so why are there proposals to build in Marcham prior to building the planned bypass.</p> <p>Respondent notes with concern that the Sustainability Appraisal does not discuss the comments in the draft Green Infrastructure Strategy (part 3) which notes that: Marcham is partially served by accessible natural greenspace sites between 2ha and 20ha, although these lie mostly to the west and south, resulting in a deficit in the eastern and northern parts of the village.</p>	<p>The Council is not obliged to select, as the preferred option, the option that performs best in terms the greatest number of SA objectives.</p> <p>The points regarding constraints to growth at Marcham are noted.</p> <p>With regards to accessible greenspace, the deficit at Marcham is noted, and is referenced within the SA Report.</p>
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England			Natural England response	Natural England expects sufficient evidence to be provided, through the SA and HRA, to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected, e.g. land allocations should avoid designated sites and landscapes and should consider the direct and indirect effects of development on land within the setting of designated landscapes.	The process of considering site options (and then alternative combinations of site options, i.e. 'reasonable alternatives') is explained within Part 1 of the SA Report.
1097646	Ian Hepburn Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB			North Wessex AONB	<p>In recognition of the emphasis on the strategic nature of the Local Plan2 we would recommend that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) should include a strategic assessment of the cumulative potential impacts on the North Wessex AONB objectives.</p> <p>It would be useful to include a section to assess the potential to integrate development policy objectives to reflect their effects on the AONB and the wider District in respect of sustainable development and in particular of community</p>	Impacts on the AONB have been a focus of appraisal work, and indeed explicit consideration is given to the potential for LPP2 to impact cumulatively with other plans (see Section 11 of the report).

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
					well-being.	
875920	Daniel Scharf			Objection	It is very disappointing to see that the Sustainability Appraisal for the part 2 Plan plays down the need and efficacy for local action.	Noted.
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	Mr Geoff Gardner	879505	SA unsound	<p>A number of comments concerning the soundness of the SA. Key issues were:</p> <p>It is considered that the SA is not sufficiently robust in establishing that no LPP2 allocations should be proposed in the Western Vale Sub-Area such as to the West of Wantage. had the site been properly and consistently assessed, it would have inevitably have performed significantly better than several of the LPP2 proposed allocations given its sustainable location, ability to deliver strategic infrastructure and absence of development constraints.</p> <p>The plan to build a major settlement in Fyfiled is against the Council's own Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Sites which offered sustainability benefits when assessed through the Growth Board work including those at SW Botley, Cumnor and Wootton are all rejected from the spatial strategy without any clear justification for their removal.</p> <p>One of the objectives is to improve and protect the natural environment including biodiversity, but all options are scored as equal; this must be a generalisation based on lack of evidence rather than a statement of fact.</p> <p>The SA confirms 'delivery is uncertain', yet other published documents do not address this as clearly. The Site Selectio topic paper takes no account of the deliverability of allocated sites in its comparative assessment. The complete overlooking of deliverability in the relevant background paper suggests a fundamentally unsound evidence base and resulting Plan.</p> <p>There is no balancing of site sustainability with green belt status. This strategy is implicit but not made clear in any of the documents.</p> <p>The process of identifying sites and comparing them to 'reasonable alternatives' is far too vague, and in many cases undocumented, to justify inclusion in LPP2; Of the 3 options tested, the lack of a clear small sites approach shows that the Plan has deliberately overlooked realistic development</p>	West of Wantage is considered within the SA Report as a site option.
1094583	Dr Youngman					Fyfield was considered as a site option in 2016, but subsequently ruled out.
1096101	Drivewalk Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055			Site options identified and assessed by the Growth board are discussed within Part 1 of the SA Report, alongside other site options.
879120	Gow Family Gow Family	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353			When dealing with high level / strategic alternatives, each with various components to them, it can be difficult to differentiate them with certainty. Lack of evidence is a factor.
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd					Green Belt review findings have been taken into account within the SA Report.
1097353	Liam Ryder Planner Gladman Developments					Part 1 of the SA Report discusses the process of considering site options, and then alternative combinations of site options (i.e. 'reasonable alternatives') ahead of selecting the preferred option.
1098254	Martha Kibaris					Chapter 8 of the SA Report explains the Council's reasons for supporting the preferred option, in light of reasonable alternatives.
829404	Mr & Mrs Chapman					The Council (working with AECOM) determined that there was not a reasonable need to test a spatial strategy option that would involve having a separate spatial strategy for the unmet need apportioned to the Vale. High level considerations that served to 'frame' the reasonable
858458	Mr Paul Butt Paul Butt Planning					
1096872	Patsy Dell Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services Oxford City Council					
1096196	R M Burson EM					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096915	Burson and Sons Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	Mr Fenwick	1022452		opportunities at a non-strategic level, below 50 units. This means that the Plan and the SA has failed to consider the 'reasonable alternative' of a more dispersed development strategy.	alternatives are discussed within Section 6.2.
1022473	Rosconn Group	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353		Option 4 did not score as well as Option 1 overall. The Council's reasons for selecting Option 4 over Option 1 are unclear. Indeed, the Council conclude the appraisal shows Option 1 to perform best in terms of the greatest number of objectives, primarily because it would involve concentrating growth at a small number of large sites.	Potential drawbacks to the plan, in respect of certain objectives, are explained within the SA Report.
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568		The Plan is not legally compliant in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Report. The SEA process is defective for failure to consider "reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographic scope of the plan" as required by SEA Reg 12(2)(b)  The preferred option seems to be an amalgamation of the other three options. The SA does not consider the reasonable alternative of having a separate spatial strategy for the unmet need apportioned to the Vale. It is unreasonable not to at least assess this as an option.  The Local Plan 2 does not meet the Sustainability Appraisal Objective to reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds especially water, air, soil and noise pollution. The Local Plan 2 does not meet the Sustainability Appraisal Objective to seek to address the causes and effects of climate change.	
1096101	Drivewalk Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055	Sites EACH06 and EACH07	A Landscape and Visual Impact assessment to inform an illustrative layout plan is intended to be produced to demonstrate that the visual gap when seen from the public footpath and the space between the edge of Wantage and the former depot site in views from the A417 would not result in an unacceptable coalescence between Wantage and East Challow and/or will maintain their separate identity.  Sites EACH06 and EACH07 do not lie within the floodplain of Woodhill Brook, and lie within Flood Zone 1 on the Environment Agency website.	Noted.
1022463	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	Mr Steven Pickles	724498	Support	Support reasons for retaining Parcel 2 in the Greenbelt.	Support acknowledged.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)			Thames Valley Police response	<p>Comment questions how the Council will be able to reduce crime rates in an area that already has some of the lowest crime rates in the country.</p> <p>North Drive has a very low crime rate and is a community of safety and security, any such large development and increase to the population is more than likely to only increase crime.</p>	Impacts on crime rates are not a particular focus of the analysis presented within the SA Report, recognising that it is inherently difficult to predict effects (associated with site options, alternatives combinations of site options, or the plan as a whole) with certainty.
1096101	Drivewalk Ltd	Mr Paul Butt	832055	West of Wantage site	<p>Large scale growth at the West of Wantage site would necessitate a Wantage Western Relief Road . The West of Wantage site is distant from the centre of Wantage, where bus services operate from . There is an opportunity to upgrade the canal for cycling. There is already a premium bus service route to Oxford from Wantage . The committed growth in the area is not set to deliver a premium bus service to Oxford. It is noted that a further premium bus service from Wantage to the strategic employment site of Milton Park is set to be delivered from the already committed growth.</p> <p>Another comment states that this area does not relate well to the existing settlement and there would be a risk of coalescence with the committed Grove Airfield scheme.</p> <p>One respondent believes that the large scale growth West of Wantage would not 'necessitate' the Wantage Western Relief Road as contributions towards it are already required to be made by all developments within the South East Vale Sub-Area.</p>	Two West of Wantage site options are examined closely within the SA Report (in particular, see Appendices III and IV).
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Neil Mantell	1097568	Western Vale	<p>It would be more appropriate for the unmet need to be distributed in accordance with its spatial planning framework. However, as identified in para. 6.4.7 of the consultation Plan's Sustainability Assessment, having been based upon flawed work undertaken by the Growth Board, it again did not consider any spatial options with the Western Vale.</p>	The matter of potential allocations within the Western Vale is discussed within Section 6.2 of the SA Report.

## Habitats Regulation Assessment

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095499 1094583	Leanne Parry Dr Youngman			Ecology	There are concerns over damaging the ecology and existing habitats for wildlife. Concern over the amount of Light level pollution for the existing residents and wildlife Wildlife corridors are essential to allow movement of species between sites.	Noted. It is considered this falls outside the scope of the HRA.
1094583 1096948	Dr Youngman Haidrum Breith Senior Biodiversity and Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust.			Cothill Fen SAC	Concern over the impact the development will have on Cothill Fen SAC. More assessments are needed to ensure development does not effect recreational pressure, hydrology and air quality. Polciy 8b does not settle the concerns that the proposed mitigation actions will not be fully effective in mitigating adverse recreational impacts	The effects of the LPP2 on Cothill Fen SAC through recreational pressure, hydrology and air quality have been considered further in updating the HRA report. It is considered that Policy 8b proposed mitigation actions will require a project-level HRA in order to demonstrate that the specific development can be delivered without likely significant effects on the SAC. This is made clear within the LPP2 HRA.
1094583 1095874	Dr Youngman Caroline Ball			Objection	This comment objects to the HRA stating that the policies should consider the impact to the environment of these proposals and put in place limitation of access to paths and byways to off road vehicles. It also raises issues over the concern on the Natura 2000 site.	Effects on Cothill Fen SAC (a Natura 2000 site) through recreational pressure are considered within the HRA.
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England			Evidence	Evidence is needed through SA and HRA to support site allocations	The effects of the LPP2 on Cothill Fen SAC and Oxford Meadows SAC through recreational pressure, hydrology and air quality have been considered further in updating the HRA report.
1022361 1096948	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			Project Level Assessments	Recommend Project Level HRA assessments to include air pollutions and transport impact to consider the impact on Cothill Fen SAC. They should test the worst case senario to accommodate future growth beyond 2031 Should be incorporated into Site development templates	The HRA recommends a project level assessment and this is reflected in the Site Development Templates.
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			hydrological changes	HRA should also assess for hydrological changes and the potential impact	The hydrological baseline data for Cothill Fen SAC has been updated in the HRA following consultation with Natural England and a review of a site-specific hydrological assessment relating to Dalton Barracks.
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and			Transport	Transport Schemes including sustainable transport schemes are adequatly tested and assessed as schemes such as Park and Rides bring more traffic and therefore air pollution closer to SAC.	This has been considered in updating the LPP2 HRA.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
	Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust					
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			Live stock	Sites require active management and so they have livestock grazing on the land. This increases visitor pressures and means there are issues with dog walkers, gates being left open, dog foul, scaring of livestock and dogs of leads. Adding more housing, will increase these issues.	This has been considered in updating the LPP2 HRA.
829404	Mr & Mrs Chapman			SODC Evidence	South Oxfordshire's HRA has been discussed.	Noted

**Infrastructure General**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			CPRE Sites/development	That an additional Policy equivalent to Policy DC8 in the 2011 plan, considered by the Vale as consistent with the NPPF, needs adding to the Chapter 3.	The Council consider this is appropriately covered by Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services as set out in the Part 1 Plan
1095787	Mr Tony Parsons			Environment maintenance	Comment questions how Council will be able to maintain additional roads, paths, verges and parks when, in the opinion of the commenter, standards of maintenance have been declining in recent years.	Noted.
825516	Mr Keith Diment			General infrastructure	Comments express concern that the infrastructure and amenities at site allocations are insufficient to cope with additional demand. Comments encompass road capacity, schools, shops, leisure and sport facilities, pubs and churches.	The Council considers the proposed allocations are deliverable which is demonstrated within the Site Selection Topic Paper. A suite of evidence base studies have been produced to assess the impact of sites on landscape, infrastructure, flooding and viability which has informed the site selection process. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is published alongside the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan that sets out the final infrastructure package to support the site allocations in the Part 2 Plan.
1094555	Mr Francis Sketch					
1098560	Mummery					
1094213	Mr James Crafe					
1095042	Mrs Woodley					
1095800	Mr and Mrs Guy and Jessica Bishop					
874446	Mr Christopher Baker					
1095903	Mr Martin Rhodes					
1095932	Mr Meriel Lewis					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
1096707	Prof James Allan					
1094957	Debby Fox					
1097839	Nick Tucker					
1097845	Sally Tucker					
830143	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council					
1098052	Ms Hazel Abraham					
1057747	Minscombe Properties Ltd	Mr Terry Gashe	1057745			

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
928815	Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England			Highways England - Transport	Overall, in accordance with national policy, we look to the Vale of White Horse District Council (VoWHDC) to promote strategies, policies and land allocations which will support alternatives to the car and the operation of a safe and reliable transport network.	Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England on the Local Plan and evidence base.
725573	Ms Barbara Morgan Network Rail			Network Rail - Level Crossings	We request that a policy is provided confirming that: The Council has a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume.	The Council has considered this comment for the preparation of the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1095874	Caroline Ball			Objection - infrastructure before houses	Comments raised concerns that infrastructure should be provided before new housing is built.	Supporting infrastructure will be planned in a timely manner and be delivered in parallel with growth, in accordance with Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services, of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment					
1097535	Mr SPB Capel					
825516	Mr Keith Diment					
1094555	Mr Francis Sketch					
1094632	Mr William Hambly Symons					
1094885	Mr Sonke Adlung Senior Editor Oxford University Press					
1094957	Debby Fox					
1095667	Mr Lakelan Chairman Blewbury Parish Council					
1095717	Dr Katsuaki Inoue					
874446	Mr Christopher Baker					
871494	Mr Noel Newson					
1096225	Mr Richard Bahu					
1096707	Prof James Allan					
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse)					

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096890	Committee) Mrs Fran Simmons					
1096893	Miss Beth Simmons					
1096903	Miss Alex Simmons					
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanneley Parish Council					
1094957	Debby Fox			Overall traffic levels	Comments express general concern over increasing levels of traffic.	Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, the Council has taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes required to support development in the Local Plan, and beyond. The final package of transport schemes required to support growth in the Local Plan, is informed by extensive evidence base work. This includes but not limited to, the Evaluation of Transport Impact Study using the Oxfordshire Transport Model, and the Oxford to Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study. The final package of supporting infrastructure is included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan
1094964	Anna Hillis					
1098052	Ms Hazel Abraham					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
730272	Mrs L Martin Marcham Parish Council					
1094957	Debby Fox			Public transport provision	Comment expresses general concern over level of public transport provision including around North Abingdon.	The Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Part 1 Plan seek to encourage sustainable modes of transport and a reduction in the need to travel wherever possible, with Core Policy 33 setting out how the Council will work with Oxfordshire County Council and others to promote sustainable transport accessibility to development, including measures set out in the Local Transport Plan 4. The Council has also undertaken a study assessing public transport within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area.
866592	Mr Bob Evans					
725573	Ms Barbara Morgan Network Rail			Rail infrastructure funding	Comment suggests plan should include requirement for developers to contribute to the cost of rail upgrades necessary to cope with extra passengers.	The Council has updated its Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies the contributions required from development towards necessary infrastructure provision and improvements. This includes consideration of rail improvements. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan supports the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan
1094957	Debby Fox			Sustainable modes of travel	Comment questions how the plan encourages sustainable modes of travel.	The Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Part 1 Plan seek to encourage sustainable modes of transport and a reduction in the need to travel wherever possible, with Core Policy 33 setting out how the Council will work with Oxfordshire County Council and others to promote sustainable transport accessibility to ne development, including measures set out in the Local Transport Plan 4.
1095667	Mr Lakeland Chairman Blewbury Parish Council			Transport impact on villages	Villages require improved transport infrastructure, including public transport and cycle routes, to thrive.	Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with the Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						<p>Council has taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes required to support development in the Local Plan, and beyond. The final package of transport schemes required to support growth in the Local Plan, is informed by extensive evidence base work. This includes but not limited to, the Evaluation of Transport Impact Study using the Oxfordshire Transport Model, and the Oxford to Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study. The final package of supporting infrastructure is in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.</p>

Education General

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Amendment - pupil place planning	Oxfordshire County Council suggest that an updated housing trajectory clearly showing how and when each site will develop would be useful to help inform a view on the implications for pupil place planning.	The Council notes the County Council's suggestion. A Housing Trajectory will be published alongside the Publication Plan.
1094957	Debby Fox			Insufficient school provision	A number of respondents have raised concerns that existing schools serving the villages to be expanded are not large enough.	Supporting infrastructure will be planned in a timely manner and be delivered in parallel with growth, in accordance with Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services, of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. Also Appendix A: Site Development Templates under the heading Social and Community, shows the necessary infrastructure requirements that the site allocation will need to provide or contribute to, including the necessary provision of education facilities on-site or contributions towards the expansion of existing school provision in the area.
1096903	Miss Alex Simmons					
1094555	Mr Francis Sketch					
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)					
1098629	Mrs H R Cole					
1095499	Mrs Leanne Parry					
1094555	Mr Francis Sketch			Objection - Primary schools should be built before houses and the plans for secondary schooling are inadequate	Respondent has raised an objection that infrastructure such as primary schools should be provided prior to the housing being built.	Supporting infrastructure will be planned in a timely manner and be delivered in parallel with growth, in accordance with Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services, of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
730231	Mrs Susan Blomerus Appleton with Eaton Parish Council			Support	Appleton with Eaton Parish Council supports the new primary schools to be built and suggest that new secondary schools may also be needed.	The Council acknowledges the support of Appleton with Eaton Parish Council.  The requirements for secondary level education have been considered in updating the Site Development Templates to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

## Self-Build and Custom Build

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
875920 730190 1100197	Daniel Scharf Councillor Debby Hallett Mr Peter Canavan Senior Planning Policy Officer South Oxfordshire District Council			Self and custom build policies	Concern raised as to the lack of a specific policy relating to self and custom build and delivering the need/demand in registers. Encouragement should be given to self and custom build opportunities, particularly in relation to potential affordability. Affordable living, energy efficiency and running costs should also be referred to.	The potential for a Development Policy on Self and Custom Build has been considered by the Council in the preparation of the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan. Further detail on the inclusion of a self-build policy in the Part 2 Plan can be found in the Building Healthy and Sustainable Communities Topic Paper.
875920	Daniel Scharf			SHMA Issue	Comments regarding concerns with the SHMA. These relate to issues with local champions for self build which could alternatively be achieved through planning policy, lack of clarity regarding why room sizes, property types and HMOs should be looked at and a wish for a detailed analysis of the SHMA and consideration as to whether its recommendations are still appropriate. One comment added that limited weight should be given to it. There was a suggestion for part of large sites being allocated to self building or co-housing.	The Examination of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 included testing of the Oxfordshire SHMA in relation to Vale's housing need. It was scrutinised in depth with the Inspector concluding the Vale's housing need is sound. The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 was Adopted at the end of 2016 and thus is considered to be up to date.  The potential for a Development Policy on Self and Custom Build has been considered by the Council in the preparation of the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan. Further detail on the inclusion of a self-build policy in the Part 2 Plan can be found in the Building Healthy and Sustainable Communities Topic Paper.

## Health Care General

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Additions to policy	Comments suggesting that the Local Plan should provide for the expansion of health services and associated infrastructure.	The Council continues to work proactively and collaboratively with the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and the Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust to consider the necessary health care facilities to support the planned growth for the District, as set out in the Local Plan. In light of this, the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, sets out the necessary health care provision needed to support the growth proposed in the Part 2 Plan
1050211	Mrs Anne Lankester Locality Co-ordinator for the SE & SW of Oxfordshire Oxfordshire CCG			Clinical Commissioning Group Response	Planned housing growth will have a significant impact on primary care and practices will need access to developer funding.	
827932	Julie Maberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Involvement of NHS and emergency services	Evidence of the support of the NHS and emergency services for the Plan should be included.	
1096128	Carmen Somerset Brock			Need to make provision for healthcare	Comments suggesting that the Local Plan should provide for the expansion of health services and associated infrastructure.	
1094555	Mr Francis Sketch					

## Cycling Infrastructure

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
763485	Mr Ian Leggett Botley-Eynsham Community Path & Bike Safe	Mr Paul Slater	872479	B4044 Community Path	A comment, objecting to the Plan due to the omission of the B4044 Community Path or requesting the inclusion of th Community Path in the Local Plan.	Noted. Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking in the adopted Part 1 Plan supports the provision of sustainable transport measures to promote the use of public transport, cycling and walking.  The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other key stakeholders to support the provision of new cycling routes where proposals are consistent with other relevant policies in the Local Plan 2031.
763485	Mr Ian Leggett Botley-Eynsham Community Path & Bike Safe	Mr Paul Slater	872479	Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plans (LCWIP)	Recommendation that a LCWIP is prepared as part of the Local Plan process.	Noted. Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking in the Part 1 Plan supports the provision of sustainable transport measures to promote the use of public transport, cycling and walking.  The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other key stakeholders to support the provision of new cycling routes where consistent with other policies of this plan.  Development Policy 16: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans of the Part 2 Plan ensures development proposals are supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council guidance including their Walking and Cycling Design Guide.  The Council supported Oxfordshire County Council in submitting an expression of interest to obtain further resource to develop Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plans for the central area of Oxfordshire where development of homes and jobs is currently focused.
929685	Dr Peter J Collins CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse Committee)			Maintenance, Green Infrastructure and Design	Sections/ text relating to maintenance, Green Infrastructure and design should be strengthened.	Each application will be determined alongside the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance, relevant legislation, and the Council's Development PlanCore Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking, Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure in the Part 1 Plan will apply when deciding on planning applications.
1094957 1094984 1094555	Debby Fox Mr Ewart Mr Francis Sketch			Provision for cycle paths	A number of comments relating to the need for more cycle paths, with Wantage, Harwell and Milton mentioned specifically.	The Council encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport including upgrading and providing new cycle links and facilities, particularly between key routes, as detailed in Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking of the adopted Local Plan. Consequently, the Council are working proactively with Oxfordshire County Council and key stakeholders to undertake extensive evidence base work in terms of sustainable modes of transport. This includes but not limited to, the Oxford to Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study and the Evaluation of Transport Impact Study using Oxfordshire Transport Model. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, read alongside the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, also details a number of cycle schemes for the Western and South East Vale sub-areas to help support the planned growth of the Local Plan.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			Provision for cycle paths - safeguarding	Comment relates to the need for more cycle paths and requests land be safeguarded for these.	Noted. Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking in the Part 1 Plan supports the provision of sustainable transport measures to promote the use of public

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						<p>transport, cycling and walking.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other key stakeholders to support the provision of new cycling routes where consistent with other policies of this plan.</p> <p>Development Policy 16: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans of the Part 2 Plan ensures development proposals are supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council guidance including their Walking and Cycling Design Guide.</p>
1094602	Mr Dave Cavanagh Chair Oxfordshire Ramblers			Support for the promotion of walking and cycling included in the Plan	Support for the promotion of walking and cycling included in the Plan	Noted.

5 year housing land supply (5YHLS)

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096101 1021077 1097677	Drivewalk Ltd Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire David Wilson Homes (Southern)	Mr Paul Butt Neil Mantell David Murray-Cox	832055 1097568 1097679	Alternative Sites/Strategy to assist Supply	Comments raised concerns over the Council's supply position especially in relation to the recent appeal decision at Mather House and Greensands, East Hendred. Three sites have been proposed to assist: Grove Park, EACH06 and EACH07 in the Western Vale Sub-Area. One comment raised the potential of allocating in the Western Vale rather than not allocating as this is not consistent with the overall strategy.	Please see the Site Selection Topic Paper for further detail on the assessment of the alternative site. The Council has a 5YHLS as demonstrated through the Council's 5YHLS Statement 2016/17 and tested at a recent appeal at Brewer Close.
1022242 1094394	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group Claire Arnold Clerk Watchfield Parish Council			Delivery Test	Comments highlighted the delivery test being proposed through the Housing White Paper. One comment generally raised concerns over the tests and the penalties whilst another recommended introducing punitive penalties or the meaningful withdrawal of planning permission if developers sit on permissions.	Comments noted.
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			East Hanney Sites Contribution to Supply	East Hanney Parish Council raised concerns over whether the proposed allocations at East Hanney can contribute in the short term when there are infrastructure constraints.	Point noted. The Council's site assessment indicates this site is deliverable in the short term.
730284 1094284	Mr Brian Rixon Mr James Greenman			Not include Oxford's Unmet Need in 5YHLS Calculation	Comments recommend that policy wording should state that the Vale's proportion of Oxford's Unmet Need will not be included in the five year housing land supply.	Local Plan 2031 Part 1, Core Policy 2 identifies the Council's approach to meeting the Vale's proportion of Oxford's unmet need. It is clear this proportion will be added to the Vale's housing requirement at the appropriate time and therefore will be included in the Council's five year housing land supply calculations at the appropriate time. Therefore the policy cannot be amended to reflect this suggestion.
730190 1022242 1095180 1096069 1096101 879508 756760	Councillor Debby Hallett Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group Mr Mark Baker Ms Jones Redcliffe Homes Ltd Drivewalk Ltd Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd Mr Roger Turnbull East Hendred Parish Council	Mr Paul Butt Mr Paul Butt Mr Geoff Gardner	832055 832055 879505	Overall Deliverability	We have received a number of comments raising concerns over the delivery of housing in the district. Just under half of these were from Taylor Wimpey. Concerns raised over the absence of phasing and how infrastructure impacts on build out rates. Comments referenced the recent appeal decision at Mather House and Greensands, East Hendred and raised concerns over the delivery of larger sites, including Monks Farm and Grove Airfield. One comment recommended that the shortfall can be remedied by additional allocations. Recommended that delivery rates should be realistic, having regards to overall quantum of development in specific areas, in particular in and around Didcot, need to reflect lead in times to gain permission and reflect that national housebuilders are reconsidering delivery rates.	The Council's five year housing land supply is based on robust and up to date evidence including delivery rates from developers /agents. This ensures they are realistic and reflect the appropriate lead in times. The Local Plan 2031 Part 2 proposes to allocate above the requirement to assist with housing supply. Further detail on phasing is provided alongside the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1021077 1097814 1097677	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire  Gale and Binning  David Wilson Homes (Southern)	Neil Mantell  Mr Kenneth Dijkman  David Murray-Cox	1097568  724542  1097679			
1099225	Welbeck Strategic Land Ltd			Overall Deliverability	We have received a number of comments raising concerns over the delivery of housing in the district. Just under half of these were from Taylor Wimpey. Concerns raised over the absence of phasing and how infrastructure impacts on build out rates. Comments referenced the recent appeal decision at Mather House and Greensands, East Hendred and raised concerns over the delivery of larger sites, including Monks Farm and Grove Airfield. One comment recommended that the shortfall can be remedy by additional allocations. Recommended that delivery rates should be realistic, having regards to overall quantum of development in specific areas, in particular in and around Didcot, need to reflect lead in times to gain permission and reflect that national housebuilders are reconsidering delivery rates.	The Council's five year housing land supply is based on robust and up to date evidence including delivery rates from developers /agents. This ensures they are realistic and reflect the appropriate lead in times. The Local Plan 2031 Part 2 proposes to allocate above the requirement to assist with housing supply. Further detail on phasing is provided alongside the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman Group Land Planning Manager Bovis Homes Limited			Oxford Unmet Need and Buffer	One comment highlighted confusion over whether the 20% buffer will be applied to the Vale's proportion of Oxford's Unmet Need.	Point noted. A buffer of 5% or 20% will be applied dependent on whether there has been persistent under delivery at that point.
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group			Supply Method	One comment raising concerns over the use of the sedgefield method in the rest of district area as it adds a significant amount of supply onto the five year period.	Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence as set out in the Part 1 Plan identifies the approach and method to the Council's five year housing land supply. The policy was examined by an independent Planning Inspector for the Examination of the Part 1 Plan which was found to be soundly based and consistency with national policy.
1096854	RH Systems	Liz Alexander	1096857	Support Additional Allocations - Flexibility for 5YHLS	One comment suggest additional allocations should be proposed to ensure there is flexibility with maintaining a 5YHLS.	Noted.
1022242	Dr David Illingworth North Abingdon Local Plan Group			Unmet Need Impact on Supply	One comment suggests it is not appropriate for the Vale's proportion of Oxford's Unmet Need to be added the five year supply before Adoption of the Plan, regardless of whether this is after the December 2018 timeframe.	Core Policy 2 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1: Strategic Sites and Policies confirms how the Vale of White Horse will address the quantum of Oxford's unmet housing need, to be provided for within the Vale, through the preparation of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.  The Part 1 Plan includes a clear policy commitment to ensure unmet need is addressed in a timely manner, informed by a robust approach to plan-making and prepared in accordance with national policy and legislation.

**A34 General**

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett			A34 Access	No improvements to access of A34 from Botley.	The Council continues to work collaboratively and proactively with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to investigate and mitigate against the impact of development and to implement a Route Based Strategy for the A34, as detailed in Core Policy 34 of Part 1 of the Local Plan
871969 1096211 928815 875920 1093046 1096128	Michael Morrow Mr Farrell Patrick Blake Assistant Asset Manager Highways England Daniel Scharf Mrs Claire Flint Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)			Congestion on A34/ new traffic data needed	Plan needs to include policies and strategy for reducing, not mitigating, car use. The current situation creates uncertainty for the growth of jobs and housing and impacts on surrounding villages. Traffic data needs to be updated to reflect the current situation.	The Council continues to work collaboratively and proactively with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to investigate and mitigate against the impact of development and to implement a Route Based Strategy for the A34, as detailed in Core Policy 34 of Part 1 of the Local Plan. The Council's Local Plan Part 1 and Infrastructure Delivery Plan, has identified schemes and funding including the development of, south facing slips on the A34 at Lodge Hill, improvements to the Milton Interchange junction, north facing slips at Milton Park, and the Thames Crossing Bridge at Culham Science Centre to help alleviate congestion and to support the growth of the districts Local Plan.  The Council has also undertaken an Evaluation of Transport Impacts, with the final package of transport schemes required to support growth in the Local Plan to be informed by further evidence base work, prior to the pre-submission of the Local Plan. This includes the Evaluation of Transport Impact Study using the Oxfordshire Transport Model, and the Oxford to Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study. The final package of supporting infrastructure is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1096903	Miss Alex Simmons			Frilford junction	The plan does not commit to action on the A34, or any other roads, which would help improve Frilford Lights	The Council continues to work collaboratively and proactively with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to investigate and mitigate against the impact of development and to implement a Route Based Strategy for the A34, as detailed in Core Policy 34 of Part 1 of the Local Plan. The Council's Local Plan Part 1 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, has identified transport schemes including the development of, south facing slips on the A34 at Lodge Hill, improvements to the Milton Interchange junction, north facing slips at Milton Park, and the Thames Crossing Bridge at Culham Science Centre to help alleviate congestion and to support the growth of the districts Local Plan.  The Council has also undertaken an Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study, and the Oxford to Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study. The final package of supporting infrastructure will be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1096843	Neil Hancox			Lodge Hill	Concern over likelihood of Lodge Hill improvements being delivered. Also that the improvements will not prevent residents of the North Abingdon development driving into the town and may encourage them to shop elsewhere.	The Council continues to work collaboratively and proactively with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to investigate and mitigate against the impact of development and to implement a Route Based

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
						<p>Strategy for the A34, as detailed in Core Policy 34 of Part 1 of the Local Plan. The Council's Local Plan Part 1 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, has identified transport schemes including the development of, south facing slips on the A34 at Lodge Hill, improvements to the Milton Interchange junction, north facing slips at Milton Park, and the Thames Crossing Bridge at Culham Science Centre to help alleviate congestion and to support the growth of the districts Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has also undertaken an Evaluation of Transport Impact Study using the Oxfordshire Transport Model, and the Oxford to Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study. The final package of supporting infrastructure will be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.</p>
1096177	Mr John Samways			Safety of A34	Concerns in relation to the safety of the A34 and associated road closures.	The Council continues to work collaboratively and proactively with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to investigate and mitigate against the impact of development and to implement a Route Based Strategy for the A34, as detailed in Core Policy 34 of Part 1 of the Local Plan.
875920	Daniel Scharf			Speed limit review on A34	Suggestion for 55mph speed limit to reduce differential speed between HGVs and cars to improve congestion, noise, air quality, frequency and severity of accidents.	The Council continues to work collaboratively and proactively with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to investigate and mitigate against the impact of development and to implement a Route Based Strategy for the A34, as detailed in Core Policy 34 of the Part 1 Plan..

**A417 and A338 General**

<b>Consultee ID</b>	<b>Consultee and / or Organisation</b>	<b>Agent and Organisation</b>	<b>Agent ID</b>	<b>Comment Category</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
1094555	Mr Francis Sketch			A417 concerns	Comment raises concerns with regard to travel on the A417 to employment sites. resident to get to the employment sites with no plans to improve the West Hendred junction nor to increase the capacity of the A417.	<p>Core Policy 17 of the Part 1 Plan sets out the strategic highway improvements identified for the South-East Vale sub-area to mitigate the impact of planned growth. These include route improvements on the A417 between Wantage and Blewbury.</p> <p>In addition, the Council continues to support the re-opening of a railway station at Grove in accordance with Core Policy 19 of Local Plan Part 1, with land safeguarded in accordance with Core Policy 19a of the Part 2 Plan.</p>

## Historic Environment

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
929661	Mr Martin Small Principal Adviser (Historic Environment Planning) Historic England			Objection to lack of evidence base for Heritage policies	Historic England is deeply concerned that there is an insufficient evidence base to underpin the Heritage policies in Part 2 of the Local Plan. They suggest that the Council undertake further Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Plans, character assessments of the historic towns in the Vale and to consider the preparation of a heritage strategy for the district as a whole, particularly for those settlements with proposed site allocations, in order that the the Loal Plan 2031 Part 2 is based on adequate, update and relevant evidence about the historic environment. They offer assistance in preparing such a strategy.	The Council has considered Historic England's comments in refining the accompanying text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan. The Council will continue to work with Historic England to ensure policies related to the historic environment sets out a clear and positive strategy.

## Green Infrastructure

Consultee ID	Consultee and / or Organisation	Agent and Organisation	Agent ID	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1021056	Mr Richard Harding South Oxfordshire District of CPRE			CPRE Comments	CPRE Oxfordshire (Vale of White Horse) welcomes the Green Infrastructure Strategy, but suggests a number of amendments and raises several queries and concerns. CPRE would be happy to work with the Council to enhance footpath networks. Two members of CPRE requested an amendment to encourage the use of green roofs and raingardens within the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	The Council has considered the comments in updating the Green Infrastructure Strategy to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
827932	Julie Mabberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Definition of Green Infrastructure	The Campaign for Wantage and Grove has raised a concern regarding the definition of Green Infrastructure used in Core Policy 45 and the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	The Council has considered this comment in updating the Green Infrastructure Strategy to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem Natural England			Natural England Support	Natural England welcomes the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Supported noted and welcomed.
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			Net Gain in Green Infrastructure	One comment has asked how a net gain in Green Infrastructure is obtained.	Core Policy 45 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Green Infrastructure Strategy ensure that developments create a net gain in Green Infrastructure by designing into the development, and connecting to existing green infrastructure.
827932	Julie Mabberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Objection	Two objections have been raised by the Wantage and Grove Campaign Group 1)that the Local Plan does not safeguard land for use as accessible natural greenspaces. 2)that there is insufficient support for the Green Infrastructure Strategy in the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 policies	The Council considers that these issues are adequately addressed in Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure of the Local Plan Part 1, and the Green Infrastructure Strategy.
1097593	Susan Halliwell Director for Planning and Place Oxfordshire County Council			Oxfordshire County Council - Strategy	Oxfordshire County Council recommend that active travel and increasing opportunities for social interaction that might not otherwise occur are added to the list of positive health benefits that GI promotes.	The Council has considered Oxfordshire County Council's comments in refining the accompanying text for the Publication Version of the Part 2 Plan.
1096948	Haidrun Breith Senior Biodiversity & Planning Officer Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust - stakeholder engagement	Issues raised regarding stakeholder engagement with the Wildlife Trust and other parties, the location of the document on the website and request to comment on GI strategy after deadline.	The Council has engaged with key stakeholders in the preparation of the Green Infrastructure Strategy. The Green Infrastructure Strategy was also published for public consultation alongside the Preferred Options Version of the Part 2 Plan.  Further information on the Council's engagement with stakeholders can be found in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.
827932	Julie Mabberley Campaign Manager Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			Policies to Support Greenspace	Policies in Local Plan Part 2 should support creation of natural greenspace within the town to address existing deficits.	The Council consider this issue is addressed by Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy.
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock Senior Account Manager M3 (EU)			Protection of Open Spaces	Disruption to green open spaces should be kept to a minimum, and where replacement spaces are proposed, these should include trees to minimise air pollution.	The Council consider this issues is addressed by Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy.

Alternative formats of this publication are available on request

These include large print, Braille, audio, email,  
easy read and alternative languages

Please contact Planning on 01235 422600

**Planning Policy Team**  
135 Eastern Avenue, Milton  
Park, Abingdon, OX14 4SB

Email: [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

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