

Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area

General Comments

Category	Summary	Council Response
Alternate Strategic Sites	A range of sites are proposed as alternatives to development. These include:- Land at East Hanney (safeguarded for a reservoir)- Land at Shrivenham (to replace proposals at Cumnor)- Dalton Barracks- Land at Appleton- Land at Wootton- Land South of Radley	The Council consider the proposed sites are in sustainable locations for development as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which demonstrates alternative sites have been assessed.
Alternative Site - Cumnor	A range of sites are proposed as alternatives to development. These include:- Land at East Hanney (safeguarded for a reservoir)- Land at Shrivenham (to replace proposals at Cumnor)- Dalton Barracks- Land at Appleton- Land at Wootton- Land South of Radley	The Council consider the proposed sites are in sustainable locations for development as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which demonstrates alternative sites have been assessed.
Alternative Site - Dalton Barracks	A range of sites are proposed as alternatives to development. These include:- Land at East Hanney (safeguarded for a reservoir)- Land at Shrivenham (to replace proposals at Cumnor)- Dalton Barracks- Land at Appleton- Land at Wootton- Land South of Radley	The Council consider the proposed sites are in sustainable locations for development as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which demonstrates alternative sites have been assessed.
Alternative Site - Land South of Cumnor	Representation seeking to have their land included in Core Policy 8 as a strategic development site.	The council considers that the site south of Cumnor, as promoted by the landowners, is not strategic in size and therefore not considered suitable for allocating in Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
Alternative Site_Appleton	A range of sites are proposed as alternatives to development. These include:- Land at East Hanney (safeguarded for a reservoir)- Land at Shrivenham (to replace proposals at Cumnor)- Dalton Barracks- Land at Appleton- Land at Wootton- Land South of Radley	The Council consider the proposed sites are in sustainable locations for development as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which demonstrates alternative sites have been assessed.
Alternative Sites - Radley South	A range of sites are proposed as alternatives to development. These include:- Land at East Hanney (safeguarded for a reservoir)- Land at Shrivenham (to replace proposals at Cumnor)- Dalton Barracks- Land at Appleton- Land at Wootton- Land South of Radley	The Council consider the proposed sites are in sustainable locations for development as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which demonstrates alternative sites have been assessed.

Category	Summary	Council Response
Alternatives Sites - Wootton	A range of sites are proposed as alternatives to development. These include:- Land at East Hanney (safeguarded for a reservoir)- Land at Shrivenham (to replace proposals at Cumnor)- Dalton Barracks- Land at Appleton- Land at Wootton- Land South of Radley	The Council consider the proposed sites are in sustainable locations for development as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which demonstrates alternative sites have been assessed.
Cumnor High Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not possible to expand Cumnor High Street 	The council is not seeking to allocate any strategic site allocations in Cumnor through Local Plan 2031 Part 1. requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation.
English Heritage - CP8 - Historic Nature and Conservation (1)	English Heritage welcomes the references to the historic town centre of Abingdon-on-Thames and the distinctive character of the countryside and villages having been maintained in the vision for the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area, although we would prefer "conserved and enhanced" as terminology more consistent with the NPPF.	Support is welcomed and is noted. The council does not object to the proposed change should the inspector consider it appropriate.
English Heritage - CP8 - Historic Nature and Conservation (2)	English Heritage would prefer the first paragraph of Core Policy 8 to read ".....whilst protecting the Oxford Green Belt and historic and biodiversity features". In itself and in isolation, English Heritage does not consider that this omission is sufficient to render the Local Plan unsound, but when taken in combination with a number of other omissions and amendments we have identified. we consider that the Plan does not quite set out the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of, and clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the NPPF (see our comments on Policy 39).	The council does not consider the rewording to this policy necessary as the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 has separate policies on protecting the Historic Environment (Core Policy 39) and Biodiversity (Core Policy 46). These policies will apply to future development proposals as appropriate.
General Comment	The town centre development proposals have been a disaster and handled poorly, which bodes badly for the new development proposals. Draft Core Policy 8 makes clear that	Comments are noted. The redevelopment of the Charter area (Phase 2) of the Abingdon-on-Thames town centre was affected by the economic downturn and also to the changing nature of

Category	Summary	Council Response
	the Council's over-arching priority for this sub-area is to maintain the service and employment roles for Abingdon and to develop in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in Draft Core Policy 3.	high streets more generally. The redevelopment of the town centre is supported by the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
General Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vales infrastructure is not presently equipped or sufficient to deal with the present traffic volume. • However, there is no point to have improved major road infrastructure that then leads to sub-standard roads B roads. • Public transport will remain in a sufficient condition because there are too many cars on the available road. Bus companies find it hard to operate a sufficient service with the deficient road network. • No mention about Network Rail and opportunities they could provide. 	The council has engaged, both formally and informally with statutory consultees and prescribed bodies throughout the plan making process to ensure that infrastructure can be delivered in a timely manner alongside growth in the district. Infrastructure requirements are included in the relevant policies of the local plan, with contributions set out in the site templates (see Appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1). Core Policy 19 supports the re-opening of Grove Railway Station.
Highways Agency - CP8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP8 should set out to meet its requirements where it is reasonable and in the commitment of achieving sustainable development. • The plan should be the most reasonable strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives • LP1 should be developed on effective joint working on cross-boundary priorities. 	<p>The council considers itself to have demonstrated that it has satisfied its duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities, statutory consultees and prescribed bodies.</p> <p>The council is committed to a process with the other Oxfordshire Authorities to address the un-met need arising from Oxford City, including the possibility of an early review of the Local Plan.</p>
Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon and Radley – Loss of Agricultural Land	In areas close to where we live - such as North & North-West Abingdon-on-Thames; South Kennington; North & North Radley - good, productive agricultural land will be lost.	The council considers that in the absence of sufficient brownfield land capable of meeting the objectively assessed housing needs for the district, the most sustainable alternative is to consider land within or on the edge of existing settlements capable of accommodating the strategic needs of the district. The council encourages the re-use of previously developed land provided it is not of high environmental value as set out in Core Policy 43 (ix). The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 restricts development outside of the existing built area of market towns, local service centres and larger villages except through the allocations in the local plan or where allocated through Neighbourhood Development Plans.
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	Access, Congestion and Road Safety Proposed development sites in North Abingdon at Dunmore road/Twelve Acre Drive	The Council are satisfied this site provides a sustainable location for development which is demonstrated within the Strategic Sites

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>are first in the Green Belt and second the existing road network is severely congested and prone to accidents. Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive cannot cope with current traffic levels. Building 1,000 homes on the Dunmore road and Peachcroft side of the Lodge Hill roundabout with the possibility of 1,000 additional vehicles would cause further traffic chaos and pollution. The number of houses proposed is excessive. The road network is already congested and dangerous. 1000 new houses in North and North West Abingdon will dramatically increase traffic congestion. It will likely cause 1500 cars to use Dunmore Road, already a bottleneck during rush hour, with several accidents having already taken place. The development is adjacent to the A34, the sixth most congested road in the country. This will adversely impact local and through traffic on a major national artery with all the inherent economic implications. It is difficult to get out onto Dunmore Road in the car at most times now. This has not been helped by the decision to make Wootton Road roundabout a single lane (the traffic was bad enough when it was two lanes).It is almost impossible now at peak times to turn right safely out of Boulter Drive onto Dunmore Road. If this development goes ahead with the possibility of 1000 additional vehicles, traffic along Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive will grind to a permanent halt causing further traffic chaos and pollution. Before planning any additional housing, strategies for dealing with current and additional traffic are needed. I do not understand why traffic could not go out from the new estates onto the old A34 around Lodge Hill for example. If I'm driving I have no choice but to go down Boulter Drive onto Dunmore Road. Many others can only use Dunmore Road to leave the area. The planned new build only adds to the risk. As there is no alternative route, how will emergency services</p>	<p>Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which includes consideration of transport amongst other considerations. The Council are satisfied the Plan, the Site Development Template for North Abingdon, CP12 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (DLP07) identify the necessary development and infrastructure required to support development. In regards to specific matters on transport the Site Development Template includes a number of development/infrastructure requirements including transport measures more specifically contributions towards delivery of slips on A34 at Lodge Hill, investigation into congestion, junction improvements at Dunmore Road/A4183, and improvements/contributions towards bus services/infrastructure.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>cope if this road is blocked and somebody needs an ambulance, the police or fire services? The plans to provide access directly onto Peachcroft and Dunmore Roads will cause unnecessary congestion. A better approach would be to have direct access onto a roundabout on Oxford Road, in preparation for the A34 South access point. This would enable people living in the planned estates to leave Abingdon for work using the A34 without adding to congestion. As a local resident I frequently queue in traffic on Dunmore Road but can't remember queuing to leave or enter Abingdon on the Oxford Road. Infrastructure If the development must go ahead it is important that Dunmore Road is given infrastructure reducing the speed limit to 30mph and introducing roundabouts at junctions of roads with Dunmore Road .If these houses go ahead, I suggest that Dunmore Road be made into a one way system or a dual carriageway. Rather than feed into Dunmore Road, which has problems for traffic turning right and left out of the side roads, a new road should be built at the northern end of the proposed estate, running parallel, at the top of the hill, to the A34.In the proposed North Abingdon development, "Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive would cause severance for the site and pedestrian crossings would need to be implemented" (SA Report Appendices p.119). Roundabouts would be needed to allow vehicles to exit estate roads. Thus the site could only comply with SO3 if Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive becomes a residential road rather than a ring road. This would cause severe congestion elsewhere in the town. There will need to be pedestrian crossings, roundabouts to enable access to and from roads such as Alexander Close and Boulter Drive and the speed limit restricted from 40 to 30 mph for safety reasons. The community infrastructure levy is an insignificant contribution towards the necessary infrastructure. Without</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>substantial improvement of the A34 the area will grid lock. Infrastructure funding may not be available. North Abingdon site should be removed from the plan on this and other grounds outlined in this response. If the land is not removed, then set CIL and other developer contributions higher to cover the full £13 million for the interchange plus extra for alterations to Dunmore Road. An upgrade to the A34 is needed before any more housing is considered. The A34 will require a diamond junction at Lodge Hill (North Abingdon), additional lanes between the M40 and Chilton, possibly a southern bypass and a new river crossing. These major infrastructure improvements would need to be in place before any housing development is undertaken. A diamond junction or interchange at Lodge Hill, which has been needed for several years due to traffic congestion in Abingdon, must be in place before any housing development is commenced. There is already an access road through from Lodge Hill to a civil engineer's contractor site and on to the development but this has been excluded as an option in the plan. The assessment that Abingdon is the most sustainable development is flawed, the development would not provide sufficient money for the upgrade of the A34 Lodge Hill junction. If money were found to build it, it would only add to existing traffic problems on the A34. In addition, if the N. Abingdon development were built, Dunmore Road would no longer function as a ring road, and the A34 would become the Abingdon ring road. An improvement to the junction is unlikely to existing alleviate traffic problems in the town since many people living in the new development would drive through the town to get to jobs which are mainly in the south, and to get to the central shopping area. The orbital road will change to a town road with lower speed limits, more junctions and traffic measures. Land to the south of the</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>town is not in Green Belt and there is already a closed off link road to go north of the A24 near Drayton Refuse Centre then would it not be more sensible to also add a link road going south onto the A34 in the same area instead of the suggested diamond junction at Lodge Hill which is mainly for travelling south on the A34? If this access to the A34 south of Abingdon were put in place this would ease traffic congestion coming into Abingdon on the Drayton Road onto the A415 to go south on the A34. If the proposed reservoir in Steventon were to happen in the future then a two way junction onto the A34 south of Abingdon would make access easier for lorries and other heavy traffic working on the reservoir. The plan should specify proper provision for the integration of the N. Abingdon development. Air Pollution The development is subject to noise and air pollution from the A34. Nitrogen Dioxide levels have risen since 2004 in Abingdon Town Centre and exceed the Government's Health Standard (Vale of the White Horse "Air Quality Action Plan Consultation Document 2014"). This will have a long term health effect on the chronically ill and other residents living in and around the Town Centre. The Town Centre was declared an "Air Quality Management Area in April 2009. Copenhagen Drive/Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive was to be used as a measure to alleviate further pollution to Abingdon Town Centre. This measure failed. Additional traffic caused by further housing developments north or south of Abingdon must not be allowed to put further lives at risk. 800 houses will increase greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution, contrary to SO 12. Air pollution in Abingdon-on-Thames will increase due to congestion on Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive will no longer be able to divert traffic from the centre of town - thus exacerbating AQMA issues rather than providing a solution. The only solution is not to build houses</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>in this part of Abingdon. Amenity disagree with the proposal to build in the Green Belt. The green land softens the impact of the A34. The proposed development will run alongside of the A34, a busy and over capacity road. Mitigating noise and pollution will be very hard. Mismatch between the location of housing and jobs More than 70% of projected jobs are south of Abingdon at Vale Science park. This is too far to walk or cycle and there are no bus routes. New residents will have driven to work, which conflicts with Core Policy 35 which seeks to support sustainable transport measures to promote public transport, cycling and walking. An additional 1200 cars on these roads will lead to an unacceptable increase in congestion and air pollution. The vulnerability of A34 and lack of alternative routes leads to severe congestion at peak times. Many people that move to these new homes won't work in Oxford. They may get jobs at Milton Park or in the Harwell area, adding to traffic going through Abingdon. Even if they work in Oxford - we already have gridlock so often on the A34. Pedestrian Access I'm a member of the Rambling Association concerned what will happen to North Abingdon's footpaths. The old A34 will become more dangerous to cross. The footpath from Abingdon to Sunning well is one of the few quiet walks available on our doorstep, would change its character - so it will be more difficult for people to find a place to walk and relax.</p>	
Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of rural views from Wytham Woods (University Bye-Law). • Urban Sprawl along the A420. • Impossible growth to the south and west of the village 	The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation.
Objection to Ab/OX Spatial Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan fails to efficiently ascertain the districts infrastructure problems and necessary improvements, while underestimating the inherent risks with an over exaggerated 	The Council is satisfied that the Plan, the Site Development Template for North Abingdon, CP12 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (DLP07) identify the necessary development

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>holistic approach, with arbitrary sub-districts. • CP8 has not been properly analysed • Not all proposals within the green belt have not been sufficiently justified. • The Vale failed to undertake the necessary assessments against SHMA figures. • The plan is unrealistic in trying to make up its previous 5 year undersupply. • A suitable site to accommodate 200 units should be included in the plan to help relieve pressure from the 5 year housing supply. • No allocation of sites in the Vale's proportion of the Oxford Green Belt should be made until a full joint review of the entire Green Belt has been completed by all five of the Oxfordshire District Councils and the County Council • Lost of character from development within the Green Belt. No development should take place within the green belt until full joint review is undertaken by all five Oxfordshire Districts. • The development fails to take into account those ranked in the below the four tier of settlement hierarchy. • Draft CP2 recognises that Oxford Council may not be able to accommodate its own objectively assessed housing needs (2011-2031) within its constituency. • Assessment is needed if any unmet housing need from Oxford can be accommodated within the VoWH. • A realistic timeframe is needed to be agreed. • It is essential the Local Plan is progressed without delay. • No definitive figure has been obtained from the CCG regarding the necessary infrastructure. • Too much development within AONB's and Greenbelts • Economy has been given more material weight than the environment. • The housing figures quoted by the Local Plan do not accord with SHMA figures. • The quoted housing supply over the life span of the plan do not accord with CP8.</p>	<p>and infrastructure required to support development. In regards to specific matters on transport the Site Development Template includes a number of development/infrastructure requirements including transport measures more specifically contributions towards delivery of slips on A34 at Lodge Hill, investigation into congestion, junction improvements at Dunmore Road/A4183, and improvements/contributions towards bus services/infrastructure.</p> <p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation.</p> <p>The council is committed, through Core Policy 2, to work with the other Oxfordshire authorities to ensure that the objectively assessed housing needs of the market area are met.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
Objection to allocation/development South of East Hanney	<p>Objections to the allocation include the following reasons:</p> <p>Impact of the allocation on the Letcombe Brook, including its ecology and biodiversity Existing flooding issues will be exacerbated through further development Allocation will negatively impact on the existing character of the settlement</p> <p>Archaeological sensitivities relating to this site Development will negatively impact upon the local road network of the village and also that of the A338 Concerns with how the site will be accessed The existing school is at capacity with some having to commute elsewhere at present Local sewerage treatment works is at/over capacity at present Not enough local services and facilities to accommodate the growth Lack of sustainable transport routes such as cycle ways and pedestrian routes linking the site to the existing settlement and to employment locations, leading to a dependence on the private motor car No local employment capability in the village Many objections state that as a result, the strategic site would be contrary to the NPPF and also to local plan policies Will negatively impact on the medical facilities available in the area Development would result in the loss of high quality agricultural land Objections to the village's allocation as a Larger Village in the settlement hierarchy</p> <p>Comments from Berks Bucks Oxon Wildlife trust and other consultees stating that the site is a Traditional Orchard priority habitat, and the last remaining such site in the settlement. Would lead to a significant increase in the total number of houses in the village Comments include a number of those made by East Hanney Parish Council The vast majority of suggested modifications to make the plan sound seek the removal of the strategic site allocation South of East Hanney</p>	<p>The location of growth at East Hanney is in accordance with the overarching sustainable spatial strategy embedded in the Plan and is in accordance with the hierarchy of settlements in accordance with the Town and Village Facilities Study Update (COM04). The Council consider the site South of East Hanney to be a sustainable location for development which is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which demonstrates a range of considerations have been considered. The Council are satisfied the Plan identifies the necessary development and infrastructure requirements to enable and support growth in particular through the Site Development Template, CP12 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07). The Council will also continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant parties to ensure the necessary infrastructure is provided as outlined in the Plan. In response to specific concerns, the Template sets out the need for the siting of development to take consideration of the Letcombe Brook, not impact on the Priority Habitat nearby, drainage strategy to be required, mitigation to minimise impacts on landscape setting, contributions and/or improvements to bus services, road junctions, ensures adequate access and contributions towards increasing capacity of primary school. East Hanney is considered a Larger Village as demonstrated through the Town and Village Facilities Study Update (COM04).</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
Objection to Development at Cumnor	An objection is received to development at Cumnor as there is insufficient infrastructure in the village to accommodate growth.	<p>The council is not seeking to allocate any strategic development sites in Cumnor through Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</p> <p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation.</p>
Objection to Development at Wootton	A number of objections are received to development at Wootton due to inadequate infrastructure and the impact of traffic congestion.	<p>The council is not seeking to allocate any strategic development sites in Wootton through Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</p> <p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation.</p>
Objection to proposed growth within Ab/ OX Sub-Area	It is suggested that build rates will need to be much faster than comparable development elsewhere in order to meet the councils targets and that the forecasts for economic growth are widely optimistic.	The council has undertaken detailed market capacity work (see HOU03) to ensure that the objectively assessed housing need for the district can be delivered in a timely manner for the plan period.
Oxford City Council Comments	Core Policy CP8 (Abingdon / Oxford Fringe) - CP8 sets out a housing requirement for the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe area of 5,438 for the period to 2011 to 2031, caveated to meeting only the needs arising in the Vale. It states that: "If or when required, needs arising elsewhere in the Housing Market Area, will be addressed by timely and effective cooperation working in accordance with CP2". For the same reasons as set out above in respect of the Duty to Cooperate, this is inconsistent with national policy, not justified as the most appropriate strategy, and not effective due to the delay to meeting the pressing housing needs	Comment is noted. Vale of White Horse District Council is committed to an Oxfordshire-wide process for dealing with any un-met need arising from Oxford City, as set out in Core Policy 2.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	evident within the wider Housing Market Area (particularly Oxford).	
Oxfordshire County Council Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core Policy 8: it is not clear how the figure of 5,438 homes to be delivered has been calculated 	The figure forms part of the total objectively assessed housing need for the district as a whole. Certain figures are known such as completions, estimated completions, site allocations, and known commitments. Windfalls have been derived by past trends. Local Plan 2031 Part 2 allocations have been split on a pro-rata basis in line with predicted growth.
Support for CP8	A number of responses provide general support for the Ab/Ox Spatial Strategy. Specific comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overarching policy is to maintain and enhance the local employment and service centres and to minimise the pressure on the highway network whilst protecting the Oxford Green Belt. CP8 states that development should be in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. CP8 states planning will be brought forward through a masterplanning process. 	Support is welcomed and is noted
Support for Green Belt Release of Land at North Hinksey	Support is received for the release of Green Belt Land at North Hinksey.	Support is welcomed and is noted
Support for Housing in Ab/Ox Sub Area	Housing needs in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford fringe sub areas should be met in full and located as close to Oxford city as possible in order to secure a sustainable location for new housing development and reduce the impact on the A34 corridor.	Support is welcomed and is noted

Abingdon Comments

Category	Summary	Council Response
Developer Contributions	Proposed developments are sited within adjoining parishes. CIL would accrue to those parishes, though their connection is in regard to Abingdon and its infrastructure. Should the sites be approved then there should be a parish boundary review.	Noted.
English Heritage – Supporting Comment	English Heritage welcomes the recognition of the historic town centre of Abingdon-on-Thames as a benefit in paragraph 5.2.	Support is welcomed and is noted.
General Comment – Infrastructure and Traffic Congestion	Infrastructure. It is important that prior to any housing development there should be full agreement on improving the town's infrastructure. New housing development places additional burdens on an already overstretched infrastructure. Improvements should either be undertaken ahead of or at the same time as the housing development itself, depending upon the nature of the infrastructure to be improved. There is insufficient funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy, and other sources, to support the measures needed to manage the increase in traffic and pollution. Roads and Traffic Congestion is heightened at peak times at Peachcroft Farm and Dunmore roundabout. Traffic congestion is a major problem throughout Abingdon. Additional traffic from the proposed developments would increase the pressure on the peripheral road. Residents already face delays each morning due to road congestion. Measures are needed to ease this congestion. Improvements on Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive could include widening carriageways and improving the capacity of the roundabouts. There is a need to undertake works on the Lodge Hill junction on the A34 to increase the junction capacity through the provision of a diamond interchange as referred to at paragraph 5.37 (page 60). Traffic going into Abingdon town centre is likely to increase and measures are needed to ensure that air quality is not compromised. Diversion routes need to be of a standard which can cope with the demands placed on them and avoid issues arising where these are inadequate, such as when the Bagley Wood road collapsed. A pedestrian crossing on Lodge Hill is essential as it is already difficult to	Land is safeguarded through Core Policy 12 to support the delivery of two significant transport schemes in Abingdon-on-Thames. This includes a diamond interchange at the A34 Lodge Hill Junction and a southern by-pass linking the A415. The diamond interchange will significantly reduce the number of vehicles which use the Marcham Interchange to access the north of the town, further redirecting traffic away from the town centre. Site templates also seek the provision, or contributions towards bus services, pedestrian crossings and shelters, including on the A4183 to the north of Peachcroft Roundabout. Contributions from development will also be required for additional buses from North Abingdon-on-Thames towards Science Vale to reduce the number of car journeys in this direction at peak times.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	cross. Public Transport Investment is needed to improve bus services along the Copenhagen Drive and Dunmore Road to take people both into Oxford and Abingdon town centre thus reducing reliance on private vehicles.	
Location of Growth - Smaller Sites	The Housing Requirements Table (pg. 53) does not adequately define where the housing needs for Abingdon will be met, particularly in regard to Windfall and Local Plan Part 2 sites.	The housing requirement states, in footnote 'b' that the Local Plan Part 2 allocation will be reduced where dwellings are allocated in Neighbourhood Development Plans or come forward through the Development Management Process. Windfall sites are sites which will come forward unexpectedly and projections for these are based on a robust trajectory.
Object to Development – Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has not been any quantitative assessment on the 4 strategic sites around Abingdon. • S04 is inadequate and misleading in regard to the sites. There has been no objective quantitative assessment of the infrastructural impact of building more than 1500 new homes on strategic sites 1 (North-West Abingdon), 2 (North Abingdon), 3 (South Kennington), and 4 (North-West Radley) . The Sustainability Assessment under S04 is inadequate and misleading. How it is possible that 1500 new homes will have “a minor positive” impact on the currently oversubscribed local GP surgeries? Education and road infrastructure: Building 1500 new homes would require substantial supporting infrastructure for which the Plan makes no provision. Building an extension of Lodge Hill interchange on A34 will only alleviate Abingdon's current serious traffic problems. Development of more than 1500 new homes on sites 1, 2, 3 and 4 will negate the benefits, contribute to further inner-town traffic flow deterioration. 1500 new homes can generate up to two hours of continuous non-stop traffic which will leave almost no spare “rush hour” capacity on the access road. “Dunmore road” and “Twelve Acres Drive” are heavily congested during rush hour and have no capacity to absorb the impact of the speed reduction and additional crossings which will come with the new development, and additional flow of extra cars. Consider alternative sites located to the 	Detailed traffic modelling has been completed for the district, accommodating the proposed growth arising from the strategic site allocations. Educational requirements for Abingdon are set out in Core Policy 12 and also in the site templates in Appendix A. The council has engaged with statutory consultees and prescribed bodies at various stages in the plan making process to ensure that the Local Plan is based sound, robust evidence.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	West of A34 with easy access to existing diamond interchanges and sufficient space for infrastructural development.	
Object to development and release of Green Belt	The Green Belt is meant to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. Proposed plans would compromise the neighbouring towns and villages of Abingdon, Sunningwell, Radley and Kennington and their relation to the special character of Oxford and its landscape setting. The proposed plans fail to preserve the special character of the historic town of Abingdon by increasing its sprawl towards Sunningwell and subsuming Radley village. The plans fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Building a village sized settlement, will destroy the integrity of this landscape. The strategy's consultants state that in the urban fringes and important open gaps between settlements, development or changes of use which would harm their essentially open or rural character will not be permitted. It calls for development on a reduced area and for the distinctive character of Lodge Hill to be respected. The development will destroy hedgerows, disturb wildlife, lead to a decline in the number of farmland birds and destroy ecological corridors. Sites in the Oxford Green Belt that have been identified for housing should be withdrawn from the Plan and if necessary the programme reduced accordingly. All sites currently proposed for removal from the Green Belt should be left as they are. No piecemeal housing development should be allowed unless carried out hand in hand with development of facilities for residents e.g. shops, GP surgery.	The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation, including land adjacent to the settlements of Abingdon, Radley and Kennington where we are seeking to allocating strategic sites.
Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Coalescence, Historic Character and Setting	Abingdon is an old town, bordered by countryside, separating and protecting it from the A34. This development would remove that protection, leaving it looking as just another big housing estate. The proposed development to the north/north-west of Abingdon would destroy its unique character as an historic market town, Views from the north would be blighted; local footpaths overwhelmed; and local ancient woodland damaged. Reduce the level of housing development proposed so as not to impact on historic characteristics of Abingdon (and Oxford) in line with principles and purpose of the Green Belt.	The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation, including land adjacent to the settlements of Abingdon, Radley and Kennington where we are seeking to allocating strategic sites. The council has also completed a number of landscape and visual impact assessments to ensure that any development is planned sensitively and mitigation measures form part of the site templates where

Category	Summary	Council Response
		<p>necessary. The council considers that the impact of the sites to the north and north west of Abingdon-on-Thames will not have a negative impact on the unique character of the historic market town centre.</p>
<p>Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt</p>	<p>I disagree with the proposal to build on the Green Belt. The Green Belt north of Abingdon should be protected from development. Four development sites have been identified in the Green Belt to accommodate 1,510 houses and a further 11 sites are proposed for removal from the GB. Development North of the peripheral road, already at full capacity and more during peak periods, will further increase congestion. Green belt will be lost forever. National Policy The plan ignores Government advice that “protecting our precious green belt must be paramount” and that boundaries should be altered only in “exceptional circumstances”. The claiming of Green belt land for this development is unjustified, and the process unsound. It reflects easy options rather than a broader strategic approach to Abingdon's future development. It is accepted that in the Vale of White Horse there has been an under supply of housing in the past and the Council needs to identify more housing sites, but this is not a justification for allowing this development in the Oxford Green Belt. Unmet housing need is not an exceptional circumstance to justify taking land out of the Green Belt. Green belt designation can only be overcome if overriding need is demonstrated. That overriding need is not demonstrated. The proposals conflict with the five Green Belt purposes set out in National Policy. One of the purposes of the Green Belt is to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Abingdon-on-Thames is an important historic town and claims to be the longest inhabited town in the country. To develop this prominent site for housing would affect the setting and special character of the town. Another purpose of the Green Belt is ‘to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’. Developing these two sites would undoubtedly result in significant encroachment on a valuable and prominent site in open countryside. Government advice, October 2014, re-iterates the requirement for councils to prioritise</p>	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation, including land adjacent to the settlements of Abingdon, Radley and Kennington where we are seeking to allocating strategic sites. The council has also completed a number of landscape and visual impact assessments to ensure that any development is planned sensitively and mitigation measures form part of the site templates where necessary. The council considers that the impact of the sites to the north and north west of Abingdon-on-Thames will not have a negative impact on the unique character of the historic market town centre.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>brownfield sites and protect the Green Belt from development. By allocating this site the council has ignored this advice. Consultation has been very poor. While I had no major objections to the original plans, later meetings threw in new development areas that would have a serious impact on Abingdon's Green Belt so that the surrounding villages would have no distinct boundaries from the town of Abingdon. The land to the east of the Oxford Road was included late in the Plan process in October 2014 and many local residents were unaware of its inclusion. The public was not warned or given any opportunity to object to the further change of the Green Belt. Previous plans Previous plans endorsed by Planning Inspectors, have said that protecting the Green Belt land is a priority and that extension of building northwards towards Lodge Hill should be "resolutely avoided". Commenting on previous plans, successive Planning Inspectors have acknowledged the significant importance of a gap between North Abingdon and Radley, preventing encroachment into the rural setting, and its vulnerability to inappropriate development Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland There is a diversity of wildlife including skylarks and the open aspect is a key criterion for the preservation of Green Belt. As a family we currently enjoy accessing the local countryside using the footpaths adjoining Twelve Acre Road from Mattock Way. The proposed plans are to build on this land, which would be a great loss for us and our neighbourhood. Proposed development North and North-West of Abingdon will result in loss of Green Belt habitat for wildlife (including Red Kites and Skylarks) and countryside amenity. The proposed green spaces there will be inadequate to compensate. The proposals would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring Blake's Wood Ancient Woodland, immediately bordering the site to the West of the Oxford Road. There would be a potential adverse impact on Sugworth Site of Special Scientific Interest. The land is valuable farmland. Footpaths across it facilitate recreational use. The characteristics of the land in question have not been properly assessed. The land makes a significant contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>land to the east of Tilsley Park has high landscape value. Being on rising land, any building on it would have a large impact and affect the setting and special character of Abingdon. Landscape and Amenity The pleasant rural outlook we currently have, will be gone forever. The considerable gradient of the site will allow the new residents to have wonderful views across town as far as the Berkshire Downs, but this housing will appear as an eyesore to those viewing it from Abingdon and the Downs. The Vale lay great emphasis on how they are not planning to build to the top of the hill, but a study of the contours and of their proposed upper limit will show that the appearance of the housing will obscure the top of the Hill The area will become a less pleasant area to live so residents like myself, who have lived here most of their life and have supported the town, may move away. Any housing on this land would be imposing from the existing homes off Dunmore Road and 12 Acre Drive. New housing would also suffer from traffic on the A34 which at this point is slightly elevated with all traffic being clearly visible. Public footpaths and streams passing through the proposed development would be affected. I am concerned what will happen to the footpaths of north Abingdon. Public Footpaths into neighbouring villages and countryside will be overwhelmed by the scale of development. Footpaths to Sunningwell and Radley would be virtually destroyed by the development. The old A34 will become an even more dangerous road to cross. The footpath from Abingdon to Sunningwell, one of the few quiet walks available on our doorstep, would change its character so it will be more difficult for people to find a place to walk and relax. The area of ancient woodland to the North of the site on the West side of Oxford road has been neglected. This woodland will be dangerous to children and is part of the rural scene close to the top of Lodge Hill. If my objection fails and construction should occur then quality cycling paths should be provided from the North at Lodge Hill into town. Safe and convenient ease of movement by all users will be severely compromised by extra traffic leading to more congestion, preventing access for walkers to footpaths which cross already busy roads into neighbouring villages and</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>countryside. The suggested 'mixed uses and facilities as appropriate with good public transport' will fail to deliver what is promised/ designed, Historic Character and Setting Abingdon has a strong claim to be the longest inhabited town in the country. Archaeology indicates that people have lived here since at least the early Iron Age. To develop this large prominent site on the northern edge of Abingdon, on higher ground than surrounding existing residential development, would affect the setting and special character of the town. This would include not only the physical development and the setting itself in open countryside, but also the impact increased traffic would on the narrow historic streets, Listed buildings and narrow river crossing which contribute to Abingdon's historic character. A further concern is the gradual slope of the land, rising towards the north and the physical prominence of any development. Any new development would be very visible from North Abingdon and beyond. This would include other parts of the Oxford Green Belt. A previous Planning Inspector noted the landscape rim to the north of the town was an important area which should be protected and not developed. Abingdon is a Historic Market Town. Urban sprawl into Green Belt land is progressively destroying its unique character, and views from the high land to the North of the town. The Green Belt between Abingdon and Oxford is of strategic importance. Abingdon was formerly County Town of Berkshire. It contained the Abingdon Abbey, a powerful opponent of Henry VIII, and was then a significant location. Abingdon became part of Oxfordshire in the seventies, but there was never any intention to subsume Abingdon into Oxford. The historic nature of Abingdon as a market town would be damaged by spreading into the Green Belt to the North of the town- especially on the approach from Oxford via Hinksey Hill and Bagley Wood. Abingdon is overdeveloped with modern housing with very little architectural diversity, additional mass building of modern houses would only add to this. The defining features of Abingdon are its historical town setting, river and the surrounding Green Belt. Building on Green Belt land would harm the defining features of this small historic town. Building such a</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>large development on Green Belt to the north of Abingdon would destroy its character and distinctive sense of place. The proposals will encourage the spread of Abingdon town, begin the process of merging Abingdon with Radley and eventually Oxford, removes high (visual and agricultural) quality land and in so doing will damage the character of a historic town. The green belt area between Abingdon and Oxford must be protected to retain the historic and cultural nature of both towns. The council has stated that it does not want Radley and Abingdon to join up but this proposal if approved makes the gap smaller and remaining land vulnerable. The land makes a significant contribution in preventing Abingdon-on-Thames and Radley merging into one another, a key purpose of a Green Belt and a significant contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Building on fields East and West of Oxford Road, North of Abingdon will irrevocably change the historic landscape and setting of Abingdon in the countryside. The past extension of Abingdon to the North sensitively created an effective boundary for the Town. The use of walling around Peachcroft and Long Furlong estates along with the continuous ribbon of road created the impression of a wall medieval moated town, entirely suitable for a historic town like Abingdon. The North entrance to the town is pleasantly situated in the landscape. This will be lost if the current plan is approved. The proposals harm Abingdon's unique character. The open high land north of the town forms an attractive gateway, recognised and guarded in previous Abingdon plans. The N Abingdon site is approximately 10m below Lodge Hill, with the rest of the site and surrounding area is approximately 25m below Lodge Hill, indicating the site dominance over the area. Because of the natural topography of the site, the landscape cannot be sufficiently mitigated against. Traffic and Pollution Large scale development North and North West of Abingdon will generate significant additional traffic and pollution. The area planned to the West of Oxford Road is surrounded on three sides by roads carrying heavy traffic and to the East, on two sides by these roads (A34, Oxford Road at Lodge Hill, and Twelve Acre Drive or Dunmore</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>Road. This traffic is noisy and polluting. This would not be a suitable environment to live in or raise children. Existing traffic problems and air pollution will be made worse by the new development especially since major employers are to the south of Abingdon. Flooding Additional housing will increase the likelihood of local flooding as the houses will be built on sloping land, and there have been previous floods on Twelve Acre Drive. This area is a major collector of water feeding the springs that lead to relocation of houses in the Long Furlong Area and which will affect the ecology of all of the area below it. If construction occurs there will either be too much surface water runoff or excessive drying of the subsoil, affecting the stability and ecology in an unquantifiable way. Regular flooding of the Western end of Twelve Acre Drive and severe flows into the River Stort testify to the quantity of water that has to be dealt with. There is a danger that the already waterlogged ground at the bottom of the sloping land from Lodge Hill will cause flooding from run off from extensive concreting over. SHMA Uncritical acceptance of the strategic housing market assessment has led the VoWHDC seeking space for an impractically high number of new homes. The VoWHDC should re-examine the SHMA figures and challenge the assumption that employment growth (in an area of already high employment) will be much higher than in the past. Once a more rational housing need figure has been arrived at the VoWHDC should develop a long term response that does not involve the loss of green belt. Green Belt Review 'Green Belt Review,' published February 2014, proposes alterations to the boundary of the Oxford Green Belt in a number of locations, including part of the site which is the subject of this submission but only on land to the west on the A4183. The consultants did not recommend that land to the east of the A4183 should be removed from the Green Belt. The Council states in this Draft Plan that it does not want Abingdon and Radley to merge but in proposing this site, especially the area to the east of the A4183 they are going against their own consultants' criteria, as if allowed, there will be very little gap between the new housing and Radley and this will make the remaining land even more vulnerable. The</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>first stage of The Green Belt Review was to identify suitable land parcels to form the basis of an assessment. The consultants concluded that the sub division into land parcels should follow linear boundaries which are readily visible on the ground but contain landscapes of a well-defined character. This methodology led to the definition of eleven land parcels in the existing Green Belt, with a further two in an additional area under review to the west of Abingdon. The two sites considered in this submission are classified in different land parcels. NALPG consider this is a very broad brush approach. There is insufficient detail included in each Land Parcel to properly assess the characteristics of the land and the contribution it makes to the Green Belt. Location There is an argument for building on land to the West of the Tilsley Park, Abingdon. Why, if we have such an important historic town, must its development proceed towards Oxford, rather than across the Thames towards Nuneham Courtney, Clifton Hamden and Culham, or to the South Infrastructure The increase in the amount of houses proposed is excessive. If the development must go ahead it is important that supporting services and transport links are in place before any houses are built. Consideration should be given for providing accommodation for those wishing to downsize, maybe to bungalows, from larger houses.</p>	
Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	<p>New large developments require new services and facilities. They should not overload already stretched services. Housing and developments should be designed to minimise the need for infrastructure improvements. All developments and supporting infrastructure should be scaled to local residents' needs and not add to congestion or pressures to local services Developments of housing, local centres and supporting infrastructure should be based on proximity with the jobs. All changes should be sympathetic to the local community and their needs, to the character of the local environment (both green and built). There is insufficient information in the documentation by which to judge which aspects of the present infrastructure are to be changed to meet the proposed increase of population In this area. Build elsewhere so that Abingdon does not become overcrowded. Ensure new development is</p>	<p>Land is safeguarded through Core Policy 12 to support the delivery of two significant transport schemes in Abingdon-on-Thames. This includes a diamond interchange at the A34 Lodge Hill Junction and a southern by-pass linking the A415. The diamond interchange will significantly reduce the number of vehicles which use the Marcham Interchange to access the north of the town, further redirecting traffic away from the town centre. Site templates also seek the provision, or contributions towards bus services, pedestrian crossings and shelters, including on the A4183 to the north of Peachcroft Roundabout. Contributions from development will also be required for additional buses from North Abingdon-on-Thames towards Science Vale to reduce the</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>accompanied by appropriate and timely infrastructure delivery to secure effective sustainable transport choices for new residents and businesses. I cannot see how public services and infrastructure, such as the road network, already over-stretched in many places can possibly be improved within the timescales to meet the increase in demand. The District will be unable to cope with this level of growth and I am very concerned about the impact it will have on the environment and the countryside. Timescales and commitments for delivering the necessary infrastructure are needed. Education A new primary school is needed at a minimum to meet demand. All new facilities mentioned in Q4 should be in place before any building commences - any S106 monies will be insufficient to pay for all new infrastructure that will be needed. Services and facilities in North Abingdon, including the medical centre, dentist, local convenience store and schools can just cater for existing residents. The Local Plan 2031 identifies the need for an additional Primary school in North Abingdon but not a Secondary school. However, the local secondary school could not accommodate a further 2000 students. Healthcare Development North of Abingdon and surrounding villages will add to the divide in services, i.e. doctors, dentists, leisure facilities, that exists between North and South. A solution to the Drayton Road problem would allow South Abingdon to take its fair share of growth and prosperity that North has enjoyed since the 1980 Local plan, where the developments of Peachcroft, Audlett Drive, Dunmore Farm were planned and built. As a GP working at the Malthouse Surgery in Abingdon I am concerned about the lack of health care planning/provision in the local plan. We provide primary care services to over 19,000 patients. Introducing 2000 new homes (potentially 4800 patients) into our catchment area could not be catered for with the current surgery building and resources. The Malthouse Surgery was to be re-developed as part of the town centre refurbishment, but is now not proceeding, leaving an outdated building unfit for purpose and unsuitable for the healthcare needs of a growing population. The community infrastructure levy on the developers, would seem to</p>	<p>number of car journeys in this direction at peak times. The council has engaged constructively with statutory consultees and prescribed bodies at various stages through the plan making process to ensure that the submission version of the Local Plan will deliver the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities in a timely manner alongside growth.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>provide an opportunity to relocate The Malthouse Surgery and create a new health centre fit for the 21st century. The Surgery would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with the Vale. Road Infrastructure and Parking Abingdon is already over congested. The diamond interchange at Lodge Hill needs to be completed, or guaranteed before any more houses are built. This development would put an additional 1200 cars on Abingdon's roads. Lodge Hill interchange needs to be done before this development is approved or started. Planned road changes should be carried out before any developments. Abingdon should be excluded from large housing development until such time as a southern bypass has been built. The 'inner ring road' should allow for future duelling to allow for the inevitable increased traffic pressure should new houses be built on the 'outside' the inner ring road. Developing the A415 will increase traffic through the town. The plan fails to address how it will deal with the increased traffic from on the A415 and the river crossings in South Abingdon. Evidence is needed to demonstrate how the council will provide a contribution to this major infrastructure investment and the mitigation needed during the absence of this infrastructure project. In direct conflict with CP 39 with a large proportion of land needed for this is situated in a Scheduled Monument. Housing in Abingdon is expensive and may affect developers' ability to sell. Sort out congestion and infrastructure first. There is inadequate space within the proposed development site for these amenities to be built. More demand will be placed on parking in Abingdon town centre and at local supermarkets, which do not have the capacity to cope with new developments in both the North & South of Abingdon. The local parade of shops at Peachcroft has a small car park, often heavily congested. There is only one way in and out of the car park into Peachcroft Road causing heavy traffic in surrounding local roads. Residents tend to drive and not, walk, cycle or use public transport to access services and facilities. It is unrealistic to suggest that 'new' residents will be any different. This should be about long term planning but the Southern Abingdon by pass and new river crossing form no part</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>of this plan. If they did, the distribution of housing might be different and Green Belt North of Abingdon would not be required. The A36 around Abingdon and entire Vale of White Horse District is verging on "unsafe". Further traffic would increase the vulnerability. If all the planned road changes are not carried out before any developments I feel this would affect the legacy of the plans. Public Transport</p> <p>It is incorrect to describe a single bus service as being "excellent". During rush hour this service is running over capacity - by the time a bus reaches North Abingdon at rush hour there is regularly no seats left and no standing room. To make the plan sound Abingdon's public transport links with Oxford should not be described as excellent but identified as in need of improvement and consequent amendments to the plan should be made. Flooding There is a lack of drainage as the A34 contributes to flooding in the North of Abingdon. The proposed sites would be vulnerable. The River Stort will require additional flood defences. Much of the land around Abingdon is floodplain unsuitable for development due to its proximity to the Thames. Adequate flood risk assessment needs to be carried out well in advance, which would allow time to address further necessary investigations, recommendations and amendments and for the work to be carried out properly, with adequate planning, funding, execution, plus examination to check it has been correctly done. Burial sites note that it is proposed to save policies CF3 and CF4 from the 2011 local plan in order to safeguard land at Faringdon and Wantage for burial sites. I submit that similar safeguarding of land for a burial site needs to take place in Abingdon. Safeguard the land along the route of the former Wilts and Berks canal as per the saved policies: L14 and L15 Consultation This plan as will fail to deliver any infrastructure improvements to Abingdon and as a local resident I have received no proactive consultation or notification of these 'plans'.</p>	
Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Pollution	Increased local traffic will increase greenhouse emissions and pollution within the area. Nitrogen dioxide levels in Abingdon have continued to rise in Abingdon Town Centre since 2004. As confirmed in the Vale of the White Horse's latest "Air Quality Action Plan Consultation Document	The site templates for both north and north west Abingdon-on-Thames request investigations of potential noise and air pollution impacts from the A34, Copenhagen Drive, Dunmore Road, and the B4017 and mitigate to offset any

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>2014" continue to exceed the Government's Health Standard. This will have a long term health effect on the chronically ill and other residents living in and around the Town Centre. Abingdon Town Centre was declared an "Air Quality Management Area in April 2009. Originally the peripheral road Copenhagen Drive/ Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive route was identified as a primary measure by The Vale of the White Horse Town Council to reduce traffic into the centre and therefore reduce pollution levels to a satisfactory level. This has failed and the increased traffic will exacerbate the problem. I am writing to express my deep concerns that the proposed local plan includes so much development so close to the A34 - Motorway. I have lived along Copenhagen Drive in Abingdon and the noise from the A34 is horrendous. I installed at great expense extra noise reduction glazing throughout the property but still the vibrations from the lorries through the day and all night impacted through the walls. I was never able to have the windows open and installed an electrical ventilation system in the bedroom. There has been no objective quantitative assessment of the impact of the A34 proximity to sites 1 (North-West Abingdon) and 2 (North Abingdon). If such assessment had been carried out it would have established that excessive noise and air pollutions render the sites non-compliant with Strategic Objective "SO 4: Improve the health and well-being of Vale residents, reduce inequality, poverty and social exclusion and improve the safety of the Vale as a District where everyone can feel safe and enjoy life." Measurements taken across site 2 on 16/12/2014 indicated spatial average noise level of 80dB with maximum measured level of 84dB. Exposure to noise at such levels are considered health hazards and employment Health and Safety regulations mandate provisions of hearing protection devices. Why such a strong negative factor has been ignored by the Sustainability Assessment which qualifies the impact on SO4 as "minor positive"? Alternative sites should be considered located sufficiently far from A34 to neutralise the impact of the noise and air pollution.</p>	<p>adverse impacts. Core Policy 43 (vi) seeks all future development proposals to have regard to air quality and any Air Quality Management Areas.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	<p>Access, Congestion and Road Safety Additional housing in North Abingdon will place more pressure on access roads and the A34 for car and bus users. Bus journey times into Oxford have increased significantly in recent years making the option of working in Oxford increasingly challenging. Abingdon is almost at gridlock. North Abingdon, Abingdon town centre and South Abingdon are already heavily congested. The Highways Agency has stated that local roads and the A34 running through the area are at 'breaking point'. The Highways Agency have made it clear that a redesign of the Lodge Hill intersection on the A34 to provide south facing slip roads is not an option and would do little to alleviate traffic congestion other than to funnel more vehicles onto the A34 where they would sit in a stationary queue. 1000 new houses will create 1500 to 2000 more cars in an area that suffers regular traffic gridlocks and jams. The ring road is overcrowded with difficulties for traffic joining it from the current estates but no thought has been given to this. The North Abingdon peripheral road has been designed as a free flowing route to relieve traffic away from Abingdon town centre. The town centre is seriously congested, suffers poor air quality and is subject to AQMA. Should the proposed 1000 houses be built in North Abingdon, the peripheral road will become a residential road requiring roundabouts, pedestrian crossings and speed limits. This will place further pressure on the town centre and other 'cut through' roads ending in difficulty for Abingdon residents. There is no local employment within walking or cycling distance. New jobs are envisaged south of Abingdon not within walking or cycling distance or journeys easily made by public transport. The majority of residents in North Abingdon drive all over the country to work not just Oxford or South Abingdon. The roads cannot keep up with natural growth let alone massive increases. The Vale Local Plan has not complied with CP 37. The existing road network is severely congested and prone to accidents. Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive cannot cope with current traffic levels. It is almost impossible now at peak times to turn right safely out of Boulter Drive onto Dunmore Road. If this development goes ahead with the possibility of</p>	<p>The Vale of White Horse has worked constructively with Oxfordshire County Council on the modelling of traffic flows in line with growth for the district up to 2031. Land is safeguarded through Core Policy 12 to support the delivery of two significant transport schemes in Abingdon-on-Thames. This includes a diamond interchange at the A34 Lodge Hill Junction and a southern by-pass linking the A415. The diamond interchange will significantly reduce the number of vehicles which use the Marcham Interchange to access the north of the town, further redirecting traffic away from the town centre. Site templates also seek the provision, or contributions towards bus services, pedestrian crossings and shelters, including on the A4183 to the north of Peachcroft Roundabout. Contributions from development will also be required for additional buses from North Abingdon-on-Thames towards Science Vale to reduce the number of car journeys in this direction at peak times. The council has engaged constructively with statutory consultees and prescribed bodies at various stages through the plan making process to ensure that the submission version of the Local Plan will deliver the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities in a timely manner alongside growth.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>1000 additional vehicles, traffic along Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive will grind to a permanent halt causing further traffic chaos and pollution. It is difficult to get out onto Dunmore Road in the car at most times now. Trecent County Highway scheme narrowing Dunmore Road at the Wootton Road roundabout has made traffic queues worse. Since the alteration of the roundabout on Dunmore/Wootton Road junction, we now have standing traffic on the whole of Dunmore Road at peak times. Another serious accident has occurred on the Dunmore/Boulter Drive junction. This road has become so busy and dangerous, there would be chaos if these houses were built. Lengthening queues on Dunmore Road as a result of this proposed development will push more people to drive through the town centre, worsening the air quality. The traffic implications of the proposed housing would increase commuting times to school and work. When problems occur on the A34, Dunmore Road becomes part of a rat-run. Dunmore Road was supposed to be an outer ring road to alleviate traffic in the town centre but if houses are built on the far side from the existing long furlong development it will no longer be an outer ring road. Before planning additional housing, strategies for dealing with current and additional traffic are needed. Why could traffic not go out from the new estates onto the old A34 around Lodge Hill for example. If I'm driving I have no choice but to go down Boulter Drive onto Dunmore Road. Many others can only use Dunmore Road to leave the area. The planned new build adds to the risk. As there is no alternative route, how will emergency services cope if this road is blocked? Abingdon town centre is already over congested, with insufficient parking. This plan takes no account of the increased traffic and congestion, and competition for the few parking spaces. Residents will instead choose to go to shop in Oxford, or Didcot, where they can park and avoid traffic jams. This plan will diminish the viability of the town centre. Infrastructure Consider and develop infrastructure according to current needs and future plans before exacerbating the problems with new housing developments in the North of Abingdon. Further detailed assessment is needed, statistics of potential increase</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>usage, and pollution. If there is to be an interchange for the A34 then the building of this new access road would dovetail into those works. Rather than feed into Dunmore Road, which has problems for traffic turning right and left from side roads, built a new road at the northern end of the proposed estate, running parallel, at the top of the hill, to the A34. In the proposed North Abingdon development, "Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive would cause severance for the site and pedestrian crossings would need to be implemented" (SA Report Appendices p.119). Roundabouts would be needed to allow vehicles to exit estate roads. Thus the site could only comply with SO3 if Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive becomes a residential road rather than a ring road. This would cause severe congestion elsewhere in the town. Traffic problems on the ring road require a radical re-think of the routeing of traffic around the town and surrounding area. The cost per dwelling of providing the infrastructure necessary to make the proposed size of housing development functionally viable, if paid by the developer and then passed on to the buyers, will make the development economically unviable. We need improved routeing of traffic around the town to the Culham and Drayton Roads, including new cross-river access. Southbound entry and northbound exit slip roads are needed at the Abingdon North junction on the A34 to relieve unnecessary ring road traffic. There will need to be pedestrian crossings, roundabouts to enable access to and from roads such as Alexander Close and Boulter Drive and the speed limit restricted from 40 to 30 mph for safety reasons. The community infrastructure levy is an insignificant contribution towards the necessary infrastructure. Without substantial improvement of the A34 the area will grid lock. The movement of traffic in and out and around the town is restricted by there being only two bridges over the Thames. A large development North of the town will worsen the traffic problem. The introduction of more traffic calming measures, pedestrian crossings and traffic lights will further slow the flow of traffic. The suggestion that people will walk or cycle to work is unrealistic as most people will find it too far to walk and don't feel safe</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>cycling. Regular carriageway closure on the A34 within the vicinity of Abingdon, diverts traffic through the town bringing it virtually to a standstill. Further development will make this problem worse. No further large developments should be considered in the town until the A34 is brought up to motorway standards with three lanes and a hard shoulder. The vulnerability of the A34 is a critical factor- requiring a diamond junction at Lodge Hill (N Abingdon), as well as additional lanes between M40 and Chilton, a southern bypass and river crossing. This needs to be in place before any housing development, otherwise traffic congestion within Abingdon will become impossible during lane closures for widening. An upgrade to the A34 is needed before any more housing is considered. The A34 will require a diamond junction at Lodge Hill (North Abingdon), additional lanes between the M40 and Chilton, possibly a southern bypass and a new river crossing. These major infrastructure improvements need to be in place before any housing development is undertaken. A diamond junction or interchange at Lodge Hill must be in place before any housing development is commenced. The A34 is unfit for purpose with existing traffic flows, and an upgrade will be needed to accommodate increased through traffic as well as any additional local traffic displaced onto the A34. Any housing development near the A34 must include the reservation of sufficient additional land to enable such an upgrade. Funding must be secured for these major infrastructure projects before any housing development is allowed to start. The assessment that Abingdon is the most sustainable development is flawed, the development would not provide sufficient money to upgrade the A34 Lodge Hill junction. If money were found, it would only add to existing traffic problems on the A34. In addition, if the N. Abingdon development were built, Dunmore Road would no longer function as a ring road, and the A34 would become the Abingdon ring road. An improvement to the junction is unlikely to existing alleviate traffic problems in the town since many people living in the new development would drive through the town to get to jobs which are mainly in the south, and to the central shopping area. Funding to</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>support the infrastructure measures needed may not be available. Page 51 of LPP1 states “Joint working with Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other neighbouring authorities will have identified a long-term solution to traffic management around Oxford, the A34, and in Abingdon-on-Thames and Botley.” Although such work may be in progress there is no guarantee of its success, nor any likelihood of delivering a solution in a timescale consistent with housing development timetables. With regard to south facing slips on the A34 at Lodge Hill and a second River Thames crossing for the town that would remove east-west through-traffic from the town centre, these are major infrastructure projects requiring significant financial support and there are doubts that this will be forthcoming. Approval for the North Abingdon developments should be conditional upon funding for the creation of South facing slips at the Lodge Hill junction being in place. Developing the A415 will increase traffic through the town unless an eastern bypass were constructed avoiding Bridge Street. The Plan mentions exploring a southern bypass of Abingdon with South Oxfordshire District Council. Now is the time to include this in the Plan in order to plan for proportionate strategic growth in the Vale’s principal settlement this side of 2031 and prevent building on the Green Belt north of Abingdon which is so controversial. Concentrating developments to the North of Abingdon does not reflect a clear strategic approach to housing in the area. The developments for the A34 interchange are given the same status as a South Abingdon bypass, which would generate much greater traffic relief, link up the areas of the Science Vale (Culham, Milton Park and Harwell) and enable greater expansion of Abingdon in a more radial manner. Issues around pinch points in traffic are already very clear at the Wootton Road roundabout, and not likely to be relieved. The difficulty of access and parking within the town increase congestion and pollution. No Park-and-Ride facilities are included at the gateways to the town - nor is space available for these. Parking must be addressed before planning consent or traffic will become impossible in the town. It is misleading to state</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>'proximity to the city of Oxford and excellent public transport connectivity'. Geographically Abingdon is close but journey times are unreasonable - 45 minutes during rush hour for a 5 mile journey. There are currently no bus services along Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive that connect to main employment locations, which would otherwise need to be provided-complete with lay-bys, so as not to impede traffic flow. Insufficient consideration has been given to the impact proposed growth in Vale will have on infrastructure supporting these developments which fall outside the District boundary. The Plan does not acknowledge or address increased traffic levels from South East Vale on the already heavily congested A415 east of Abingdon and the Culham and Clifton Hampden river crossings which currently facilitate much north-south traffic movement from the South East Vale area and Oxford but which lie outside the Vale boundary. The Plan should include evidence on how development in the South East Vale on the scale proposed will contribute to this major infrastructure investment from which it will benefit, and how it will mitigate traffic issues in the absence of this infrastructure project being achieved during the life of this plan. With regard to land put forward for safeguarding for this new road link (Appendix E: 13). Over half of the land forms part of a Scheduled Monument and therefore would conflict with Core Policy 39 which states the council will "ensure new development conserves, and where possible enhances, heritage assets". Air Pollution Additional traffic will increase the already high levels of pollution in the town. Nitrogen Dioxide levels have risen since 2004 in Abingdon Town Centre and exceed the Government's Health Standard (Vale of the White Horse "Air Quality Action Plan Consultation Document 2014"). This will have a long term health effect on the chronically ill and other residents living in and around the Town Centre. The Town Centre was declared an "Air Quality Management Area in April 2009. Copenhagen Drive/Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive was to be used as a measure to alleviate further pollution to Abingdon Town Centre. This measure failed. Additional traffic caused by further housing</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>developments north or south of Abingdon must not be allowed to put further lives at risk. The proposed developments will increase greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution, contrary to SO 12. Building on the fields East and West of the Oxford Road will increase housing density, traffic and with these air pollution. Abingdon is within an Air Quality Management Area. As an asthmatic, on many days the air quality is appalling. If you stand on Wittenham Clumps (hills to the South of Abingdon) and look towards the town a layer of smog is usually visible, We do not need more traffic in and around the town. Building on these areas will also increase the risk of flooding through loss of land to capture rain and increased pressure on drains in the area. Building residential areas beyond the peripheral road, properly and safely assimilated within Abingdon, will increase traffic flow and air pollution in the town centre Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Amenity The removal of Green Belt land for this purpose is outside the principles of Green Belt in removing access to Green Spaces for current and future residents of Abingdon, with the need to cross the A34 to access green land from North Abingdon, (a risk for Children). There is an infringement on the natural borders of Green Belt/Abingdon laid out by the current peripheral road. Overall the claiming of Green belt land for the purpose of this development is unjustified, and reflects easy options rather than a broader strategic approach to Abingdon's future development. I disagree with the proposal to build in the Green Belt. The green land softens the impact of the A34. I would reiterate points in my previous letter with regard to people needing "green spaces" and the "unattractive" location of some of the proposed houses under the embankment of the A34 (in what is sometimes referred to as the "circus" field). The proposed housing in North and North-West Abingdon will run alongside the A34 – a busy and over capacity road, with attendant noise and air pollution that will be difficult to mitigate. The new residents will be isolated, subject to this pollution and disconnected from local facilities. Build elsewhere where the communities can be integrated within existing settlements and not beyond a very real</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>boundary. The plan should specify proper provision for the integration of the N. Abingdon development. Mismatch between the location of housing and jobs Policy states that sites for housing should minimise travel by car. The North Abingdon sites have no local job opportunities and none are planned. If approved up to 1600 cars a day will make 3200 journeys in and out of the location to work placing unnecessary burden on the local road infrastructure. By proposing to build 1000 new houses on Green Belt land in North Abingdon the Vale is failing to comply with its own Strategic Objective 8 of reducing the need to travel, as it will force the new residents in North Abingdon to travel long distances to find work. As 70% of the new jobs identified in the Vale plan are associated with the Science Vale to the south of Abingdon, the houses proposed to the north and north-west of Abingdon land will exacerbate existing traffic problems on both local roads and A34. The distance between the new houses and jobs is too far to walk or cycle and there are no bus routes. New residents will drive to work, which conflicts with Core Policy 35 which seeks to support sustainable transport measures to promote public transport, cycling and walking. An additional 1200 cars on these roads will lead to an unacceptable increase in congestion and air pollution. The vulnerability of the A34 and lack of alternative routes leads to severe congestion at peak times, and at other times if there is an incident on it. Increased traffic through Abingdon to Culham Science Centre, and round the orbital road will increase air pollution in the town- with a significant contribution to excess early deaths thus having an adverse impact on the health and well-being of Vale residents. Reduce commuting by building new homes close to where the employment is and is planned to be - in the South Vale. The plan seeks to encourage more ecologically friendly commuting, including walking, cycling and public transport) which is impractical if the housing is located North of Abingdon. This project should be done in reduced stages as it is impossible to forecast housing and employment fluctuations so far in advance. Sort out Abingdon's pollution, infrastructure, facilities and traffic congestion before additional houses/traffic are attracted to the</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>town. Cycling The Plan gives too little attention to cycling. A study on Abingdon's traffic "Dealing with Traffic" was published in 1999 by the group Abingdon Transport 2000. Their recommendations provided the basis of the adopted traffic plan for the centre of town. The traffic system cannot absorb the proposed construction and development related traffic without major intervention. This has not been decided upon nor is it planned within the existing foreseeable budgets. There will be chaos if the proposed development goes ahead as planned. I would like to amplify that point and many others contained herein in the Examination in Public. Pedestrian Access I'm a member of the Rambling Association concerned what will happen to North Abingdon's footpaths. The old A34 will become more dangerous to cross. The footpath from Abingdon to Sunningwell, one of the few quiet walks available on our doorstep, would change its character - so it will be more difficult for people to find a place to walk and relax.</p>	
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Green Belt	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework lists the five purposes of a Green Belt. We consider that the North Abingdon site makes a High Contribution to four of the five Green Belt purposes. In the fifth purpose we consider that releasing the site from the Green Belt runs counter to the Government's aim to recycle derelict and other urban land.</p>	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation, including land adjacent to the settlements of Abingdon, Radley and Kennington where we are seeking to allocating strategic sites.</p>
Object to Development North of Abingdon and South of Radley – Green Belt	<p>The site to the East of Oxford Road is an important part of the barrier between Abingdon and Radley. Proposed release of Green Belt North West of Peach Croft Farm and South and East of Whites Lane, Radley would compromise the remaining gap (as stated in the Informal Assessment for Oxford City Council). The site to the West of the Oxford Road forms part of the barrier between Abingdon and Sunningwell. This site makes a High Contribution to this Green Belt purpose, to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. North Abingdon Local Plan Group formed following a Public Meeting on the draft Local Plan 2031 in November 2014. The group comprises nine individuals who oppose the identification of land by the Council in the Oxford Green Belt</p>	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation, including land adjacent to the settlements of Abingdon, Radley and Kennington where we are seeking to allocating strategic sites.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	to the North of Abingdon-on-Thames for 1000 houses. The group has produced reports on the proposal - on air quality, Green Belt and traffic - and leaflets to inform residents of the proposals and widen understanding of the issues.	
OCC -North and North West of Abingdon – Education	A new 1.5fe school will be required to accommodate this scale of housing growth in Abingdon. This school should be provided as early as feasible in the development. The site should allow for future growth up to 2fe and therefore be 2.22ha and meet OCC's requirements. The cost of a 1.5 form entry school is currently £7,109,000 (3Q 2012). Expansion of secondary school and SEN school capacity serving Abingdon will also be required. Pages 8 and 10 of the Local Plan Appendix A and pages 30-32 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan support this requirement for educational provision.	Comment is noted. This is included in the site template in Appendix A as a requirement.
Parish Boundary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the sites are approved then there should be a parish boundary review. 	Comment is noted.
Support for development	The inclusion of sub-areas is supported and in accordance with the NPPF paragraphs 156 & 157. It is appropriate to direct a large proportion of housing allocation to Abingdon, as recognised by the council's sub-areas. The plan sufficiently identifies an 18 year housing supply and includes measures as to the approach it will take in order to deliver the remaining need. The plan would not be effective if it included housing figures, which it could not deliver. The second table of the policy sets out the number of homes to be allocated to each strategic site. We would encourage the Council to provide some flexibility to enable more or less homes to be delivered following further detailed assessments of the individual sites. The allocation at North West of Abingdon-on-Thames comprises two parts in separate ownership promoted through the Plan process by separate agents. Assessments have been undertaken to establish the number of dwellings that can be accommodated taking into account site constraints. Land east of Wootton Road has the potential to provide circa 170 new dwellings, whilst land west of Wootton Road (my clients interest), is able to deliver circa 90 dwellings.	Support is welcomed and is noted

Category	Summary	Council Response
	Therefore, we consider that the Council should provide flexibility in the numbers they are proposing by stating a minimum of 200 homes.	
Wording page 52	Abingdon Town Council agrees with the comment on page 52 (paragraph 5.7) that Abingdon has the “highest need for affordable housing” and that this needs addressing. On the previous page it states that Abingdon should continue to be an “attractive place to live.” It should be “attractive and affordable” rather than just “attractive”.	Comment is noted. The provision of affordable housing for the district is set out in Core Policy 24 and is in line with the outcomes of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment

North of Abingdon-on-Thames Site

Category	Summary	Council Response
Consultation Process	Part of the site north of Twelve Acre Drive and east of the A 4183 (Oxford Road), was added in October 2014, a late stage in the Local Plan process. Many Peachcroft residents who would be seriously affected by the development were unaware of the proposal until we notified their North East Abingdon Community Association in November 2014. This site east of the A4183 had not been identified as a potential housing site by the Council when the Green Belt Review was undertaken.	The Local Plan has been subject to statutory consultation including public consultation in November 2014. . This was undertaken in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (OCD01). The Regulation 22 Statement (DLP09) details the consultation methods undertaken.
Developer Contributions	There appear to be some anomalies in the IDP in that North Abingdon is to provide a new primary school through a S106 obligation• The CIL 123 list needs updating. • S106 contributions for a new primary school in N Abingdon, need updating. • The gifting of the land for a primary school needs to be considered.	The anomalies identified have been addressed in the submission version of the IDP. The IDP is however a live document and so can continue to be updated as appropriate.
Development North of Abingdon – Measures that should be put in place	North Abingdon Local Planning Group has developed a list of things that we think should be put in place if the site is developed. See attached document – What we would need – LFLPG Final.pdf. This should not undermine our case against the development, but we realise the site may go ahead whatever we say, so have considered what is proposed, using our local knowledge.	Points acknowledged. The Council are satisfied the Plan, the Site Development Template for North Abingdon and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07) identify the necessary development and infrastructure requirements.
General Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The trees planted west of Sunningwell track, will be decimated? • Dunmore roundabout needs reviewing. age 52, Point 5.7 states that “Abingdon-on-Thames is our largest settlement: it has the largest range of services and facilities, a good employment base, excellent public transport links to Oxford and beyond, and it has the highest affordable housing across the Vale.” This statement is too generic and inaccurate, as not all the town benefits uniformly. Most employment opportunities are relatively low paid. 	Points noted. The Site Development Template states existing trees will be retained, junction improvements at Dunmore Rd may be required and the Council are satisfied paragraph 5.7 is accurate and provides context.

Category	Summary	Council Response
General Comment – Green Belt	<p>This substantial area of the Oxford Green Belt has an important contribution to make, which has been recognised, and vigorously defended in the past, by the Vale Council. A County-wide review of Oxford Green Belt is scheduled to complete in June 2015. Oxford City Council and the four rural district councils, including the Vale, have signed up to this Review to meet Oxford's Housing needs. In view of this it is important that the merits or otherwise of the proposal for this site are thoroughly investigated. Land between the edge of Radley and Lodge Hill is considered to make a significant contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Green Belt Review suggested that the land to the east of the A4183 made a valued contribution to the Green Belt. Yet the Council have now included part of this land for a large housing development. The November 2014 'Local Plan 2013 Draft Adopted Policies Map' indicates part of the Green Belt to be within the proposed Housing site (Appendix 7). This is identified on the Consultant's Site Analysis Map (August 2014) as a 'Sensitive Landscape' (see Appendix 7).</p>	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review (NAT02-03) in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation. This review has informed the site selection process.</p>
General Comment – Infrastructure	<p>I do not oppose in principle the construction of new homes on sites in North Abingdon. However, more work is required to ensure our road network and transport infrastructure is able to cope with thousands of additional houses throughout the Vale. While I am pleased that the site at North Radley has been removed, I am concerned about the large increase in dwellings at the North Abingdon on Thames site. The number has almost doubled. I have serious concerns that the number of homes could place unsustainable strain on local infrastructure. Severe infrastructure problems constrain economic productivity and growth across the region. More work is required to ensure our road network and transport infrastructure is able to cope with thousands of additional houses throughout the Vale. We need to see a diamond junction at the Lodge Hill interchange in order to</p>	<p>Points noted. The Council are satisfied the Plan identifies the necessary development and infrastructure requirements to enable and support growth. The Site Development Template, CP12 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07) identify the necessary transport infrastructure. The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant parties to ensure the necessary infrastructure is provided, as outlined in the Plan.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	keep pace with development proposed for Abingdon; an area already operating over capacity.	
General Comment – Infrastructure and Services	At present there is insufficient infrastructure to deal with the increased population. The increased population will justify a small shopping centre hub in North Abingdon. Reduce the housing requirement; there are not enough local facilities for the proposed density of housing for Abingdon.	Abingdon is the largest and most sustainable settlement in the district, it contains a good range of services and facilities and access to employment and it has the greatest need for affordable housing. Strategic growth at Abingdon will not only help to meet the housing need and deliver improved services and facilities, including for example the upgrade to the A34 junction at Lodge Hill, but also helps to increase the vitality of the town centre thus supporting local businesses.
North Abingdon – Delivery	Support and comments state removing the stipulation that future development should be limited to those parts of the sites identified in the Landscape Capacity Studies.	The Council consider the capacity identified in the Plan for this site is appropriate based on robust evidence including Landscape Studies (NAT04.1-04.12). The capacity for this site set out within the Site Development Template in Appendix A of the Plan (pgs. 9-10) is sufficiently flexible as to respond to masterplanning as it identifies 'around 800 homes, subject to masterplanning'.
Object to development at North Abingdon – Alternative site	Implementation works would disrupt existing residents, whereas one unified development on one site would be less so. There is available an adjacent publicly owned airfield (former Royal Air Force). The public would gain if this land were used rather than that of private owners. An airfield development could make a larger contribution to meeting the country's housing needs. Is it too late to consider this option?	The Council are satisfied this site is a sustainable location for development. The proposed strategic sites are supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which includes assessment of alternative sites.
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Air Pollution	Proposed Green Belt housing developments to the North of Abingdon will worsen existing air pollution in the town centre. Dunmore Road and Twelve Arce Drive will no longer be able to function as a ring road, particularly for large HGV and articulated vehicles, increasing traffic through the town centre. General traffic congestion will be exacerbated by the regular accidents and closures of the A34 with no alternative route. These housing	The Plan acknowledges the impact development can have on air pollution. CP43 sets out the requirement for all development to have regard to air quality and Air Quality Management Areas. The Site Development Template for North Abingdon also includes the site specific requirements for development to investigate potential air pollution impacts and consider potential impact on Abingdon-on-Thames Air Quality Management Area.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>developments undermine the Vale's "Air Quality Action Plan" to alleviate the town centre's air pollution problem. Nitrogen dioxide levels in Abingdon have continued to rise in Abingdon Town Centre since 2004 continue to exceed the Government's Health Standard. This will have a long term health effect on the chronically ill and other residents living in and around the Town Centre. Abingdon Town Centre was declared an "Air Quality Management Area in April 2009 following the introduction of the Abingdon Integrated Traffic Strategy. Originally the peripheral road Copenhagen Drive/Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive was to be used as a measure to alleviate further pollution in Abingdon Town Centre. The route was identified as a primary measure by the Vale of White Horse Town Council to reduce traffic into the centre therefore reduce pollution levels. This measure has failed.</p>	
<p>Object to Development North of Abingdon – Consultation (2)</p>	<p>The group comprises nine individuals who are opposed to the identification of land by the Council in the Oxford Green Belt to the North of Abingdon-on-Thames for approximately 1000 houses. Our first meeting was held on Monday 17th November and we were particularly concerned that the residents of Peachcroft estate were unaware of the proposed development, as the site to the north between the Oxford Road (A4183) and Peach Croft Farm had only recently been included in October 2014. Our fears were confirmed and a representative of Peachcroft later joined the group. We have written several papers concerning the proposal including papers on The SHMA, Green Belt, Traffic and Air Quality and have posted draft copies of these on the Long Furlong Community Association website. This is to help residents learn more about the issues and make informed choices and decide whether they want to make representations concerning the Local Plan. The Council have produced so many documents that it is overwhelming. In</p>	<p>The Local Plan has been subject to statutory consultation including public consultation in November 2014. This was undertaken in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (OCD01).To demonstrate the Local Plan is robust and sound, the Council have produced a number of evidence base studies to support the Local Plan. The Submission Documents Library available online provides a list of these documents. In regards to air pollution, the Plan acknowledges the impact development can have on air pollution. CP43 sets out the requirement for all development to have regard to air quality and Air Quality Management Areas. The Site Development Template for North Abingdon also includes the site specific requirements for development to investigate potential air pollution impacts and consider potential impact on Abingdon-on-Thames Air Quality Management Area.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>addition we have posted advice as to how to fill in the submission form as it is very complicated and may put people off making representations. Following on from this we printed 3000 leaflets and delivered these to residents on Peachcroft, Long Furlong and some roads off Copenhagen Drive alerting residents to the proposal. Many, as we suspected, were unaware of the proposal. This leaflet contained details of two 'drop in' sessions we organised on Wednesday 10th December 2pm-6pm and Saturday 13th December 10am-1pm to give general advice on the proposal and the submission forms. These were well attended and residents found them helpful. We also wrote letters to the Oxford Mail and the Abingdon Herald voicing our concerns and these were printed on 8th and 10th December respectively. Additionally the CPRE held a meeting on 2nd December on Green Belt sites identified in the Vale Draft Local Plan and a member of our group was asked to speak about our concerns about the proposal in North Abingdon. We have produced these reports ourselves and not employed private consultants and have put them in the public domain to inform residents of the proposal and to widen understanding of the issues involved. We feel strongly about the issues and have had to produce them in a very short timescale but hope that they contribute to the debate. We are keen to be invited to put our views in person to the Planning Inspector at the Planning Inquiry stage.</p>	
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Consultation Process	<p>Many residents on Peachcroft estate was unaware of the proposed development. North Abingdon Local Plan Group, who oppose the development of sites in the Green Belt, has taken a number of steps to inform local residents, through leaflets, drop-in sessions and producing papers on the SHMA, Green Belt, Traffic and Air Quality and posting them on the community website to help people gain a better understanding of the issues.</p>	<p>The Local Plan has been subject to statutory consultation including public consultation in November 2014. . This was undertaken in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (OCD01). The Regulation 22 Statement (DLP09) details the consultation methods undertaken.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	The group is keen to be invited to put their views in person to the Planning Inspector at the Planning Inquiry stage.	
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Consultation Process (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor community involvement as required by the Statement of Community Involvement. 	The Local Plan has been subject to statutory consultation including public consultation in November to December in which included this site. This was undertaken in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (OCD01). The Regulation 22 Statement (DLP09) details the consultation methods undertaken.
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Green Belt	<p>Amenity The site provides a much valued green lung to North Abingdon residents. The presence of Tilsley Park to the West of the site is consistent with using the Green Belt for recreation. The land is a valuable health and welfare asset. Building on it will damage the quality of life in Abingdon, in particular the north side as it will change the balance of access to the amenities and facilities of the town. Development may reduce the soak away soil drainage and cause flash flooding of the Dunmore Road and the existing local housing. It's not sensible or safe to build housing estate on the land between Oxford Road (Lodge Hill), the farm buildings, Peachcroft Farm and Twelve Acre Drive. The land is outside Abingdon and contained by two fast main roads. Air pollution is already a problem here. Consultation The land to the east of the Oxford Road was included late in the Plan process in October 2014 and many local residents were unaware of its inclusion. The public was not warned or given any opportunity to object to the further change of the Green Belt. Landscape Land to the east of Tilsley Park has high landscape value. The site makes a valued contribution to the landscape of Abingdon. If developed for housing, it would result in an intrusive development in open countryside, which due to the slope of the land will be unduly prominent, have a large impact affecting the setting and special character of Abingdon. The N Abingdon site is approximately 10m below Lodge Hill, with the rest of the site and</p>	The proposed strategic sites are supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which includes consideration of the Green Belt, landscape and agricultural land amongst other considerations. The council has prepared a local Green Belt review (NAT02-03) in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation. This review has informed the site selection process. In regards to specific matters on landscape, biodiversity and woodlands, the Site Development Template includes a number of development/infrastructure requirements including landscape and environmental consideration and transport measures.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>surrounding area is approximately 25m below Lodge Hill, indicating the site dominance over the area. Because of the natural topography of the site, the landscape cannot be sufficiently mitigated against. The development of the two sites would be significant encroachment into the countryside. The site is in the immediate vicinity to Tilsley Park sports centre. Building on the green field along Dunmore Road will remove the last piece of green land in the area and spoil the area for the current residents. The proposal would mean that the view of the countryside and amenity would be lost. Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland The proposed release of this land from Green Belt and the identification for housing will lead to a loss of biodiversity contrary to Core Policy 46 of the draft Plan. Building on this green belt land will destroy the wildlife habitat. On any given day there are red kites, skylarks, and in the evenings, bats, all coming from this land. 'Green spaces' cannot compensate wildlife. They don't know where the planners think they should live. Loss of natural habitat for wildlife will drive away the Red Kites and Skylarks. The biodiversity and undisturbed habitat of Blake's Oak Ancient Woodland will be lost. The site should remain in the Green Belt. The Council have not recognised Blake's Oak Ancient Woodland immediately bordering the site to the West of Oxford Road. Ancient Woodlands are irreplaceable features of our landscape since they take hundreds of years to develop and below ground there is a mycelium structure with filaments that as a single organism would extend under every single tree and out into the fields at their margins. Thus the part of the site adjoining this Ancient Woodland has an important role in conserving and enhancing the biodiversity the Council wishes to conserve, restore and enhance. If the site is released from the Green Belt and Housing is proposed then specific measures must be included to protect Blake's Oak Ancient Woodland from loss</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>or damage. The Council have not identified that the site is within close proximity of Sugworth Site of Special Scientific Interest. The land is valuable farmland. Footpaths across it facilitate recreational use. There is a diversity of wildlife including skylarks and the open aspect is a key criterion for the preservation of Green Belt. National Policy The Council appear so determined to meet housing figures that any other planning consideration, including Government advice, is overridden. Releasing this site would threaten the integrity and essential purpose of the Oxford Green Belt. This site for 800 houses, straddling the A4183 (Oxford Road), is unsuitable for housing in light of long established, tested and recent Government planning policy on the Green Belt, the enormous impact and size of the proposal, and strong local concerns. The plan ignores Government advice that “protecting our precious green belt must be paramount”, that boundaries should be altered only in “exceptional circumstances” (statement by the Rt Hon Eric Pickles and the Housing and Planning Minister Brandon Lewis 14 October 2014). Nick Boles has said that unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the ‘very special circumstances’ justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt. One of the five purposes of the Green Belt is ‘to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’. Developing these two sites would undoubtedly result in significant encroachment on a valuable and prominent site in open countryside. One of the five purposes of the Green Belt over the years and specifically mentioned in Paragraph 80 of NPPF is ‘to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns’. By identifying this physically prominent site in the established Green Belt, the Council is ignoring long established and recent Planning advice. Government advice, October 2014, re-iterates the requirement for councils to prioritise brownfield</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>sites and protect the Green Belt from development. By allocating this site the council has ignored Government advice and the strong concerns of the residents of North Abingdon. Previous plans have always said that protecting the Green Belt land is a priority and that extension of building northwards towards Lodge Hill should be “resolutely avoided”. This has in the past been endorsed by Planning Inspectors. The recent Green Belt Review did not recommend that the land to the east of the Oxford Road be taken out of the Green Belt. Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive, parts of the Abingdon Peripheral Road, provide a natural edge to urban Abingdon. This site makes a High Contribution to this Green Belt purpose 'To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas' which the Informal Assessment by Oxford City Council correctly acknowledge but which the Vale Green Belt Review asserts is not applicable. The Council has not made a case for ‘exceptional need’ as required by the Government to release this land from the Green Belt. They have not carried out a proper assessment of the whole of the site. Coalescence, Historic Character, Setting and Sense of Place Development would destroy Abingdon's sense of place, forming a continuous urban mass to the A34. The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl. The development will result in a continuous line of housing all the way from Abingdon to Oxford. Abingdon is a beautiful town. Adding additional housing will turn the North of Abingdon into a huge housing estate and add additional traffic to the area. The urban sprawl into Green Belt land is progressively destroying its unique character, and views from and towards the high land to the north of the town. Public Footpaths into neighbouring villages and countryside will be overwhelmed by the scale of development. One of the five purposes of the Green Belt is to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Abingdon-on-Thames is an important</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>historic town and claims to be the longest inhabited town in the country. To develop this prominent site for housing would affect the setting and special character of the town. Releasing this site for housing development on this prominent site could destroy Abingdon's unique character. The high open land to the north of the town currently forms an attractive gateway. The land provides a distinct gap between the village of Radley and Abingdon and its development for housing would erode the distinctive sense of place currently enjoyed Abingdon and Radley residents. Protecting the Oxford Green Belt has been a priority acknowledged by previous Local Plans considered by Planning Inspectors, and adopted by the Vale council, including the 1983 Abingdon Local Plan. Commenting on previous plans, successive Planning Inspectors have acknowledged the significant importance of a gap between North Abingdon and Radley, preventing encroachment into the rural setting, and its vulnerability to inappropriate development. The green belt area between Abingdon and Oxford must be protected to retain the historic and cultural nature of both towns. The council has stated that it does not want Radley and Abingdon to join up but this proposal if approved makes the gap smaller and remaining land vulnerable. The land makes a significant contribution in preventing Abingdon-on-Thames and Radley merging into one another, a key purpose of a Green Belt and a significant contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive provide a natural boundary to the northern edge of Abingdon-on-Thames. Abingdon will be in close proximity to Steventon. The land is part of the setting of the Radley College Mansion House. Green Belt Review We understand that it is appropriate for the Council to review Green Belt boundaries, as they have not been reviewed since 1991 when The Oxford Fringe and Green Belt Plan was</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>adopted, but no robust case has been made to justify releasing such a large area of prominent, important Green Belt land. The extension of the “North Abingdon” site east of Oxford Rd into Peachcroft farm was not included in the document for consultation in April. The Vale green belt review of February 2014 did not recommend that this area was withdrawn from the Green Belt. North Abingdon Local Plan Group disagrees with the consultants' assessment of the sites against the five purposes of the Green Belt. Following our in depth examination of the site, we have included our summary table in the attached Topic paper on the Green Belt in Abingdon. The Green Belt Review Phase 3 Report title 'Amendments to boundaries of The Green Belt around inset villages and the new inset village at Farmoor.' is misleading as Abingdon is not a village. The site to the east of the A4183 is not considered in this document, as the consultants presumably do not consider it should be removed from the green belt. The Green Belt Review concluded that the site to the west of the A4183 (in addition to others in North Abingdon) 'no longer meet the purposes of the Green Belt. For this reason, the development of these sites will not harm the purposes of the Oxford Green Belt, which will continue to be protected in accordance with Core Policy 13.' Page 62 of draft Local Plan 2031. NALPG disagrees with this and challenges the credibility and validity of this conclusion, for the reasons given in this submission. Paragraph 5.42 states that all the sites fall within land identified through the Green Belt Review as no longer meeting the purposes of the Green Belt. This is not the case as the Green Belt Review proposed to keep the land to the east of the A4183 within the green belt boundary, yet the Council at a late stage included the site. The Green Belt Review said that the land in North Abingdon east of Oxford Road does meet the purposes of the Green Belt. Agriculture This site is currently good</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>agricultural land being used productively. A detailed soil survey should have been undertaken prior to proposing housing on the site, to establish whether the land is Best and Most Versatile. The Sustainability Assessment Report consultants suggest that the split is approximately 10% Grade 2 and 90% Grade 3 Agricultural Land Classification. Depending on the split between 3a and 3b grade of land, with 3a being classified as Best and Most Versatile, developing this site could result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. The site is Grade 2 and 3 farmland bounded in one place by Ancient Woodland (Blake's Oak). The development would lead to loss of farmland and wildlife habitat and have an adverse effect on Peachcroft Farm. The farm would lose the grazing area where turkey and geese are kept which could mean the business may become financially unviable. Domestic cats living in the new housing could have a disastrous effect on the many free range geese and turkeys. The Council should listen to the development report advice not to build on top quality agricultural land and retain the Green Belt area between Abingdon (the oldest populated town in the country) and Oxford. Flooding There is a risk of flooding from the pumping of foul water. Risk management measures are required. Location Employment is planned in the south placing housing to the north, will creating further congestion. The A34 is already at full capacity. The eastern extension of the North Abingdon site should be removed from the plan due to this land having not been included in the original Green Belt review, and would therefore be seen as being the result of a piecemeal review whose sole purpose was to release land for development, which surely cannot be legal. I object to this level of development on green belt around Radley. I paid a premium for my house as it directly overlooks the area towards Bayworth. The council should have re-examined the proposed south western</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>development (Local Plan 2026) Do not develop housing on higher land, nor rural areas, nor those adjacent to ancient woodland. Use non- Green Belt areas to the west of the town which will have little effect on the landscape. Take building on the green belt out of the plan to only consider after all the other non-green belt sites have been built on. Abingdon should not be expected to develop housing sites to house Oxford overflow.</p>	
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Infrastructure	<p>The plans have not taken local infrastructure needs into account. Roads around Abingdon are already full to capacity especially in the morning and afternoon. There are regular queues towards the Marcham roundabout, and it is often difficult to turn right out of roads off the ring road (Twelve Acre Drive). More houses mean more cars, and the situation will worsen. Schools and amenities in the area are full. More houses will exacerbate this problem. None of the developments in this area make provision for work to change the Abingdon North A34 access to make this four way, so all the traffic will have to use the ring road or town centre. The proposed housing cannot be sustained by the existing infrastructure and facilities so should not proceed. 800 homes is too many. Reduce the number of houses and the infrastructure will cope. Either build new housing closer to area of employment or undertake major works to increase the capacity of the A34 and build an eastern bridge over the Thames. Consider rail links to Abingdon. The delivery of south facing slips is not fully funded by the N. Abingdon development and other funding is not guaranteed. The congestion of the A34 has been acknowledged in paragraph 5.32 but this fact has been effectively ignored in the rest of the plan. Safeguarding of land for a burial site needs to take place in Abingdon. I made just such a comment at the earlier stage of this local plan consultation but my suggestion was ignored and instead the land zoned for housing – the land to the North of Abingdon. There is no bus</p>	<p>Points acknowledged. The Council are satisfied that the Plan, the Site Development Template for North Abingdon and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (DLP07) identify the necessary development and infrastructure required to support development, informed in particular by cooperative working with Oxfordshire County Council including the Evaluation of Transport Impacts study (TRA02-02.1). The site templates includes a number of localised transport mitigation measures that will be refined further based on a site specific Transport Assessment to be prepared by the promoter at planning application stage including investigation of congestion and relevant junction improvements. The IDP sets out in further detail the delivery of the A34 slip roads including funding. The Site Template includes a requirements for a new primary school on site and improvements to bus services including appropriate routing. The Council will continue to work with the relevant stakeholders to ensure effective delivery of infrastructure.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>service from the whole length of the North Abingdon peripheral road, Audlett Drive, Peachcroft Road, Dunmore Road and Copenhagen Drive as this route is designed to be free flowing to alleviate serious traffic congestion from the town centre. If new services and facilities are to be delivered the necessity to over develop in North Abingdon is removed as new services and facilities can be accommodated in other less built up locations. • Phasing should firstly focus on the A34 • Provision of a new primary school is a must. • There is little mention to the future developments of a secondary school, in response to the rising population. • Youth facilities and groups need to be also considered. • IDP funding is not adequate • Lack of funding to make the infrastructure changes necessary, make this development unsuitable and unsustainable. • Abingdon has no railway • A diamond junction or interchange at Lodge Hill must be in place before any housing development is commenced. The claim that North Abingdon has the highest need for affordable housing is spurious. It cannot be said that people wish to live in North Abingdon because of the high employment opportunities because there is no employment in the North Abingdon area sufficient to sustain such a large increase.</p>	
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	<p>The open high land to the north of Abingdon forms an attractive gateway to the town. The view over this land is important to residents of North Abingdon. The site is on prominent rising land and any housing would be intrusive in the landscape. The site makes an important contribution to the attractiveness of the landscape including the rolling sweep to the north of the site nearest Lodge Hill. Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive form a clear boundary to the north of Abingdon. The importance of this valued landscape has been recognised and endorsed by a previous Local Plan Planning Inspector Part of the wooded area at the back is ancient woodland containing Blake Oak. The land</p>	<p>Points noted. The Council are satisfied this site provides a sustainable location for development which is demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which includes consideration of the Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity amongst other considerations. The Council have produced a number of Landscape Studies (AT04.1-04.12) to inform the site selection process in which the Site Development Template for North Abingdon reflects.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	meets point i), iii) and v) in Core Policy 44 and should be protected. Part of the site adjoining this Ancient Woodland has an important role in conserving and enhancing the biodiversity the Council wishes to conserve, restore and enhance. • The landscape to the north of the town provides a natural rim to the town. • The site will result in a substantial visual intrusion into the open countryside. • Lighting from Tilsley Park will also intrude upon the new development, contrary to CP44. • No Visual Feasibility study was undertaken for the North-West Abingdon site. • East of Tinsley Park has the highest landscape value. • The area is farmed with only a small part of the site bordering onto the A34. • The Vale have failed to mention the close proximity of Sugworth SSSI.	
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Loss of farmland	No detailed survey has been undertaken to determine the exact quality of the farmland. Peach Croft farm is a local farm providing a highly valued community facility. The eastern extension of the North Abingdon site would affect the greater part of Peach Croft farm and would threaten to make this long-standing business unviable.	The proposed strategic sites are supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which includes consideration of agricultural land amongst other considerations
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Overdevelopment	The North of Abingdon has already been “over-developed” there is no further room for expansion here	The Council consider this site is a sustainable location for development as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03).
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	Access, Congestion and Road Safety Proposed development sites in North Abingdon at Dunmore road/Twelve Acre Drive are first in the Green Belt and second the existing road network is severely congested and prone to accidents. Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive cannot cope with current traffic levels. Building 1,000 homes on the Dunmore road and Peachcroft side of the Lodge Hill roundabout with the possibility of 1,000 additional vehicles would cause further traffic chaos and pollution. The number of houses proposed is excessive. The road network is already congested and dangerous. 1000 new houses	The Council are satisfied this site provides a sustainable location for development which is demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which includes consideration of transport amongst other considerations. The Council are satisfied the Plan, the Site Development Template for North Abingdon, CP12 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (DLP07) identify the necessary development and infrastructure required to support development. In regards to specific matters on transport the Site Development Template includes a number of development/infrastructure requirements including transport

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>in North and North West Abingdon will dramatically increase traffic congestion. It will likely cause 1500 cars to use Dunmore Road, already a bottleneck during rush hour, with several accidents having already taken place. The development is adjacent to the A34, the sixth most congested road in the country. This will adversely impact local and through traffic on a major national artery with all the inherent economic implications. It is difficult to get out onto Dunmore Road in the car at most times now. This has not been helped by the decision to make Wootton Road roundabout a single lane (the traffic was bad enough when it was two lanes). It is almost impossible now at peak times to turn right safely out of Boulter Drive onto Dunmore Road. If this development goes ahead with the possibility of 1000 additional vehicles, traffic along Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive will grind to a permanent halt causing further traffic chaos and pollution. Before planning any additional housing, strategies for dealing with current and additional traffic are needed. I do not understand why traffic could not go out from the new estates onto the old A34 around Lodge Hill for example. If I'm driving I have no choice but to go down Boulter Drive onto Dunmore Road. Many others can only use Dunmore Road to leave the area. The planned new build only adds to the risk. As there is no alternative route, how will emergency services cope if this road is blocked and somebody needs an ambulance, the police or fire services? The plans to provide access directly onto Peachcroft and Dunmore Roads will cause unnecessary congestion. A better approach would be to have direct access onto a roundabout on Oxford Road, in preparation for the A34 South access point. This would enable people living in the planned estates to leave Abingdon for work using the A34 without adding to congestion. As a local resident I frequently queue in traffic on Dunmore Road but can't</p>	<p>measures more specifically contributions towards delivery of slips on A34 at Lodge Hill, investigation into congestion, junction improvements at Dunmore Road/A4183, and improvements/contributions towards bus services/infrastructure.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>remember queuing to leave or enter Abingdon on the Oxford Road. Infrastructure If the development must go ahead it is important that Dunmore Road is given infrastructure reducing the speed limit to 30mph and introducing roundabouts at junctions of roads with Dunmore Road .If these houses go ahead, I suggest that Dunmore Road be made into a one way system or a dual carriageway. Rather than feed into Dunmore Road, which has problems for traffic turning right and left out of the side roads, a new road should be built at the northern end of the proposed estate, running parallel, at the top of the hill, to the A34.In the proposed North Abingdon development, “Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive would cause severance for the site and pedestrian crossings would need to be implemented” (SA Report Appendices p.119). Roundabouts would be needed to allow vehicles to exit estate roads. Thus the site could only comply with SO3 if Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive becomes a residential road rather than a ring road. This would cause severe congestion elsewhere in the town. There will need to be pedestrian crossings, roundabouts to enable access to and from roads such as Alexander Close and Boulter Drive and the speed limit restricted from 40 to 30 mph for safety reasons. The community infrastructure levy is an insignificant contribution towards the necessary infrastructure. Without substantial improvement of the A34 the area will grid lock. Infrastructure funding may not be available. North Abingdon site should be removed from the plan on this and other grounds outlined in this response. If the land is not removed, then set CIL and other developer contributions higher to cover the full £13 million for the interchange plus extra for alterations to Dunmore Road. An upgrade to the A34 is needed before any more housing is considered. The A34 will require a diamond junction at Lodge Hill (North Abingdon), additional lanes between the M40 and</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>Chilton, possibly a southern bypass and a new river crossing. These major infrastructure improvements would need to be in place before any housing development is undertaken. A diamond junction or interchange at Lodge Hill, which has been needed for several years due to traffic congestion in Abingdon, must be in place before any housing development is commenced. There is already an access road through from Lodge Hill to a civil engineer's contractor site and on to the development but this has been excluded as an option in the plan. The assessment that Abingdon is the most sustainable development is flawed, the development would not provide sufficient money for the upgrade of the A34 Lodge Hill junction. If money were found to build it, it would only add to existing traffic problems on the A34. In addition, if the N. Abingdon development were built, Dunmore Road would no longer function as a ring road, and the A34 would become the Abingdon ring road. An improvement to the junction is unlikely to existing alleviate traffic problems in the town since many people living in the new development would drive through the town to get to jobs which are mainly in the south, and to get to the central shopping area. The orbital road will change to a town road with lower speed limits, more junctions and traffic measures. Land to the south of the town is not in Green Belt and there is already a closed off link road to go north of the A24 near Drayton Refuse Centre then would it not be more sensible to also add a link road going south onto the A34 in the same area instead of the suggested diamond junction at Lodge Hill which is mainly for travelling south on the A34? If this access to the A34 south of Abingdon were put in place this would ease traffic congestion coming into Abingdon on the Drayton Road onto the A415 to go south on the A34.If the proposed reservoir in Steventon were to happen in the future then a two way junction onto the A34 south of Abingdon would make access easier for</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>lorries and other heavy traffic working on the reservoir. The plan should specify proper provision for the integration of the N. Abingdon development. Air Pollution The development is subject to noise and air pollution from the A34. Nitrogen Dioxide levels have risen since 2004 in Abingdon Town Centre and exceed the Government's Health Standard (Vale of the White Horse "Air Quality Action Plan Consultation Document 2014"). This will have a long term health effect on the chronically ill and other residents living in and around the Town Centre. The Town Centre was declared an "Air Quality Management Area in April 2009. Copenhagen Drive/Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive was to be used as a measure to alleviate further pollution to Abingdon Town Centre. This measure failed. Additional traffic caused by further housing developments north or south of Abingdon must not be allowed to put further lives at risk. 800 houses will increase greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution, contrary to SO 12. Air pollution in Abingdon-on-Thames will increase due to congestion on Dunmore Road and Twelve Acre Drive will no longer be able to divert traffic from the centre of town - thus exacerbating AQMA issues rather than providing a solution. The only solution is not to build houses in this part of Abingdon. Amenity disagree with the proposal to build in the Green Belt. The green land softens the impact of the A34. The proposed development will run alongside of the A34, a busy and over capacity road. Mitigating noise and pollution will be very hard. Mismatch between the location of housing and jobs More than 70% of projected jobs are south of Abingdon at Vale Science park. This is too far to walk or cycle and there are no bus routes. New residents will have driven to work, which conflicts with Core Policy 35 which seeks to support sustainable transport measures to promote public transport, cycling and walking. An additional 1200 cars on these roads will lead to an unacceptable increase in</p>	

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>congestion and air pollution. The vulnerability of A34 and lack of alternative routes leads to severe congestion at peak times.</p> <p>Many people that move to these new homes won't work in Oxford. They may get jobs at Milton Park or in the Harwell area, adding to traffic going through Abingdon. Even if they work in Oxford - we already have gridlock so often on the A34.</p> <p>Pedestrian Access I'm a member of the Rambling Association concerned what will happen to North Abingdon's footpaths. The old A34 will become more dangerous to cross. The footpath from Abingdon to Sunningwell is one of the few quiet walks available on our doorstep, would change its character - so it will be more difficult for people to find a place to walk and relax.</p>	
Object to Development North of Abingdon – Unsustainable location	<p>The new estates will be small, isolated and unsustainable settlements. Developing to the north of Abingdon, beyond the boundary of a major road, hemmed by the A34 and Lodge Hill is absurd. No developer can assimilate the new settlements into Abingdon while maintaining traffic flow on the essential peripheral route. Integration is required through traffic networks and urban design and a possible new peripheral road further north of Abingdon.</p>	<p>The Council are satisfied this site provides a sustainable location for development which is demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which includes consideration of landscape and transport amongst others. The Council have produced a number of Landscape Studies (AT04.1-04.12) to inform the site selection process. The Council are satisfied the Plan, the Site Development Template for North Abingdon and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (DLP07) identify the necessary development and infrastructure required to support development</p>
OCC – Infrastructure	<p>North Abingdon on Thames (800 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 4800+ veh trips per day, around 500 trips in peak hour • Expected to contribute towards potential delivery of south facing slips on A34 at Lodge Hill. Any alleviation achieved by this scheme in the peak hour congestion problems along Dunmore Road and further to west, including A415 to Marcham interchange would be far outweighed by the impact of additional traffic from such a development. • Oxford Road and Wootton Road roundabouts would not cope with peak increases in traffic. Residential road junctions along Dunmore Road would not cope without improvements. Additional severe congestion along</p>	<p>Appendix A of the Plan includes a Site Development Template (pgs. 9-11) for this site setting out in detail the site specific requirements for this allocation which does includes a number of the points raised by the County. The Council will continue to work with the County on these matters</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	Dunmore Road would push traffic back towards the town, and negate its function as a peripheral road. • Abingdon town centre approaches (Oxford Road, Wootton Road, Bridge Street, Ock Street) presently suffer considerable congestion. • Contributions should be secured towards future strategic infrastructure improvement for the relief of Abingdon. Public Transport (PT) contributions would be required. Public Rights of Way (PROW) likely to be affected. • Twelve Acre Drive and Dunmore Road form part of Abingdon relief road, subject to 40mph limit. This road already suffers substantial congestion during peak traffic periods. Any site access from the Oxford Road unlikely to be supported. New infrastructure (footways, etc.) to link with existing necessary. PROW likely to be affected.	
OCC – Infrastructure funding	28. North Abingdon – Growth has been allocated here in the hope it will support the delivery of south facing slips at the A34 Lodge Hill interchange. It will not be viable for the development to fully fund the scheme. There will also be other infrastructure and service improvements required in addition to this. Recent announcements relating to the A34 have confirmed there is no Highways Agency/DfT funding for such a scheme. The county council can also confirm it has no funding. As there is no guarantee of third party funding for Lodge Hill, there is a risk that development will progress without the interchange improvements if proven this is acceptable.	The Council acknowledges Oxfordshire County Council's point on the A34 Lodge Hill interchange and will continue to work with the County on this matter. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07) provides detail on the delivery and funding of this scheme.
OCC – Public Transport	North Abingdon This site lies to the west and east of the very frequent Abingdon-Oxford Premium Bus Route, currently with 9 buses per hour (12 in the peak hour). A pair of high-quality bus stops, incorporating a pedestrian crossing (formal or informal), shelters and real time information displays will be required on the A4183 to the north of Peachcroft Roundabout, along with connecting footpaths from the site. It is not expected that bus services will operate via Dunmore Road and Copenhagen Drive.	Appendix A of the Plan includes a Site Development Template (pgs. 9-11) for this site setting out in detail the site specific requirements for this allocation which does include the points raised by the County, as it is identified in the Template contributions towards improved bus service/infrastructure and additional buses to reduce the number of car journeys. The Council will continue to work with the County on these matters

Category	Summary	Council Response
	There are strong concerns about the impact of the proposed south-facing slips on the very frequent bus service from Abingdon to Oxford. Any such proposal would need to include a high degree of segregation of bus flows from slow moving queues of car traffic heading towards Lodge Hill. The impact of such south-facing slips on traffic patterns in north Abingdon could be considerable. The developer would contribute towards additional buses from north Abingdon towards Didcot and other Science Vale destinations, so as to reduce the number of car journeys in this direction at peak times.	
OCC – SEN facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North of Abingdon p10: Social and community requirements – this should clarify that contributions would also be required to SEN facilities 	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07) details the contributions required for SEN provision from this site.
Oxford City Council - North Abingdon	In principle the City Council sees merit in the strategic housing site allocations to the north of Abingdon. As identified by the City Council's 'Oxford Strategic Growth Options: High Level Review of Opportunities' (October 2014) ³ , there is potential to review the Green Belt boundary in this area whilst maintaining its overall function, and the area offers good connectivity to Oxford and key employment sites to the south of the City. Given the north of Abingdon area is identified as a potential urban extension for Oxford, this area provides a potential opportunity to take forward the Duty to Cooperate obligation to address Oxford unmet need. The Green Belt is to be further reviewed early in 2015 in the context of the Oxford unmet need. Therefore the approach to Green Belt review and consideration of spatial options here is piecemeal given there may need to be further strategic allocations in this area to address the Oxford unmet need. The strategy is therefore unjustified as it is not the most appropriate strategy, and not effective due to the issues described. The City Council is not wholly satisfied that land to the east of the A4183 is appropriate for development and Green Belt	<p>Support and caveats noted. The North Abingdon site boundary is justified based on our Green Belt review and landscape evidence (NAT04.1-04.12).</p> <p>Policy CP2 sets out our commitment to the ongoing process to establish the level of any unmet need City cannot accommodate including an Oxfordshire Green Belt study to inform that process. As the five strategic purposes of Green Belt do not vary by strategic context or level of housing need we see no reason why the strategic study would materially differ from our own independently produced Green Belt review.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	review given it is more constrained in heritage, landscape and visual terms, and until a joint approach to Green Belt review is taken, objects on this basis as it is not justified.	
Site Template – North of Abingdon	Blake’s Oak that has not been identified in the Site Development Template. This ancient woodland should be identified on the template and it should be acknowledged in the requirements for the site that appropriate buffers around the ancient woodland should be applied to ensure there are no impacts from the proposed adjacent development site.	The Council are satisfied this site provides a sustainable location for development which is demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which includes consideration of landscape and biodiversity amongst others. The Council have produced a number of Landscape Studies (AT04.1-04.12) to inform the site selection process in which the Site Development Template for North Abingdon reflects.
Support Green Belt boundary amendments at NW Radley, the Triangular field and Gooseacre	The Freeholder supports the proposed amendments to the Green Belt boundary at North West Radley, the Triangular field and Gooseacre, and endorses the findings of the Green Belt Review in this respect; albeit there are some concerns regarding the findings of the Review in respect of the now omitted site at North Radley.	Support acknowledged. The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF.
Support North Abingdon Site	The proposed revised Green Belt boundary on the eastern edge of the North Abingdon allocation will provide an easily identifiable, permanent boundary (as would the hedgerow further to the east), and provide for the containment of Abingdon. We support the proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary at North Abingdon (as shown on the proposed Policies Map). The proposed amendment will enable the delivery of a scheme for around 800 dwellings and supporting infrastructure. We support the Council’s Review and proposed release of the majority of the North Abingdon land from the Green Belt. The land at North Abingdon is in a highly accessible location, on the edge of the District’s largest settlement, with good links to local services and facilities (which are capable of further enhancement). It provides an opportunity to secure a permanent, long term defensible, attractive edge to the town and represents a logical extension. We support the	Support acknowledged.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>allocation of North Abingdon for around 800 dwellings, which accords with national policy and the Council's Spatial Strategy. We strongly believe that the North Abingdon site is deliverable with no insurmountable policy or technical constraints identified. We are committed to working with the Council and other stakeholders throughout the master planning process.</p>	
Thames Water - Waste Water Services	<p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site". We have concerns regarding Waste Water Services in relation to this site. Specifically sewage treatment capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations into the impact of the development and completion of this, on average, takes 12 weeks. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be necessary. In this case we ask that the following paragraph is included in the Development Plan. "Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure." We have concerns regarding Waste Water Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Drainage Infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. In the first instance a drainage strategy would be required from the developer to determine the exact impact on our infrastructure and the significance of the infrastructure to support the</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges Thames Water's points on water supply network and sewage treatment capacity and will continue to work with Thames Water on these matters. The Site Development Template (pgs. 9-11) includes the need for sewage upgrade and the paragraph requested is included at the beginning of Appendix A which sets out the general requirements for all sites (pg. 3).</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>development. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be potentially necessary for the delivery of the infrastructure, alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. We are also likely to request a Grampian planning condition to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation of the development.</p>	

North West of Abingdon-on-Thames Site

Category	Summary	Council Response
Appendix A Site Template 3. Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area: North West of Abingdon-on-Thames	We request that the 'Use' specified in the Development Template be amended to state 'a minimum of 200 homes, subject to detailed masterplanning' . In relation to Access and Highways, and the requirement to 'contribute towards delivery of south facing slips on A34 at Lodge Hill', we request clarification on whether this will be sought as a financial contribution.	The Council are satisfied that 'around' provides an appropriate degree of flexibility. The approach to contributions regarding south facing slips on A34 at Lodge Hill is set out in further detail in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07).
North West of Abingdon - Waste Water Services	Thames Water do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability at this site. They have concerns regarding Waste Water Services and note:• Sewerage capacity is unlikely to serve the extra demand• There is a three year lead time for an upgrade • A drainage strategy will be required by the developer before development can commence• A Grampian planning condition will be requested to ensure infrastructure is in place before development commences	The Council acknowledges Thames Water's points on waste water and sewage treatment capacity and will continue to work with Thames Water on these matters. The paragraph requested is included at the beginning of Appendix A which sets out the general requirements for all sites (pg. 3)
Object to Development North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	• Concerned about the impact on the River Stort. • Building next to the Stort will cause water runoff and a reoccurrence of flooding. • Will cause further poor air quality of the town. • Diamond access to A34 north at Lodge Hill will have to be implemented	Points acknowledged. The Council are satisfied that the site proposed is a sustainable and appropriate location for development. The site has been robustly assessed through the site selection assessment process as demonstrated within the Strategy. Appendix A of the Plan includes a Site Development Template (pgs. 7-8) for this site setting out site specific development and infrastructure requirements to support development, this includes consideration of flooding and drainage, landscape considerations, air pollution and quality and a number of transport measures including the slip roads in which further detail of delivery is included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07).
Object to Development North West of Abingdon –	A number of objections were received to development at this site. Issues raised include: Sustainability The proposed strategic site between the Oxford Road and A420 fails to meet the	Points acknowledged. The Council are satisfied that the site proposed is a sustainable and appropriate location for development. The site has been robustly assessed through the site selection

Category	Summary	Council Response
Traffic, Infrastructure and Flooding	<p>sustainability test. The plan provides no additional local infrastructure, eg in regard to employment, transport or medical facilities. The proposed houses will be remote from village services and bus stops which can only be accessed by crossing the busy A415. The additional traffic on the A420 from this site and elsewhere along the Swindon-Oxford corridor will bring traffic on this trunk road to a halt with increasing frequency. The village lacks any medical facilities and the future of the Children's Centre is in doubt. Delivery• There is a lack of detail on requirements which could enable a developer to gain consent without delivering essential improvements. Traffic Congestion• With industry to the south of Abingdon and housing to the north, the development will cause further traffic chaos. • Traffic measures will need to be implemented on Dunmore Rd. Dunmore Rd & 12 Acre Drive already struggle with the volume of traffic which will increase. At peak times we find it hard getting off the Dunmore Estates. A new housing development the other side of Dunmore Road, will make the situation worse. • There are no plans to drastically improve access. •Junction improvements at Dunmore Road/Wootton Road are required to provide traffic signal control with safe, convenient crossing for pedestrians and cyclists. •Land is needed for the cycle track along Wootton Road north of the Copenhagen Drive junction to be widened as a prelude to implementing the Wootton to Abingdon cycle track. • There is a need to address the serious traffic congestion and associated problems, e.g. noise pollution, prior to development. Local Services • No additional infrastructure has been planned in regard to employment, health and transport. A contribution is required to enhance public transport to secure an hourly daytime service to Abingdon, Cumnor and Oxford. • There are insufficient facilities to attract new</p>	<p>assessment process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03). The selection of sites have been informed by the Local Green Belt Review (NAT02 and NAT03). Appendix A of the Plan includes a Site Development Template (pgs. 7-8) for this site setting out site specific development and infrastructure requirements to support development, this includes consideration of flooding and drainage, relevant services and a number of transport measures. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07) includes further detail on the delivery of strategic infrastructure.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>businesses. • There are no local shops along North Abingdon. Flooding • Reference should be added to ensure that development of the site does not increase the likelihood of flooding upstream or downstream of the current watercourses. Local Character and identity • These developments would change the identity of Abingdon from a market town to a large housing estate without adequate facilities. With further developments Abingdon could become a suburb of Oxford. At present these areas have a defined boundary. • The Green belt will be eroded and Abingdon's defined boundary will be lost. • Several listed buildings prevent any adequate development to improve retail in the town centre.</p>	
OCC - Highways - North-West of Abingdon-on-Thames	<p>North West of Abingdon on Thames (200 dwellings) • This site could be expected to generate 1200 vehicle trips per day, 120 trips in peak hours. • The development would be expected to contribute towards potential delivery of south facing slips on A34 at Lodge Hill. Any alleviation achieved by this scheme in the peak hour congestion problems along Dunmore Road and further to west, including A415 to Marcham interchange would be far outweighed by the impact of additional traffic from such a development. • Oxford Road and Wootton Road roundabouts would not cope with peak increases in traffic. Residential road junctions along Dunmore Road would not cope without improvements. Additional congestion along Dunmore Road would push traffic back towards the town, and negate its function as a peripheral road. • Abingdon town centre approaches (Oxford Road, Wootton Road, Bridge Street, and Ock Street) presently suffer considerable congestion. • Contributions should be secured towards future strategic infrastructure improvement for the relief of Abingdon. Public Transport contributions would be required. • Twelve Acre Drive</p>	<p>Appendix A of the Plan includes a Site Development Template (pgs. 7-8) for this site setting out in detail the site specific requirements for this allocation which does include the points raised by the County, as it is identified in the Template that contributions towards the delivery of south facing slips on A34 at Lodge Hill will be required, congestion will need to be investigated, contributions towards future strategic infrastructure improvements to Abingdon and any mitigation identified through the Transport Assessment will be required. The Council will continue to work with the County on these matters.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	and Dunmore Road form part of Abingdon relief road, subject to 40mph limit. This road already suffers substantial congestion during peak traffic periods.	
OCC - Public Transport - North- West of Abingdon-on-Thames	North West Abingdon There is currently no bus service on this section of Wootton Road. The developer for this site would contribute to the cost of an additional hourly bus service between Abingdon and Cumnor (extending to Oxford), which would be routed along the Wootton Road through the development site. A pair of high-quality bus stops, incorporating a pedestrian crossing (formal or informal), shelters and real time information displays will be required on the B4017 to the north of the Wildmoor Roundabout, along with connecting footpaths from the site.	Appendix A of the Plan includes a Site Development Template (pgs. 7-8) for this site setting out in detail the site specific requirements for this allocation which does include the points raised by the County, as it is identified in the Template contributions towards the cost of an hourly service between Abingdon and Cumnor routed along Wootton Road and either improvements or contributions to bus services/infrastructure. The Council will continue to work with the County on these matters.

South of East Hanney Site

Category	Summary	Council Response
Alternative Sites - East of East Hanney	A range of sites are proposed as alternatives to development. These include:- Land at East Hanney (safeguarded for a reservoir)- Land at Shrivenham (to replace proposals at Cumnor)- Dalton Barracks- Land at Appleton- Land at Wootton- Land South of Radley	The Council consider the site South of East Hanney to be a sustainable location for development which is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03).
Consultation with community	No consultation with residents of East Hanney on the change from previous allocation East of East Hanney to proposed allocation South of East Hanney	The Local Plan has been subject to statutory consultation including public consultation in November 2014. This was undertaken in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (OCD01). The Regulation 22 Statement (DLP09) details the consultation methods undertaken. This proposed strategic site is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03).
Consultation with community	No consultation with residents of East Hanney on the change from previous allocation East of East Hanney to proposed allocation South of East Hanney	The Local Plan has been subject to statutory consultation including public consultation in November 2014. This was undertaken in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (OCD01). The Regulation 22 Statement (DLP09) details the consultation methods undertaken. This proposed strategic site is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03).
East Hanney Parish Council- objection to allocation South of East Hanney	We believe that building 200 houses on Land South of East Hanney does NOT minimise pressure on the highway network. East Hanney has very few employment facilities and extremely limited shops. To reach any shopping facilities, secondary school, leisure centres, health care facilities or centres of employment the extremely busy A338 road must be used. We have detailed these aspects, and supported it with evidence, in the attached document 'East Hanney community response to consultation of Local Plan 2031 Part 1 Dated 15 December 2014.'	The location of growth at East Hanney is in accordance with the overarching sustainable spatial strategy embedded in the Plan and is in accordance with the hierarchy of settlements in accordance with the Town and Village Facilities Study Update (COM04). This proposed strategic site is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03).

Category	Summary	Council Response
Environment Agency- specific wording on Appendix A South East Hanney development template	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In accordance with the SFRA development should not commence in Flood Zones 3 or 2 	The Council will continue to work with the Agency on such matters including through Statement of Common Ground.
General comment from English Heritage	No objections from English Heritage to the site allocation and welcome some clear requirements on minimising any impacts on the conservation area and retention of the historic field pattern.	Support for certain principles welcomed
Natural England- Impact of allocation on existing character of settlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape Assessment of Eight Additional Contingency Sites, concluded the site was only suitable for a small scale development. 	Noted. The Local Plan site allocations are sites where landscape impacts are acceptable or can be made so with the mitigation identified in the Site Templates, based on landscape evidence (NAT04.1-04.12).
Objection to allocation/development South of East Hanney	<p>Objections to the allocation include the following reasons:</p> <p>Impact of the allocation on the Letcombe Brook, including its ecology and biodiversity Existing flooding issues will be exacerbated through further development Allocation will negatively impact on the existing character of the settlement Archaeological sensitivities relating to this site Development will negatively impact upon the local road network of the village and also that of the A338 Concerns with how the site will be accessed The existing school is at capacity with some having to commute elsewhere at present Local sewerage treatment works is at/over capacity at present Not enough local services and facilities to accommodate the growth Lack of sustainable transport routes such as cycle ways and pedestrian routes linking the site to the existing settlement and to employment locations, leading to a dependence on the private motor car No local employment capability in the village Many objections state that as a result, the strategic site would be contrary to the NPPF and also to local plan policies Will negatively impact on the medical facilities available in the area Development would result in the loss of high quality agricultural land Objections to the village's allocation as a Larger Village in the settlement</p>	<p>The Council consider the site South of East Hanney to be a sustainable location for development which is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which demonstrates biodiversity, archaeology and transport has been thoroughly considered within the process amongst other considerations. The Council are satisfied the Plan identifies the necessary development and infrastructure requirements to enable and support growth in particular through the Site Development Template, CP12 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07). The Council will also continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant parties to ensure the necessary infrastructure is provided as outlined in the Plan. In response to specific concerns, the Template sets out the need for the siting of development to take consideration of the Letcombe Brook, not impact on the Priority Habitat nearby, drainage strategy to be required, mitigation to minimise impacts on landscape setting, contributions and/or improvements to bus services, road junctions, ensures adequate access and contributions towards increasing capacity of primary school. East Hanney is</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>hierarchy Comments from Berks Bucks Oxon Wildlife trust and other consultees stating that the site is a Traditional Orchard priority habitat, and the last remaining such site in the settlement. Would lead to a significant increase in the total number of houses in the village Comments include a number of those made by East Hanney Parish Council The vast majority of suggested modifications to make the plan sound seek the removal of the strategic site allocation South of East Hanney</p>	<p>considered a Larger Village as demonstrated through the Town and Village Facilities Study Update (COM04).</p>
<p>Objection to allocation/development South of East Hanney</p>	<p>Objections to the allocation include the following reasons: Impact of the allocation on the Letcombe Brook, including its ecology and biodiversity Existing flooding issues will be exacerbated through further development Allocation will negatively impact on the existing character of the settlement Archaeological sensitivities relating to this site Development will negatively impact upon the local road network of the village and also that of the A338 Concerns with how the site will be accessed The existing school is at capacity with some having to commute elsewhere at present Local sewerage treatment works is at/over capacity at present Not enough local services and facilities to accommodate the growth Lack of sustainable transport routes such as cycle ways and pedestrian routes linking the site to the existing settlement and to employment locations, leading to a dependence on the private motor car No local employment capability in the village Many objections state that as a result, the strategic site would be contrary to the NPPF and also to local plan policies Will negatively impact on the medical facilities available in the area Development would result in the loss of high quality agricultural land Objections to the village's allocation as a Larger Village in the settlement hierarchy Comments from Berks Bucks Oxon Wildlife trust and other consultees stating that the site is a Traditional Orchard priority habitat, and the last remaining such site in the settlement. Would lead to a significant increase in the total</p>	<p>The Council consider the site South of East Hanney to be a sustainable location for development which is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03) which demonstrates biodiversity, archaeology and transport has been thoroughly considered within the process amongst other considerations. The Council are satisfied the Plan identifies the necessary development and infrastructure requirements to enable and support growth in particular through the Site Development Template, CP12 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07). The Council will also continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant parties to ensure the necessary infrastructure is provided as outlined in the Plan. In response to specific concerns, the Template sets out the need for the siting of development to take consideration of the Letcombe Brook, not impact on the Priority Habitat nearby, drainage strategy to be required, mitigation to minimise impacts on landscape setting, contributions and/or improvements to bus services, road junctions, ensures adequate access and contributions towards increasing capacity of primary school. East Hanney is considered a Larger Village as demonstrated through the Town and Village Facilities Study Update (COM04).</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	number of houses in the village Comments include a number of those made by East Hanney Parish Council The vast majority of suggested modifications to make the plan sound seek the removal of the strategic site allocation South of East Hanney	
Objection to allocation/development South of East Hanney (1)	There are no modifications for this development that would justify this proceeding only to relocate to a brown field site elsewhere.	The location of growth at East Hanney is in accordance with the overarching sustainable spatial strategy embedded in the Plan and is in accordance with the hierarchy of settlements in accordance with the Town and Village Facilities Study Update (COM04). This proposed strategic site is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03).
Objection to allocation/development South of East Hanney from Environment Agency	Site Allocation Land South of East Hanney, Appendix A, Page 18/19 We note the inclusion of the above site allocation on land to the south of East Hanney to deliver around 200 dwellings. During previous consultations to the Plan a site to the east of East Hanney and south of Steventon Road was proposed. We have not previously commented upon this site allocation, if so we would have raised the following concerns The site is located adjacent to the Letcombe Brook, a natural chalk stream which has records of water voles, otter and native white-clawed crayfish, all of which are Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and Legally Protected Species. This reach of the Letcombe Brook is relatively undisturbed and the proposed allocation Land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for providing natural networks of linked habitat corridors to allow the movement of species between suitable habitats. We have concerns regarding whether this site is effective and therefore deliverable when taking into account the ecological constraints of the site. Unrestricted development within this allocation is likely to have a net loss in habitat corridor, and may lead to a detrimental impact on BAP and Legally Protected Species mentioned above. The Sustainability Assessment (SA) for the Local Plan indicates that the site will have a major negative	The Council acknowledges the Environment Agency comments regarding ecology in this area in particular the Letcombe Brook corridor and will continue to work with the Environment Agency, site promoters and other relevant parties to ensure there is no detrimental impact on ecology. The Council consider the provisions within the Site Development Template for South of East Hanney including specific requirements to address ecology, the Letcombe Brook and the Cowslip Meadows Local Wildlife Site which contains a UK Priority Habitat and CP46 ensure development will conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity and not deteriorate biodiversity at this site.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	effect in terms of the natural environment, due to its close proximity to an important wildlife corridor. We would therefore have concerns that the land south of East Hanney site allocation is not consistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The proposed development will result in a detrimental impact of an important wildlife corridor. This is contrary to Paragraph 109 and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which aims to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimizing impacts on biodiversity, and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. Article 10 of the Habitats Directive also stresses the importance of natural networks of linked habitat corridors to allow the movement of species between suitable habitats, and promote the expansion of biodiversity. River corridors are particularly effective in this way.	
Objection to proposed growth within Ab/ OX Sub-Area	It is suggested that build rates will need to be much faster than comparable development elsewhere in order to meet the councils targets and that the forecasts for economic growth are widely optimistic.	The evidence base for the plan includes a housing trajectory that has been informed, in part, by independent and professional advice around housing delivery and build rates. The plan, as proposed, ensures that a Five Year Housing Land Supply is achieved and maintained. Indeed, additional strategic allocations have been included in the plan to ensure the Objectively Assessed Need can be delivered in full and based on a realistic housing trajectory.
Oxfordshire County Council- Impact of allocation on ecology and biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South of East Hanney: The county has serious concerns about the potential allocation of this site and its impact on ecology. The Letcombe Brook, which is an important habitat corridor for species such as Water Vole and Otter, is shown as adjoining and partly within the site. The Cowslip Meadows Local Wildlife Site is adjacent to the proposed site and contains UK Priority Habitat. The proposed site itself may also contain UK Priority Habitat and assessment should be carried out to determine the quality of habitats. 	Point noted. The Council recognises the ecology in this area. The Site Development Template for South of East Hanney includes a requirement that development must not impact on the Cowslip Meadows Local Wildlife Site which contains a UK Priority Habitat which will need to show through an appropriate assessment.

Category	Summary	Council Response
Oxfordshire County Council- impact of allocation on Letcombe Brook	32. South of East Haney – The Letcombe Brook is shown as adjoining and partly within the site. Assessment should be carried out to determine the quality of the habitats ahead of any development.	Point noted. The Council recognises the Letcombe Brook is a positive asset that is adjoining and partly within the proposed site. The Site Development Template for South of East Hanney includes a requirement that development takes specific care which need to be shown through an appropriate assessment.
Oxfordshire County Council- Infrastructure provision in East Hanney (1)	East Hanney: 200 homes St James Primary School is currently 0.5 form entry, with an annual intake of 15. To meet the needs of this, and other, proposed developments, expansion to 1 form entry would be required. Initial school site expansion analysis indicates that the current school site area is below the minimum size recommended by the government for a 1 form entry school. Acquisition of additional site area for the school is expected to be required to enable its expansion. Initial estimates of the cost of expanding the school to 1 form entry exceed the scale of developer contributions to be expected from the proposed Local Plan scale of housing, and would need to be supplemented by contributions from other developments in the area. Expansion of secondary school and SEN school capacity serving the area will also be required. For secondary education the area is currently served by King Alfred's Academy, but is closer to the planned new secondary school at Grove Airfield. Page 18 of the Local Plan Appendix A and pages 37-38 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan support this requirement for educational provision.	The Council acknowledges Oxfordshire County Council's points specifically on education provision including recognition that the Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DLP07) support this provision.
Oxfordshire County Council- Infrastructure provision in East Hanney (2)	South of East Hanney (200 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 1200 veh trips per day, 120 trips in peak hour. • Site has highway frontage to Mill Orchard, Summertown and A338. Orchard Mill is narrow with minimal footway provision and would not be suitable to support a significant amount of development. Summertown could be suitable to sustain only a proportion of development. • Local mitigation including footway provision and culverting of highway ditch would be	Appendix A of the Plan includes a Site Development Template (pgs. 7-8) for this site setting out in detail the site specific requirements for this allocation which does include the points raised by the County, as it is identified in the Template that improvements to A338 junctions, and location mitigation (footpath and cycle provision) will be required. The Council will continue to work with the County on these matters.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	necessary. • Improvements to its junction with the A338 would probably be required. Satisfactory access could be taken from A338 with an extension southwards of the 30 mph limit. • Pedestrian/cyclist links to PROWs would be required. PT contributions would be required. SVUK contributions would be required.	
Oxfordshire County Council- Infrastructure provision in East Hanney (3)	South of East Hanney This site is very well located, adjacent to the x30 bus route from Wantage to Oxford via Botley, although new bus stops and associated infrastructure would be required on the A338 to the west of this proposal. Bus stops for the 31 bus route from Wantage to Oxford via Abingdon are not far away at St James View. A new footpath would be required on the eastern side of the A338 and some form of pedestrian crossing would also be needed. The developer would contribute to enhancement of the x30 and 31 routes from Wantage to Oxford, and also to the cost of reinstating the 36 route from Wantage to Didcot via Milton Park.	Appendix A of the Plan includes a Site Development Template (pgs. 7-8) for this site setting out in detail the site specific requirements for this allocation which does include the points raised by the County, as it is identified in the Template that provision of bus stops and infrastructure will be required and contribution towards enhancement of x30 and 31 bus routes. The Council will continue to work with the County on these matters.
Revert to previous East of East Hanney allocation	A number of comments wish for the previously proposed site East of East Hanney to be reinstated in place of the currently proposed site South of East Hanney	The Council consider the site South of East Hanney to be a sustainable location for development which is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03).
Revert to previous East of East Hanney allocation	A number of comments wish for the previously proposed site East of East Hanney to be reinstated in place of the currently proposed site South of East Hanney	The Council consider the site South of East Hanney to be a sustainable location for development which is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03).
Spatial strategy for South of East Hanney allocation is not legally compliant	We believe that the Spatial Strategy for Land South of East Hanney is not legally compliant, it has failed to comply with the duty to cooperate and is unsound. Our arguments are fully explained, with supporting evidence in the attached document 'East Hanney community response to consultation of Local Plan 2031 Part 1 Dated 15 December 2014.'	The Council acknowledges the Parish Council's comments within the community response document. However the Council consider the site South of East Hanney to be a sustainable location for development which is supported by a robust site selection process as demonstrated within the Strategic Sites Selection Topic Paper (TOP03). It is also in accordance with the overarching sustainable spatial strategy embedded in the Plan and is in accordance with the hierarchy

Category	Summary	Council Response
		of settlements in accordance with the Town and Village Facilities Study Update (COM04). The Local Plan has been subject to statutory consultation including public consultation in November to December in which included this site. This was undertaken in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (OCD01). The Regulation 22 Statement (DLP09) details the consultation methods undertaken.
Support - Expansion of site South of East Hanney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development can be brought forward early in the plan stage, providing towards the Vales housing requirements. • The site has good access links to nearby employment and services, with long term sustainability by its close proximity to Grove Railway Station (CP19). Extra pedestrian and cycle networks will be introduced. • Flood risk and highways are all capable of resolution through design methods and SUDS. • The site can be developed while safeguarding the landscape, wildlife and environment. • The site is NOT within the greenbelt or AONB, with no impact on the conservation area. • The number of dwellings is wholly Justified by the demonstrable need • will be brought forward as soon as practicably possible • Sustainability emphasised by its close proximity Grove Railway Station • with good links to nearby employment and facilities in a large village 	Support and points acknowledged.
Support for South East Hanney allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development can be brought forward early in the plan stage, providing towards the Vales housing requirements. • The site has good access links to nearby employment and services, with long term sustainability by its close proximity to Grove Railway Station (CP19). Extra pedestrian and cycle networks will be introduced. • Flood risk and highways are all capable of resolution through design methods and SUDS. • The site can be developed while safeguarding the landscape, wildlife and environment. • The site is NOT within the greenbelt or AONB, with no impact on the conservation area. • The number of dwellings is wholly Justified by the demonstrable need • will be 	Support and points acknowledged.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	brought forward as soon as practicably possible • Sustainability emphasised by its close proximity Grove Railway Station • with good links to nearby employment and facilities in a large village	
Thames Water comments - Sewage treatment at capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewerage capacity is unlikely to serve the extra demand. • 3 years lead time for an upgrade • Drainage strategy will be required by the developer before development can commence. • A Grampian planning condition will be requested to ensure infrastructure is in place before development commences. 	The Council acknowledges Thames Water's points on waste water and sewage treatment capacity and will continue to work with Thames Water on these matters. The paragraph requested is included at the beginning of Appendix A which sets out the general requirements for all sites (pg. 3).

East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Site

Category	Summary	Council Response
Alternative Site (Kingston Bagpuize)	It is stated that a strategic allocation on land east of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor could accommodate circa 500 dwellings and could be delivered in conjunction with an eastern bypass for the village, linking the A420 and the A415. This allocation could help reduce allocations in the AONB for which the plan currently proposes two allocations in the AONB which is contrary to national policy.	The Council has sought to identify a sustainable package of development across the Vale as informed by detailed assessment of all development site opportunities. Refer to Site Assessment Topic Paper.
Development at Kingston Bagpuize (Support)	Support is outlined for the allocation of land to the east of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor at Core Policy 4 and 8 of the Local Plan. Comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is clear that smaller sites will be key in achieving the housing requirement. • This site is ready for immediate development. • It will reduce the housing pressure on Oxford City • It will reduce pressure to find alternative sites within the Oxford Green Belt. • Early development of the site will help the council achieve its housing targets. • The site can be developed within 5 years of receipt from outline planning permission. • A number of assessments have been carried out by the client and council which show the suitability and sustainability for delivery on the site. Further support is received from local business who state that: 'The Council have undertaken a robust and thorough exercise in determining the future housing needs of the Vale, which are substantial, not least due to the strong local business environment which will be put at risk if the Vale does not meet its housing needs'. Newton Europe Limited which is a thriving operational consultancy business based in Kingston Bagpuize supports the site to the East of Kingston Bagpuize, which will work well with the village's existing layout, will have almost no environmental impact due to the non-descript land on which it will be sited, will help sustain employment and facilities in the village (as outlined above specifically with my business) and, as I understand it, can be rapidly moved forward for development due to its highly deliverable position. 	Support is welcomed and is noted.
Development at Kingston Bagpuize (Support)	Support is outlined for the allocation of land to the east of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor at Core Policy 4 and 8 of the Local Plan. Comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is clear that smaller sites will be key in achieving the housing requirement. 	Support is welcomed and is noted.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is ready for immediate development. • It will reduce the housing pressure on Oxford City • It will reduce pressure to find alternative sites within the Oxford Green Belt. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early development of the site will help the council achieve its housing targets. • The site can be developed within 5 years of receipt from outline planning permission. • A number of assessments have been carried out by the client and council which show the suitability and sustainability for delivery on the site. <p>Further support is received from local business who state that: 'The Council have undertaken a robust and thorough exercise in determining the future housing needs of the Vale, which are substantial, not least due to the strong local business environment which will be put at risk if the Vale does not meet its housing needs'.</p> <p>Newton Europe Limited which is a thriving operational consultancy business based in Kingston Bagpuize supports the site to the East of Kingston Bagpuize, which will work well with the village's existing layout, will have almost no environmental impact due to the non-descript land on which it will be sited, will help sustain employment and facilities in the village (as outlined above specifically with my business) and, as I understand it, can be rapidly moved forward for development due to its highly deliverable position.</p>	
English Heritage - Development Template (East Kingston Bagpuize)	English Heritage welcomes the design principle to minimise any impact in regard to the conservation area and in respect of Apple Cottage. However, Aelfrith Ditch may still be of national significance. English Heritage would welcome an additional principle in the development template: "Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage" requiring development to retain and respect the line of this earthwork.	The Council agrees this addition would provide useful clarification for the importance of protecting this historic feature. This forms part of the site template for the allocation east of Kingston Bagpuize (see Appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1)

Category	Summary	Council Response
Natural England - Landscape Assessment	Natural England question if a more detailed landscape study has been undertaken. As such, it is unclear how much development can be provided for on the site and thus the allocation is unjustified.	The Landscape Study for this site wasn't finalised at the time of Submission, but has since been progressed.
OCC - Education Requirements - Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	Kingston Bagpuize East: 280 homes John Blandy Primary School, which serves Kingston Bagpuize and Southmoor, is expected to be full at its current size of 1 form entry as a consequence of existing population growth, including previously permitted housing, and would need to expand to 1.5 form entry to meet the needs of further housing development. Initial school site expansion analysis indicates that the current school site area is below that recommended for a 1.5 form entry or larger school, which compromises the ability of the school to expand. Initial estimates of the cost of expanding the school to 1.5 form entry exceed the scale of developer contributions to be expected from the proposed Local Plan scale of housing, and would need to be supplemented by contributions from other developments in the area. Acquisition of additional site area for the school would facilitate its expansion. Expansion of secondary school and SEN school capacity serving the area will also be required. For secondary education the area is served by Faringdon Community College, which is already planning towards expansion to 240 places per year - approximately 1400 places in total – to meet the needs of population growth in this area. The additional Local Plan proposed allocations would require further extension to 270 places per year; the feasibility of this is being assessed. The county council is working with the Faringdon Academy of Schools to develop options for meeting the needs of housing development in this area. Page 17 of the Local Plan Appendix A and pages 36-37 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan support this requirement for educational provision. However, page 37 of the IDP states that contributions will be required towards secondary school places in Abingdon; this area is actually part of the Faringdon designated area.	Contributions towards increasing capacity at John Blandy Primary School and secondary school capacity is set out in the East of Kingston Bagpuize site template (see Appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1)
OCC - Highway Infrastructure - Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	East of Kingston Bagpuize (280 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 1600 veh trips per day, 160 trips in peak hour. • Strategic access to A420 is available via A415 Witney Road. Full direct site access onto A420 would not be acceptable, although a scheme to permit egress from the site could be possible. Development access to land to the west of A415 Witney Road may	Highway infrastructure comments are noted.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	cause satisfactory access to this site to be difficult to achieve without substantial highway works being carried out • The site would add to the already growing concern regarding the capacity and performance of the A420 route corridor. • Contributions should be secured towards future strategic infrastructure improvement on this route and towards improvements on A415. PT and travel planning contributions would be required.	
Public Transport and Support for Development	Stagecoach supports the approach taken to allocations within this area. Stagecoach see an opportunity to enhance service 66 with the additional housing and rising population which would mitigate travel demands on the A420.	Comment is noted and is welcomed.
Thames Water - Water Supply	Thames Water have concerns regarding Water Supply Capability in relation to this site. Specifically, the water supply network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Specific comments include: • The water supply is unlikely to be able to support the extra demand from the additional housing requirement. • 3 years lead time for an upgrade • The following needs to be included in the Development Plan: Developers will be required to demonstrate there is adequate water capacity, with possible studies and assessments that need funding to prove and identify possible water capacities. • Sewerage capacity is unlikely to serve the extra demand. • Drainage strategy will be required by the developer before development can commence. • A Grampian planning condition will be requested to ensure infrastructure is in place before development commences.	Noted. A Water Cycle Study has been prepared in partnership with Thames Water which addresses this matter. This wording is included in the Site Templates Appendix A

North West of Radley Site

Category	Summary	Council Response
Alternative Site	In addition to supporting the proposed allocations, there are also alternatives put forward for the scale and areas of growth by the landowner. Specific comments include: • The freeholder supports development of North West Radley • The freeholder wishes to express the desires for Option B, an allocation of the wider site on Gooseacre, represents the best option for Radley Village. • The freeholder has issued a LVA in response to Phase 2 of the Greenbelt Review. • The freeholder fully supports the approach by the council in respect of Area 17. • In respect to area 16 the freeholder does not support the retention of playing fields, and believes they should be removed to Gooseacre, to enable a community hub and part of the masterplanning process. • A small part of land in North Radley on Kennington Rd, could be released without causing adverse effects green belt and encroachment to Kennington and within a sustainable location. • The freeholder is disappointed in the omission of the North Radley site. Two other respondents favoured the option for Radley North-West put forward by Radley College (Option C), which reduces density, produces a recreational resource for the village, provides a safer road system and provides a new school.	The Council have completed a Green Belt Review in accordance with the tests set out in the NPPF that has identified a number of sites as suitable for release from the Green Belt. These include the site proposed for allocation in the Local Plan at North West Radley for which the Council supports. The Council is aware of proposals from a consortium of land owners including Radley College to also develop the alternative North Radley site and recognise that there may be opportunities presented by this approach (such as facilitating delivery of new community facilities). The site at North Radley is not identified for Green Belt release. It is therefore for the site promoter to demonstrate how their site could come forward without compromising the purposes of the Green Belt.
CP 8 - Objection to Development - Radley	A number of comments object to development at Radley. Specific comments include: • The proposed development will form part of Abingdon, in itself a market town. But the development will be on green belt land, which is unacceptable and is in area that is already heavily congested, bounded by the A34 and Dunmore Road. • Residents of this new estate will be forced to drive to their place of employment, further adding to the congestion. • There is inadequate infrastructure to support development • Development would be detrimental to the local protected wildlife • There would be a loss of quality agricultural land. It is also stated that about 500 Radley residents responded to the earlier consultation April using a standard letter. It is suggested that these were all considered by the council as	The Council consider that Radley represents a highly sustainable location for development with excellent access to services and facilities and with good public transport connections to both Abingdon and Oxford by both rail and bus. The plan makes appropriate provision for infrastructure alongside housing development. The site identified for allocation is proposed for removal from the Green Belt.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	one objection, despite assurances from Council Leader Matthew Barber on 4th April that they would be considered individually. How can this possibly be right that at a stroke the views of 500 people are disregard?	
CP8 – Support for Development - Radley	The Freeholder supports the overall strategic approach that the Council have taken and consider the Plan to be consistent with the requirements of national planning policy in terms of seeking to meet objectively assessed housing targets and taking the opportunity to undertake a review of its Green Belt boundaries in order to help meet this need on otherwise sustainable sites in the short term. The Freeholder submits that there is scope to amend the policy to include an extended allocation comprising an amalgamation of both the North and North West Radley sites. Another comment stated that the council's current approach is sound, specifically the draft allocation at North West Radley.	Noted.
Development of Green Belt - Radley	Reference is made to a previous public inquiry concerning the release of the Whites Land from the Green Belt: “the gap is already fairly narrow and largely open so that the loss of this site to built development might well contribute to an increased perception of coalescence from some viewpoints, due to the intervisibility between settlement edges.” Planning Inspector 2005	The Council have completed a Green Belt Review in accordance with the tests set out in the NPPF that has identified a number of sites as suitable for release from the Green Belt. The previous inquiry referred to was not informed by the current housing need identified in the up-to-date Oxford SHMA.
English Heritage - Historic Environment - North-West of Radley	English Heritage welcomes the principles to “preserve the setting of Radley College, including views to and from the College as well as the parkland setting of the College” and “Conserve and enhance the semi-rural setting of the historic core of Radley”.	Noted
OCC - Education Provision - North-West of Radley	NW Radley: 240 homes Radley Primary School is currently a 0.5 form entry school. The next scale of school supportive of effective and efficient delivery of education is 1 form entry. Initial school site expansion analysis indicates that the current school site area is below the minimum size recommended by the government for a 1 form entry school. Acquisition of additional site area for the school is expected to be required to enable its expansion. The level of developer contributions expected from 240 homes is shown in the IDP	Noted

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>(page 34) as £778,320. The initial school site expansion analysis estimates that £0.7-£0.9m would be required to meet minimum standards for a 1 form entry primary school, and that further investment would be required to bring the school up to preferred standards. There could, therefore, be viability concerns about expanding the village school on this scale of housing. Expansion of secondary school and SEN school capacity serving Abingdon will also be required. Page 15 of the Local Plan Appendix A and pages 34-35 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan support this requirement for educational provision.</p>	
OCC - Highways - North-West of Radley	<p>North West Radley (240 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 1400 veh trips per day, 140 trips in peak hour. • Expected to contribute towards potential delivery of south facing slips on A34 at Lodge Hill. • Might also be expected, therefore, to have a significant impact on Sugworth Lane. Principle access to site would be from White's Lane which has poor alignment. Highway improvement scheme would be required to remove sub-standard bends. • Strategic access to A34/A423 north would be through Kennington. Local mitigation (e.g. footways, crossing points, traffic management, etc.) may be required. • Strategic access to A34 south would be via Lodge Hill south bound slip (if built) or via Abingdon peripheral road to Marcham Interchange. This route is already heavily congested during peak times. Contributions (if not for slip roads) should be secured towards future strategic infrastructure improvement for Abingdon. PT contributions would be required. • Further local mitigation (e.g. footways, crossing points, traffic management, etc.) may be required.</p>	Noted.
OCC - Public Transport - North-West of Radley	<p>North West Radley This site is located within walking distance of bus stops at Gooseacre and at Radley Church, although footway links to these stops would require significant improvement, including widening. Significant improvements are also required at these bus stops, including the provision of new shelters. The walking route to the rail station also requires significant improvements, such as widening the footway along Church Road. A contribution would be</p>	Noted.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	required to the cost of enhancing the Abingdon-Kennington-Oxford bus route, with particular emphasis on the reliability and frequency of the peak hour service. The cost of this enhancement would be shared with another developments in Kennington.	
Radley - Highways and Access	It is stated that remodelling the junction on A34 at Lodge hill will lead to increased traffic through Radley and so some account of this must be taken. A relief road of some type should be incorporated in the plan, otherwise the quality of life of residents will be affected by noise and fumes, and, moreover, there will be increased danger from the greater number of cars passing through. The existing roads are just not sufficient to sustain extra traffic.	The plan has been informed by detailed transport evidence and close working with the Highways Authority. The upgrading of the junction at Lodge Hill will help to alleviate traffic issues in Abingdon town centre. Radley is already well connected by public transport and represents a sustainable location for development.
Radley - School Provision	The Governors of Radley Primary School are aware that the Vale of the White Horse is developing the Local Plan for 2031. We wish to be active stakeholders in this process so that we can best fulfil the future needs of the children attending our school. • If there were to be an expansion to the school, we would favour an expansion to 1 FE (Form Entry, i.e. 30 children per year) and not to a larger school. • The Governing Body is in favour of the proposed site for a new primary school. • Facilities, services and infrastructure would have to be addressed.	Noted and comments welcome. The Council is committed to working with the Education Authority (OCC) and local stakeholders to ensure infrastructure is planned for appropriately.
Radley -Green Belt	It is stated that the Curtis Industrial Site should not be included as an employment site, as it may be returned to the green belt.	Noted. (Not directly related to the LP proposals)
Scale of Development	A number of comments raise concern over the scale of development at Radley. These include: • The housing allocation has increased from 700 to over a 1000 units. • Although the original North Radley Site has no proposed development it is still planned to be removed from the green belt. • Despite assurances, the original 500 objection to the first draft have been counted as one. • No extension was offered for public response unlike Radley College. • Detrimental noise and street lighting pollution. • Site contains an abundance of habitats and species. • Was an EIA conducted? • Not enough services and infrastructure for the planned development. • Full capacity at the primary school. •	The Council consider that Radley represents a highly sustainable location for development with excellent access to services and facilities and with good public transport connections to both Abingdon and Oxford by both rail and bus. The plan makes appropriate provision for infrastructure alongside housing development. The proposal is for 240 dwellings at Radley village. Other development is planned at Kennington, albeit located within Radley parish. The development proposed at Kennington does not adjoin or form any part of the village of Radley.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	Insufficient parking facilities • Will affect the character of Radley College Mansion.	
Thames Water - Water Supply - North West Radley	Thames Water do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site. However, Thames Water do have concerns regarding Waste Water Services. In particular: • Sewerage capacity is unlikely to serve the extra demand. • Drainage strategy will be required by the developer before development can commence. • The following needs to be included in the Development Plan; Developers will be required to demonstrate there is adequate water capacity, with possible studies and assessments that need funding to prove and identify possible water capacities. • A Grampian planning condition will be requested to ensure infrastructure is in place before development commences.	The plan has been informed by a Water Cycle Study, which has been prepared in collaboration with Thames Water and the Environment Agency. The wording requested is already included within the Development Site Templates Appendix A.

South of Kennington Site

Category	Summary	Council Response
CP2 - Brownfield sites	VoWH have attempted at cooperation but have been challenged as to ensure brownfield sites are fully utilised.	There are limited Brownfield sites within the district suitable for strategic development. Some Brownfield Sites, for example, are located in unsustainable rural locations and not suitable for development. The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 does utilise the significant brownfield site at Didcot A Power Station for a mix of uses and are working closely with the site promoters to seek to maximise the use of this site.
Objection to Development - Kennington	A number of comments object to development at Kennington. Specific comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan presumes the infrastructure is adequate to meet the needs of the present population, this is untrue and there are failings for policing, health and most importantly transportation. • There is little evidence of a joined up holistic approach from the all the required agencies and services, with little or no guarantee that the necessary changes will be in place and ready in due time. • This is use of Green Belt land and does not justify development on such a site • Loss of rural views from Wytham Woods (University Bye-Law). • Impossible growth to the south and west of the village • The housing allocation is too high. • Local services cannot cope. 	<p>The Council understand the importance of planning for appropriate infrastructure delivery and has worked closely with a range of stakeholders and prepared a comprehensive Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Development Site Templates set out the policy requirements for each strategic site and so complement the IDP by clearly setting out the infrastructure requirements for each site.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the NPPF. The site in question has been identified as no longer meeting the purposes of the Green Belt and as such is proposed for release from the Green Belt. If the Planning Inspector agrees with this finding, then the site should not be considered as green belt.</p>
OCC - Education - Kennington	South Kennington – 270 homes St Swithun's School in Kennington is in the process of expanding from 1.5 form entry to 2 form entry. The Local Plan proposal would be able to benefit from this additional capacity, and would be expected to contribute towards the capital cost. As the school solution is already underway, early delivery of this housing could be supported. This village feeds to Matthew Arnold Primary School, which is full, and regularly over-subscribed. It will need to expand to meet the demand from additional local population, and a feasibility study is being started into how it can grow from its current 6 form entry to 7 form entry or 8 form entry, depending on the scale of local population growth. Expansion of SEN capacity serving	Noted

Category	Summary	Council Response
	the area would also be required. Page 13 of the Local Plan Appendix A and page 33 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan support this requirement for educational provision.	
OCC - Highways - Kennington	South Kennington (270 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 1400 veh trips per day, 140 trips in peak hour. • Expected to contribute towards potential delivery of south facing slips on A34 at Lodge Hill. Could also be expected, therefore, to have a significant impact on Sugworth Lane. Principle access to site should be obtained from Kennington Road via suitable junction. Access from Sandford Lane not likely to be acceptable. • Strategic access to A34/A423 north would be through village. Local mitigation (e.g. footways, crossing points, traffic management, etc.) may be required within village and beyond. • Strategic access to A34 south would be via Sugworth Lane and Lodge Hill (if slip roads built) or via Radley and Abingdon peripheral road to Marcham Interchange. This route is already heavily congested during peak times. • Contributions should be secured towards future strategic infrastructure improvement for Abingdon. PT contributions would be required.	Noted
OCC - Public Transport - Kennington	South Kennington This site is located adjacent to the Pebble Hill Premium Route bus stops. New footpaths are required from the site to connect directly with these bus stops as there is no footpath along Kennington Road. A contribution would be required to the cost of enhancing the Abingdon-Kennington-Oxford bus route, with particular emphasis on the reliability and frequency of the peak hour service. The cost of this enhancement would be shared with another other developments in Radley. North West	Noted
South Kennington - General Comment	CP8• Detrimental effect on the common Toad from the increased housing.	The Council have considered the impact of biodiversity on the proposed strategic allocations in the Local Plan. Regarding the proposed strategic allocation South of Kennington, Appendix A: Site Development Templates required the development to contribute towards the management of the adjacent Local Wildlife Site at Bagley Wood.

Category	Summary	Council Response
		The Council have consulted with the statutory bodies such as English Heritage and Natural England who raise no significant issues with the proposed allocation South of Kennington in regards to biodiversity.
Support for Development - Kennington	Support is given for the proposed development. Specific comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in a highly sustainable location in regard to facilities, transport and its proximity to Oxford. • The South Kennington allocation is highly deliverable, in a sustainable location and is not reliant on the delivery of new infrastructure. • We agree with the comment at paragraph 5.4 of the Local Plan: "is a highly sustainable location for development particularly due to its proximity to the City of Oxford." • The sub-area has strong functional links with Oxford and constitutes a substantial employment area in its own right. • The development will be supported by a Masterplanning process involving the community, local planning authority and stakeholders. • site allocation will help deliver the A34 junction upgrade via appropriate developer contribution. • 140 Units would be delivered in the forthcoming five year period. • Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which outlines that housing delivery will be frontloaded to the beginning of the plan period in order to meet previous shortfall in a shorter time period. • Its suggest that the last part of the first paragraph of CP 8 be re phrased to read 'to minimise pressure on the highway network whilst maintaining the strategic purposes of the Oxford Green Belt'. This would help ensure the release of sites from the Green Belt. Redrow Homes would note that its anticipated trajectory is not the same as the HOUSING DELIVERY TRAJECTORY at Appendix 3 of Topic Paper 4. Accordingly, Redrow considers that the publication version should be modified to incorporate a more positive delivery trajectory for the south of Kennington location identified at Core Policy 8.	Support welcomed.
Thames Water - Water Services - Kennington	Thames Water do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site. Thames Water do however have concerns regarding Waste Water Services in relation to	Noted

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>this site. Specifically, the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Other comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewerage capacity is unlikely to serve the extra demand. • There is a 3 year lead in time for an upgrade • A drainage strategy will be required by the developer before development can commence. • A Grampian planning condition will be requested to ensure infrastructure is in place before development commences. 	

Core Policy 9: Harcourt Hill Campus

Category	Summary	Council Response
CP9 - Objection	Three comments of a total of eight received objected in part to Core Policy 9 (Harcourt Hill Campus) and it's supporting text. • A request from the residents association seeking to explicitly include reference of the need for a Transport Assessment as part of the masterplanning process in the core policy• A request to make reference to the important sports facilities which are more widely used by the residents of North Hinksey and beyond. • A wider objection from Oxford Brookes University stating that the core policy in its current format is not as positively written as previous draft iterations. The policy contradicts Core Policy 13 (Oxford Green Belt) and thus makes it unsound. That the policy is excessively restrictive which is contrary to the NPPF. A separate representation from the University seeks to remove the green belt designation from the built up area of the campus.	Need for Transport Assessment - This is sufficiently accommodated in paragraph 5.21 and additional detail provided in Core Policy 9 (iii) Recognition of the campus' sports facilities is set out in paragraph 5.18. The Council consider that the policy is wholly compliant with the NPPF and is not excessively restrictive. There are a number of issues/constraints that need to be overcome for the site to be unlocked and these are clearly set out in the policy as currently worded.
CP9 - Other	5.21 Core Policy 9 supports the redevelopment of the Harcourt Hill Campus. a). The Parish Council would not wish the footprint of any new development to extend beyond the existing footprint and an innovative transport system will reduce the volume of traffic on the limited local road system. Before any development plans are approved a substantial and integrated transport solution should be put forward. Page 55 Core Policy 9 - Harcourt Hill Campus - The photograph shown is out of date and needs updating.	Comment is noted. The council considers that these matters are already sufficiently accommodated within the wording of Core Policy 9 and supporting text. We will seek to update the photograph in due course.
English Heritage CP9 - Support	English Heritage welcomes key site issue iv regarding the long distance views of the site from (to?) Oxford, although the view is of spires, towers and domes.	Support is welcomed and is noted.
OCC - CP9 - Support	Oxford Brookes, Harcourt Hill campus: the County Council should support additional student accommodation at Harcourt Hill campus – provision of additional student accommodation here would help free up dwellings in the City to help meet Oxford's housing needs and reduce the scale of unmet need to be accommodated elsewhere.	Support is welcomed and is noted.
Oxford City Council - CP9 - Other	Core Policy CP9 (Harcourt Hill) – The City Council has an interest in how this site develops due to its relationship with Oxford Brookes' sites in Oxford. I would	Comment is noted.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	request opportunity for the City Council to participate in the examination hearing that considers this site.	

Core Policy 10: Abbey Shopping Centre and the Charter, Abingdon-on-Thames

Category	Summary	Council Response
CP10	Two general comments were received: - A comment of support from Mays Properties (Fairacres Retail Park) but requests that the plan identifies additional and/or potential sites in Abingdon-on-Thames to accommodate the remaining retail need over the plan period.- A general comment seeking to ensure that the redevelopment of this site will be mixed use and include leisure and community facilities alongside retail.	Comment is noted. Appropriate land uses for the site are set out in the adopted SPD. Further work to identify smaller sites for future retail development in Abingdon-on-Thames can form part of Local Plan 2031 Part 2.
English Heritage - Policy Wording	English Heritage would welcome a requirement in Core Policy 10 for proposals for development within the Abbey Shopping Centre and the Charter Area to conserve and enhance the historic town centre, although we recognise that this is considered in the Supplementary Planning Document.	Comment is noted. No change is considered necessary as it is adequately addressed in the adopted SPD.
Land Uses	Redevelopment needs to include mixed retail and leisure facilities.	Comment is noted. Appropriate land uses for the site are set out in the adopted SPD.
OCC - Policy Wording	Core policy 10 -The Charter: the point in para 5.26 that there should be optimal use of land for retail without compromising the provision of key community facilities should be included in the policy to protect Oxfordshire County Council's property interest in the library.	The council considers that its inclusion in the supporting text is sufficient. Land uses and urban design principles are set out in the adopted SPD and include key community facilities.
Policy Wording	6.2 Core Policy 10, Abbey Shopping centre and the Charter: on page 57 this currently reads "which supports the redevelopment of this area to enhance the retail offer within the town." This would more appropriately read "which supports the redevelopment of this area to enhance the retail and leisure facility offer within the town."	Comment is noted. Appropriate land uses for the site are set out in the adopted SPD.

Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area

Category	Summary	Council Response
Botley Central Area - Objection	<p>There were 61 objections received with respect to the section for Core Policy 11 (Botley Central Area). Significant number of objections to the defined red line boundary of the Central Botley Area (Figure 5.31). The site description in the supporting text does not refer in any detail to the other existing (non-retail) uses towards the western part of the site. Requested modifications generally seek to reduce the boundary to either the existing defined local centre (as per Local Plan 2011) or to a revised boundary consulted in the “Preferred Options” (2009). Some requested modifications sought to remove the red line in its entirety. Large number of objections seeking the preservation of Elms Parade as a structure including a requested modification from English Heritage for greater recognition of Elms Parade as a “local heritage asset”. A large number of suggested modifications requested to both the supporting text and to the text of Core Policy 11. These vary from amendments to specific wording, to the deletion of whole paragraphs of supporting text and sections of the policy. Examples include; the removal of reference to the comparison between Faringdon (a market town) and Botley; the removal of paragraph 5.31 in its entirety; removal of references to Botley acting as a District Centre in the context of Oxford, stating that development should only be to meet local needs; removal of term ‘comprehensive redevelopment’ from Core Policy; and removal of term ‘food superstore’ and replace with something smaller in scale. Objections to a lack of evidence to support large scale retail need as well as a suitable location for the provision of a hotel, includes a number of objections to the Retail and Town Centre study. Objection to any significant development on traffic grounds, in particular Stagecoach buses seek amendment to Core Policy for need to rationalise traffic movements with pedestrian/cycle movements through Botley. In addition objections and comments were raised in relation to the justification of Botley being a Central Area and a District Centre, infrastructure not adequate to support development of this size, Botley cannot compete within the economic market against Oxford, most of these facilities already exist nearby, issues around land</p>	<p>The council considers that the wording of Core Policy 11 is acceptable and that this is an appropriate site for development and redevelopment in the context of established retail need (see the retail study addendum ECO 03.2). Inclusion of land within the red line does not necessarily mean it would be redeveloped (the policy indicates development or upgrading),.</p> <p>The council has an identified need for visitor accommodation (hotels) and the Hotel Needs Assessment, which was prepared jointly with South Oxfordshire District Council. Preferred locations for such hotels include areas on the fringes of Oxford close to the strategic road network. The council considers Botley to be a suitable location in this context, particularly as there are hotels located at similar locations (Peartree to the north, Eastern By-pass to the south east) around Oxford.</p> <p>Since the submission of the Local Plan for examination, the council has been proactively engaging with a wide range of local organisations and key people in the Botley area on work to inform a Development Brief for the area. This brief will focus on the acceptable uses for the site, as well as address issues relating to height, scale, massing and density.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	ownership and developability, the loss of housing is not justified against economic benefit and poor community involvement.	
Botley Central Area - Objection	<p>There were 61 objections received with respect to the section for Core Policy 11 (Botley Central Area). Significant number of objections to the defined red line boundary of the Central Botley Area (Figure 5.31). The site description in the supporting text does not refer in any detail to the other existing (non-retail) uses towards the western part of the site.</p> <p>Requested modifications generally seek to reduce the boundary to either the existing defined local centre (as per Local Plan 2011) or to a revised boundary consulted in the “Preferred Options” (2009). Some requested modifications sought to remove the red line in its entirety. Large number of objections seeking the preservation of Elms Parade as a structure including a requested modification from English Heritage for greater recognition of Elms Parade as a “local heritage asset”. A large number of suggested modifications requested to both the supporting text and to the text of Core Policy 11. These vary from amendments to specific wording, to the deletion of whole paragraphs of supporting text and sections of the policy. Examples include; the removal of reference to the comparison between Faringdon (a market town) and Botley; the removal of paragraph 5.31 in its entirety; removal of references to Botley acting as a District Centre in the context of Oxford, stating that development should only be to meet local needs; removal of term ‘comprehensive redevelopment’ from Core Policy; and removal of term ‘food superstore’ and replace with something smaller in scale. Objections to a lack of evidence to support large scale retail need as well as a suitable location for the provision of a hotel, includes a number of objections to the Retail and Town Centre study. Objection to any significant development on traffic grounds, in particular Stagecoach buses seek amendment to Core Policy for need to rationalise traffic movements with pedestrian/cycle movements through Botley. In addition objections and comments were raised in relation to the justification of Botley being a Central Area and a District Centre, infrastructure not adequate to support development of this size, Botley cannot compete within the economic market against</p>	<p>The council considers that the wording of Core Policy 11 is acceptable. Inclusion of land within the red line does not necessarily mean it would be redeveloped (the policy indicates development or upgrading), rather that the redline area needs to be considered comprehensively.</p> <p>The council has an identified need for visitor accommodation (hotels) and the Hotel Needs Assessment, which was prepared jointly with South Oxfordshire District Council. Preferred locations for such hotels include areas on the fringes of Oxford close to the strategic road network. The council considers Botley to be a suitable location in this context, particularly as there are hotels located at similar locations (Peartree to the north, Eastern By-pass to the south east) around Oxford.</p> <p>Since the submission of the Local Plan for examination, the council has been proactively engaging with a wide range of local organisations and key people in the Botley area on work to inform a Development Brief for the area. This brief will focus on the acceptable uses for the site, as well as address issues relating to height, scale, massing and density.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	Oxford, most of these facilities already exist nearby, issues around land ownership and developability, the loss of housing is not justified against economic benefit and poor community involvement.	
Botley Central Area - Other	There were 17 other comments out of a total of around 81 comments for the section on Core Policy 11. These included the following matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct references to the refused planning application (P13/V2733/FUL) for the redevelopment of the Botley Central Area. • Comments stating that there is a lack of communication and cooperation between Vale of White Horse District Council and Oxford City Council with respect to Botley. • A need for proper consultation on proposals with the local community of Botley 	Comments relate closely to the refused planning application P13/V2733/FUL which is outside of the remit of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 examination. A number of these comments contain points which have been set out in the objections received to the wording of the core policy and supporting text. Work is under way to progress a Development Brief for the sites. This will include working with local organisations and key representatives and stakeholders.
Botley Central Area - Support	There were three comments of support for the section on Core Policy 11. These were provided by the University of Oxford and Doric Properties however Doric Properties urge the Council to amend the proposed settlement and retail hierarchy to differentiate Botley as a District Centre from Grove which is a Local Service Centre.	Support for the policy is welcomed and has been noted.

Core Policy 12: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames Sub-Area

Category	Summary	Council Response
English Heritage - South Abingdon Bypass	English Heritage has serious concerns over the proposed South Abingdon-on-Thames Bypass because the proposed route runs right through the Sutton Wick settlement site Scheduled Monument. However, as Core Policy 12 merely safeguards the land for the bypass rather than itself proposing the bypass, we raise no objection to this Policy.	Noted.
Environmental Health	The A34 running through North Abingdon causes very heavy and continuous traffic noise. The noise from the A34 is carried across North Abingdon affecting thousands of residents. The continuous noise is not healthy and the noise only reduces when there is a traffic hold up, usually at peak times. It is impossible to sit outside in good weather without being plagued by the loud noise of the A34.	The Development Site Templates for residential allocations set out the policy requirements for each site. These take account of the need for noise and air quality surveys, including given consideration to the A34, and to ensure an appropriate buffer and other mitigation is delivered.
Highways Agency - Lodge Hill	The Highways Agency make a number of points relating to the proposal to upgrade the Lodge Hill A34 Interchange. Their comments include: • Assessment for the need and deliverability for improvements at Lodge Hill is needed, particularly if the viability of proposed growth is reliant upon such an improvement. • The creation of south facing slips on the A34 Lodge Hill will be required early in the phasing of development for the North Abingdon sites (IDP) • IDP is a live document so this would need clarification prior to examination.	The Highways Authority and District Council will continue to work positively with the Highways Agency to develop detailed designs for the Lodge Hill upgrade and ensure they meet the appropriate requirements. The detailed transport evidence supporting the Local Plan (ETI) is clear that the Lodge Hill upgrade is needed. It is set out as a clear requirement in the Local Plan and IDP.
Infrastructure Delivery	A number of comments relate to infrastructure delivery. These include: • Insufficient provision on the required timescale and finances to upgrade local facilities. • Recent changes to Wootton Rd roundabout have slowed traffic further. • The funding for the A34 interchange at Lodge Hill is to partly come from the LEP, but no guarantee that this will be forthcoming. • A crossing at Lodge Hill is essential for safety. However, this will slow traffic. • Lack of commitment and attention to develop a diamond interchange and Southern By-pass. • The road infrastructure is a must to access jobs and other locations for new residents, thus the plan is unsound and ineffective at present. • North/North West Abingdon south facing slips are an essential prerequisite for any substantial development in this area. This should be delivered before any	The plan has been informed by detailed transport modelling that has tested the proposed level of growth and identified where mitigation is needed. The upgrading of the Lodge Hill Interchange is now a strategic priority for the County Council who outline their intention to develop a Park and Ride facility at Lodge Hill within their Oxford Transport Strategy (LTP4). There is a clear commitment to the delivery of the Lodge Hill Interchange upgrade within the Local Plan and the IDP. More localised highway improvements will be addressed through the site

Category	Summary	Council Response
	development commences. • Hopefully funds for the A34 improvements will be made available from central government, rather than CIL or S106 contributions.	masterplanning/ planning application stages as required by the Development Site Templates.
Lodge Hill Upgrade	A number of points are made relating to the proposed upgrade of the Lodge Hill A34 Interchange. These include: • The H/A have never supported the south facing slips on the A34. • The A34 is already congested and more traffic will bring more congestion and continual gridlock. • Not sustainable, with negative impact on the residents and businesses. • 5.33 should not suggest that the transport constraints are any worse in South Abingdon compared to the north, particularly with the 40 year old Drayton Rd transport system which was to be reviewed and updated properly. • Proposed funding through CIL and H/A is also flawed and unlikely. • Development in North Abingdon is not sustainable and not sound.	The plan has been informed by detailed transport modelling that has tested the proposed level of growth and identified where mitigation is needed. The upgrading of the Lodge Hill Interchange is now a strategic priority for the County Council who outline their intention to develop a Park and Ride facility at Lodge Hill within their Oxford Transport Strategy (LTP4). There is a clear commitment to the delivery of the Lodge Hill Interchange upgrade within the Local Plan and the IDP. More localised highway improvements will be addressed through the site masterplanning/ planning application stages as required by the Development Site Templates.
OCC - Ecological Assessment	Land for Safeguarding for Future Transport Schemes: Some of the potential schemes would have an impact on landscape, recreation, ecology and biodiversity. If the schemes are likely to progress then ecological assessments should be carried out at a very early stage. Some of the sites have potential ecological constraints and assessment would be needed to consider whether schemes could be designed to avoid or mitigate for potential impacts. Evidence will need to be provided in order to demonstrate that environmental assessments have taken place, other alternatives have been considered and the correct consultations have been carried out.	Noted.
OCC - Public Transport (1)	23. The draft strategy (www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/oxfordtransportstrategy), which has yet to be adopted, includes proposals to expand and improve Oxford's Park & Ride system by creating an outer ring of Park & Ride sites to help meet the growth needs of the districts around the city and of the city itself. This change is designed to intercept traffic further out of the city before it reaches the Oxford ring road or the immediate approaches to it, since these sections of the road network already suffer significant traffic congestion and will be placed under increasing pressure in future. 24. Two of the proposed locations for new Park & Ride sites are within the Vale at Lodge Hill and	Noted. Ongoing partnership working between VoWH and OCC is updating the transport evidence to support the Local Plan (ETI) to include the new OCC proposals for Park and Ride schemes within the VoWH. This will be completed to inform the Local Plan EIP as required.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	Cumnor. No specific sites have been identified yet but the plan linked below shows indicative approximate locations.	
OCC - Public Transport (2)	Sub areas In many ways, the Abingdon and Oxford fringe sub-area is a good area for new development from a transport perspective, because so many work journeys link into the Oxford city area. Home to work distances are shorter and there are some very good radial bus routes, also there is a rail station at Radley.	Noted.
OCC - Safeguarding of Land	2.1.4 Core Policy 12: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements. The intention on pages 60 and 61 to safeguard land for a South Abingdon-on-Thames Bypass linking the A415 to the west and South east of the town, including a new River Thames crossing as well as a Diamond interchange at Lodge Hill is welcomed. It is also considered important that land be safeguarded for an Eastern relief road.	Noted.
Oxford City Council - South Abingdon Bypass	Core Policy CP12 (Safeguarding land for highways improvements) – The City Council has an interest in how highways improvements are planned for and taken forward in this area. I would request opportunity for the City Council to participate in the examination hearing that considers this policy.	Noted.
Public Transport	Stagecoach supports the Policy. Specific comments include: • Stagecoach regrets that no policy takes full account of the need to structure urban design to facilitate efficient high quality public transport, rather than prejudiced against. • It is noteworthy that the headline policy focuses on the specification and safeguarding of highways scheme delivery, • Little attention is applied to securing efficient high quality public transport movement. • The Urban Design DPD is a not sufficiently robust to achieve this outcome • The DPD is driven mainly by aesthetics and sustainable construction, not facilitating the best public transport. • Thus, the plan is not positively prepared to deal with the greatly increased level of public transport provision and use to require its sustainable delivery.	The Development Site Template for Valley Park makes specific reference for the need for a bus priority scheme within this site as evidenced by a standalone feasibility study considering the opportunities for a bus priority scheme between Harwell Campus and Didcot, routing through the Valley Park site. The more general need for appropriate consideration for public transport within masterplanning is addressed through CP 38 and the accompanying Design Guide SPD. Furthermore, there is a suite of transport policies set out in the Local Plan, which have been prepared in partnership with the Highways Authority.
Safeguarding of Land within South Oxfordshire	One of the schemes listed in CP17 the Harwell Strategic Link Road and Southern Didcot Bypass appears to include land in South Oxfordshire policy CP18 cannot safeguard land in South Oxfordshire. The wording needs to be adapted to reflect this Two road schemes one in CP12 (the South Abingdon Bypass) and one in CP17 (the link between the A415 east of Abingdon and the A4130 north of Didcot) have	VOWH is working closely with SODC and the Highways Authority to develop joint plans for delivering the identified and necessary infrastructure across district boundaries. The safeguarding maps show 'areas of

Category	Summary	Council Response
	been recently introduced and South Oxfordshire has not had the opportunity to consult on or formally consider these. This will be done through the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031. Whilst this Council realises that there is often serious congestion in this area and that solutions need to be found we have some concern about the potential impact of these proposals in South Oxfordshire and therefore reserve judgement on these schemes.	investigation' with SODC to avoid any problems with regard to planning outside the council boundary.
South Abingdon Bypass	A number of comments are made relating to the safeguarding of land for the South Abingdon Bypass. These include: • Objection to A415/Abingdon bypass – Environmental and noise impact and congestion. Raising the road to cross the flood plains. Disturbance to local wildlife. Damage to the views of Abingdon. • No funding has been applied to the project, so potentially the map could blight the village for many years without implementation. • SODC will be bound to take into account their own local plan, which does not contain the safeguarding policy. Therefore to refuse planning applications based on the VWHDC's policy would be extremely difficult. • Safeguarding land in an another's jurisdiction is fundamentally wrong with significant implications be those affected by the proposal. • Council has admitted that it is unlikely to build the by-pass and if so not for a long time, thus it is practical to withdraw the safeguarding of the land to remove the material blighting effect on the land within and vicinity of the safeguarding. • Culham Parish Council wish to note the disappointment to have not been a consultee for the Local Plan 2031, despite the Abingdon Southern Bypass and Science Vale Thames crossing being considered in two large areas of the Parish. • The Parish wishes to express the lack of uncertainty this has caused amongst the residents.	VOWH is working closely with SODC and the Highways Authority to develop joint plans for delivering the identified and necessary infrastructure across district boundaries. The safeguarding maps show 'areas of investigation' with SODC to avoid any problems with regard to planning outside the council boundary. SODC will address the need to plan for the delivery of the South Abingdon bypass as part of preparing their updated Local Plan. The three authorities (VoWH, SODC, and OCC) have signed a commitment to joint working.
Traffic Congestion	A number of comments refer to existing traffic congestion within the Abingdon and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. Particular comments include: • CP 12 fails to address the issues of traffic congestion from Lodge Hill to the A420 junction • Noise and pollution problems will be difficult to mitigate from the A34 • Developing A415 will increase traffic through the town unless an eastern bypass is constructed avoiding Bridge Street • Recent Government Guidance advises that significant lung impairment in young children is observed within 150 metres of major roads due to NO2 and particulate pollution • North/North-west development will add additional strain to the road network, as cycling and walking are not really an option and buses do not	The plan has been informed by detailed transport modelling that has tested the proposed level of growth and identified where mitigation is needed. The upgrading of the Lodge Hill Interchange is now a strategic priority for the County Council who outline the intention to develop a Park and Ride facility at Lodge Hill within their Oxford Transport Strategy. There is a clear commitment to the delivery of the Lodge Hill Interchange upgrade within the Local Plan

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>serve these routes and train service is not available. • Increased traffic will amplify the town's air pollution. • The proposal does not help with access to Oxford, taking an hour or more to travel the 6 miles to Oxford from North Abingdon, with the development increasing the traffic significantly. • Local MP Nicola Blackwood accepts the A34 is at capacity • South facing slips will not reduce the further impact of traffic • Drayton Road congestion results from the bottlenecks at the double mini roundabout junction with Marcham Road, not the river Ock Bridge • Redesign of the double roundabout would easily reduce congestion and increase traffic flow. • Reducing the impact on North Abingdon would make South Abingdon more susceptible for moderate development • Narrowing the 2 lanes on the North Abingdon peripheral has caused further congestion. The new roundabout layout is dangerous and causes further congestion. • 1000 new houses in Abingdon North/North West will dramatically increase the traffic congestion. • It will likely cause 1500 cars using Dunmore Road, which is already a bottleneck during rush hour, with several accidents have already taken place, including two fatalities of local school children. • Lodge hill needs to be implemented but no additional housing should be built • The A34 will require additional lanes between the M40 and Chilton, this needed before any development can commence. • Otherwise lane closures for the A34 improvement will become impossible to handle after the development is completed. • Government announcements for the A34 includes CTV, information signs and minor changes to approach roads to 2 junctions north of Oxford, this will let drivers how long the queues are but do nothing to reduce congestion.</p>	<p>and the IDP. More localised highway improvements will be addressed through the site masterplanning/ planning application stages as required by the Development Site Templates.</p>

Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt

Category	Summary	Council Response
Abingdon Green Belt Comments	<p>48 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to some or all of the green belt boundary changes around Abingdon-on-Thames• Comments were specific to this settlement or referenced as part of a more general objection to green belt boundaries, and thus many of the ‘general’ objections above form part of representations made for this settlement (such as the five purposes of the green belt, not compliant with the NPPF, SHMA too high, etc.)• A number of objections state that part of the “North Abingdon” site was not consulted on during the ‘Housing Delivery Update’ consultation in April 2014• A number of objections were made that green belt boundary changes to the north and north east of Abingdon-on-Thames would erode the gap with Radley Village. • A number of objections sought for development to focus on land to the south of Abingdon-on-Thames rather than in the green belt. Some of these recognised the difficulties with traffic and flooding to the south of the settlement. • Many objected to the lack of infrastructure and the ability of the local and strategic transport network to cope, including Dunmore Road, Twelve Acre Drive and the A34. A number of objections sought a requirement for infrastructure to be provided before development, such as improvements to the Lodge Hill interchange to upgrade it to a diamond interchange. • Development to the west of Peachcroft Farm may lead to the loss of this locally important business2 of approx482 comments on the Green Belt specifically support some or all of the green belt boundary changes around Abingdon-on-Thames. Both of these came from Radley College.</p>	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not well meet the five purposes of Green Belt in the NPPF, all of which are therefore proposed for release.</p> <p>The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for the Oxfordshire Green Belt, parts of which outside the Vale have not yet been independently reviewed against the purposes of Green Belt.</p>
Appleton Green Belt Comments	<p>29 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to some or all of the green belt boundary changes around Appleton village• Comments were specific to this settlement or referenced as part of a more general objection to green belt boundary</p>	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation.</p> <p>The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for Oxfordshire, should it be required.</p> <p>The review, nor the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 seek to allocate land for development within this settlement.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
Botley Green Belt Comments	<p>4 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to some or all of the green belt boundary changes around Botley, the settlement of which traverses the parishes of Cumnor and North Hinksey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection from Oxford Brooks University seeking removal of green belt land from the built of area of their Harcourt Hill Campus to help facilitate expansion of their facilities at this location. • Objection to all green belt boundary changes around the settlement of Botley. 	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation.</p> <p>The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for Oxfordshire, should it be required.</p> <p>The review, nor the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 seek to allocate land for development within this settlement.</p>
Cumnor/Botley Green Belt Comments	<p>172 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to some or all of the green belt boundary changes around Cumnor village, the parish of which includes some boundary changes around the edge of Botley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were specific to this settlement or referenced as part of a more general objection to green belt boundaries, and thus many of the 'general' objections above form part of representations made for this settlement. (such as the five purposes of the green belt, not compliant with the NPPF, SHMA too high, etc.) • Although there was general support by many for the removal of the strategic site allocation from the Local Plan (included in the 'Housing Delivery Update' consultation of April 2014), there is a lack of understanding for why the recommended green belt boundary changes remain included in the local plan. • Development on the land to be released with damage the existing character of Cumnor village. Objections raised concerns over the impact that development as a result of these changes will have a significant adverse impact on the local infrastructure. • The majority of the recommended modifications seek to remove any changes to the green belt in Cumnor parish. <p>5 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically support some or all of the green belt boundary changes around Cumnor village. All of these comments supported the draft allocation that was included in the 'Housing Delivery Update' consultation held in April 2014.</p>	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not well meet the five purposes of Green Belt in the NPPF, all of which are therefore proposed for release.</p> <p>The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for the Oxfordshire Green Belt, parts of which outside the Vale have not yet been independently reviewed against the purposes of Green Belt.</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
General Green Belt Comments	<p>221 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt generally object to any boundary changes as a result of the green belt review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General objection to any/all green belt boundary changes, with any requested modification seeking to remove any reference to a green belt review as well as any suggested changes that arise from it. As a result, any site allocations dependent on the green belt review should also be removed from the local plan. o The objectors generally consider such changes would make the plan sound, while some consider the plan could not be made sound even if these changes were implemented. • This includes objections to the need for a local green belt review, and in some cases stating that a more strategic green belt review should be done instead. A number of objectors state that this inconsistent with Core Policy 2 which commits to a strategic green belt review. • Lack of justification in the local plan of the “exceptional circumstances” case as set out in the national policy and guidance. A number of comments state that it is therefore not legally compliant and/or sound as a result. o Some objections make reference to updated government guidance (2014) that unmet need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the green belt... • Many objections reference how the recommended boundary changes to the green belt do not satisfy the five stated purposes of the designation. • Many objections state that the SHMA figure is excessively high and should be reduced, thus eliminating the need for any green belt review. A significant number of these objections also sought to remove strategic site allocations in the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) • A number of objections made reference to a lack of public consultation on the local green belt review. • The Local Plan is unsound as it does not adequately take into account environmental and social constraints, particularly through the green belt review. <p>6 of approx. 482 comments on the Green Belt generally support the recommended changes to the Green Belt boundaries.</p>	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not well meet the five purposes of Green Belt in the NPPF, all of which are therefore proposed for release.</p> <p>The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for the Oxfordshire Green Belt, parts of which outside the Vale have not yet been independently reviewed against the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Comments of support to the recommended boundary changes are welcomed and have been noted</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
Kennington Green Belt Comments	8 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to some or all of the green belt boundary changes around Kennington village (including land that is in the parish of Radley)• Comments were specific to this settlement or referenced as part of a more general objection to green belt boundaries, and thus many of the ‘general’ objections above form part of representations made for this settlement. (such as the five purposes of the green belt, not compliant with the NPPF, SHMA too high, etc.)• The majority of the recommended modifications seek to remove any changes to the green belt around Kennington, in addition to removing similar changes in nearby settlements (Abingdon, Cumnor, Radley)	The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not meet the five purposes of the important designation. The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for the Oxfordshire Green Belt, parts of which outside the Vale have not yet been independently reviewed against the purposes of Green Belt.
North Hinksey Green Belt Comments	One of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to the green belt boundary changes around North Hinksey village (this excludes references to Botley above)• Objection to soundness of the plan and lack of clarity with respect to whether North Hinksey forms part of the Green Belt inset for Botley and whether it is considered to form part of the settlement of Botley (a local service centre) or as a standalone village.	The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not well meet the five purposes of Green Belt in the NPPF, all of which are therefore proposed for release. The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for the Oxfordshire Green Belt, parts of which outside the Vale have not yet been independently reviewed against the purposes of Green Belt. The review, nor the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 seek to allocate land for development within this settlement.
Other Green Belt Comments	• Affordable Housing - One comment seeks a modification to CP13 (vi) to be guided by policy on rural exception sites (CP25 i-ix) policy rather than Affordable Housing policy (CP24)• Densities – One comment seeks clarity on what the density of development is to be like on sites to be released from the green belt and what the urban nature of the land should be like going forward.	Core Policy 23 sets out the densities for future developments in the district. Core Policies 37 and 38 set out design principles and links to the recently adopted Design Guide SPD
Radley Green Belt Comments	16 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to the green belt boundary changes around Radley village (this excludes references to Botley above)	The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were specific to this settlement or referenced as part of a more general objection to green belt boundaries, and thus many of the 'general' objections above form part of representations made for this settlement. (such as the five purposes of the green belt, not compliant with the NPPF, SHMA too high, etc.) • The majority of the recommended modifications seek to remove any changes to the green belt around Radley from the Local Plan, including as a result the strategic site allocation. <p>1 of 482 comments on the Green Belt specifically support the green belt boundary changes around Radley village. This comment was made by Radley College, who wish to amalgamate the current strategic site allocation (North West Radley) with the previously drafted allocation of North Radley (consulted on as part of the 'Housing Delivery Update' consultation held in April 2014)</p>	<p>which do not well meet the five purposes of Green Belt in the NPPF, all of which are therefore proposed for release.</p> <p>The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for the Oxfordshire Green Belt, parts of which outside the Vale have not yet been independently reviewed against the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Comments of support to the recommended boundary changes are welcomed and have been noted</p>
Radley Green Belt Comments - Support	Support	Support is welcomed and is noted
Shippon Green Belt Comments	One of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically relates to the green belt boundary changes around Shippon village. This representation seeks to include the small village of Shippon as an inset to the green belt and for the council to define the precise boundaries.	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels which do not well meet the five purposes of Green Belt in the NPPF, all of which are therefore proposed for release.</p> <p>The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for the Oxfordshire Green Belt, parts of which outside the Vale have not yet been independently reviewed against the purposes of Green Belt.</p>
Wootton Green Belt Comments	93 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to the green belt boundary changes around Wootton village, which includes boundary changes within the parish of Dry Sanford also. • Comments were specific to this settlement	<p>The council has prepared a local Green Belt review in full accordance with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. The Green Belt review has identified a number of parcels</p>

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>or referenced as a more general objection to green belt boundaries, and thus many of the 'general' objections above form part of representations made for this settlement. (such as the five purposes of the green belt, not compliant with the NPPF, SHMA too high, etc.)• Objections as development of this land to be released will impact upon the local distinctiveness, overload existing infrastructure and community services and facilities• The majority of the recommended modifications seek to remove any changes to the green belt around Wootton from the Local Plan 2 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically support the green belt boundary changes around Wootton village. One of these representations supports the boundary changes in Wootton but opposed all other boundary changes in the green belt review. The second supports green belt change #9 as set out in phase three of the review.</p>	<p>which do not well meet the five purposes of Green Belt in the NPPF, all of which are therefore proposed for release.</p> <p>The review will inform any future strategic Green Belt review for the Oxfordshire Green Belt, parts of which outside the Vale have not yet been independently reviewed against the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Comments of support to the recommended boundary changes are welcomed and have been noted.</p>

Core Policy 14: Upper Thames Reservoir

Category	Summary	Council Response
English Heritage - Archaeological Interest	The proposed site of the Upper Thames Reservoir is of considerable potential archaeological interest when considered at a landscape scale. Paragraph 126 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment and, in doing so, to recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource. Paragraph 128 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities, in determining applications, to require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, in a level of detail proportionate to the asset's importance. Core Policy 14 should therefore include an additional criterion requiring any proposal for a reservoir to minimise the effect on the archaeological significance of the site, which should include the retention of in situ of archaeological remains where possible and their full investigation and recording, with the results deposited in a public archive. This would be consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 126 and 128 of the NPPF.	The Council considers that this suggested addition is sufficiently addressed under Core Policy 39: The Historic Environment (i), however the Council does not object to its inclusion in the policy should the inspector deem it necessary to make the plan sound.
Objection to Proposal	A number of objections were made to the core policy and/or supporting text of Core Policy 14 (safeguarding of the Upper Thames Reservoir). General objections include • Land should only be safeguarded until 2019, after which it may become available for alternative uses (should it not be the preferred option) • Significant environmental impacts should the reservoir be built • There is no demonstrated need • A smaller reservoir could be accommodated within a new settlement plan	The Council recognises that the proposed Thames Reservoir site is identified as a preferred option for the long-term management of water resources for the South East region. Until such time as a decision is made by the Secretary of State through the WRMP process in 2019, the site should be safeguarded for this purpose.
OCC - Safeguarding of Alternative Site - Longworth	Safeguarded Land 20. Core Policy 14 reserves a site for a reservoir between East Hanney, Drayton and Steventon. Thames Water's alternative option (recently published) for a large storage reservoir for London is on land at Longworth ¹ but the draft local plan does not reserve that site. 21. It is unclear why with the potential Longworth site is not also safeguarded within the plan. It would also be useful to clarify	The council considers this a matter for discussion at Examination, as to whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant the safeguarding of this site for a potential future reservoir (alongside Chinnor in South Oxfordshire). As the site does not conflict with any other strategic allocations in the Local Plan 2031, the council

Category	Summary	Council Response
	the Vale's policy on a combined housing and reservoir site on the safeguarded land.	would not object to the land being safeguarded, should the inspector deem it necessary to make the plan sound.
Oxford City Council -Support	Core Policy CP14 (Upper Thames Reservoir safeguarding) – The City Council supports this policy as it is important to ensure provision of infrastructure relating to water supply for the wider area.	Support is welcomed and has been noted.
Swindon Borough Council - Support	The safeguarding of land for the Upper Thames Reservoir is supported so not to prejudice the long-term growth of Swindon.	Support is welcomed and has been noted.
Thames Water - Alternative Site - Longworth	Thames Water consider that the alternative shortlisted reservoir site at Longworth should be similarly safeguarded by a new Policy in the Local Plan and on the Policies Map. Based on experience at the Abingdon Reservoir site which has been subject to development pressure such as the Oxford Garden City and the granting of planning permission for solar farms, Thames Water consider it is important that the Longworth Reservoir site (and the Chinnor Reservoir site) is similarly safeguarded (in addition to the Abingdon Reservoir site) until the outcome of WRMP19. Thames Water therefore consider that the Longworth Reservoir site, as identified on the attached plan, should be safeguarded in the same way as the Abingdon Reservoir site by the addition of an appropriate safeguarding policy and the associated identification of the site on the Policies Map.	The council considers this a matter for discussion at Examination. It is less clear in terms of the feasibility of this option as to whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant the safeguarding of this site for a potential future reservoir (alongside Chinnor in South Oxfordshire). As the site does not conflict with any other strategic allocations in the Local Plan 2031, the council would not object to the land being safeguarded, should the inspector deem it necessary to make the plan sound.
Thames Water - Policy Wording	Thames Water wholly support the safeguarding of the reservoir site between the settlements of East Hanney and Steventon and that the Local Plan is sound in this respect. Thames Water's approved WRMP14 identifies the need for a large water supply scheme to supply London from the mid-2020s onwards. The preferred scheme included in the plan is a 150 Ml/d wastewater reuse scheme. However, the robustness and resilience of this chosen option for water supply has not been confirmed and there remain a number of uncertainties associated with the scheme which require further work and resolution over the next five years. One of the reservoir storage options in Thames Water's WRMP14 is the Abingdon reservoir site on the area of land between Steventon, Drayton and East Hanney, to the south west of Abingdon.	The council considers this the suggested amendments are a matter for discussion at Examination.

Category	Summary	Council Response
	<p>Whilst there are other potential sites for a reservoir in the Thames catchment, the Abingdon site is the only one that can accommodate a raw water storage reservoir development greater than 100Mm3 (> 275 Ml/d). The site therefore remains the preferred option for the Upper Thames Reservoir based on detailed work already undertaken. Thames Water consider that it is essential that the safeguarded area includes the ancillary works including the areas of land required for the diversion of the Hanney to Steventon Road and the Wilts and Berks Canal, because it would not be possible to construct the reservoir if these areas are not also safeguarded from inappropriate development.</p>	