

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 1

Regulation 22 Statement

Appendix 3: Summary of Representations

MARCH 2015

Summary of Representations: Chapter 1 Introduction

Core Policies 1 and 2 and General Plan Comments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874720	Philip Rawle	0		LPPub3965		Core Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	No	CP1 Policy Wording	The response states that Core Policy 1, in part, reflects the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and it partly reflects the Planning Inspectorate's model wording of this policy. However, for it to be legally compliant and positively prepared it needs to fully reflect the model wording.
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub794		Core Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Yes	CP1 Support	Support is outlined for Core Policy 1 as it adopts the same principles as Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. It seeks to promote the delivery of sustainable development.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2909			Yes		The Policy reflects the requirements of the Framework and the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The second paragraph of the policy is also supported in that it reflects the need for the Council to make decisions, which it may not necessarily have the policy Framework for.
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2705			No		
874656	Mr & Mrs W M Wasborough	830006	Mr Mark Richards	LPPub2496			No		
879120	Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4522			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874122	Mr Timothy Shepherd	874720	Rawle Philip PRP Consultants	LPPub2003		Core Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	No	CP1 Sustainable Development Comments	A number of comments relate to Core Policy 1 and the delivery of sustainable development. These include:
874401	H Sherman			LPPub2999			No		<ul style="list-style-type: none">CP1 should be amended to closely align with the NPPF model policy
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub1215			No		<ul style="list-style-type: none">There can be no presumption of ‘sustainable development’ based on the high projections of housing need in the Oxfordshire SHMA which is itself unsound, unsustainable and should not be relied upon, further investigation into figures required.
879102	Greenlight Developments			LPPub3327			No		<ul style="list-style-type: none">The suggestion that the Plan represents sustainable development should be removed.
875920	Daniel Scharf			LPPub4179			No		<ul style="list-style-type: none">CP1 is too flexible. The definition of sustainable development is weak (paragraph 1.13) and could become a presumption in favour of any development, especially if the NPPF economic aspect overrides other considerations. Safeguards are needed to prevent the abuse of the presumption in favour of sustainable development
874307	Mr Edward Mott			LPPub2678			No		<ul style="list-style-type: none">CP1 refers to he NPPF Paragraph 14 but does not adequately reflect the implications of the Footnote 9 and National Planning Practice Guidance with regard to restrictions that apply to AONBs and other key designations.
827386	Dr Christopher Prior			LPPub781			No		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Houses on existing land need to be built first
829495	Mr.Martin Dowie			LPPub1632			No		<ul style="list-style-type: none">This does not ensure all development will meet the presumption of sustainable development and no criteria for monitoring purposes.
873626	Mr Peter Howell	874670	Douglas Bond Woolf Bond Planning	LPPub2537			No		<ul style="list-style-type: none">No criteria for monitoring purposes.
877856	TFP Developments Ltd			LPPub3144			No		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Lack of identification for lifetime homes, addressing the problem of under-occupation and does not priotise low carbon transport.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3564			No		
879104	Leslie Wells	874720	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub3789			No		
874500	Mr Alex Money			LPPub3040			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
472647	Mr Andrew Lord North Wessex Downs AONB	724542		LPPub261		Core Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	No		
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews			LPPub1782			No		
831397	B Read			LPPub3832			No		
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4376			No		
874670	Douglas Bond			LPPub4739			No		
875809	Mrs Jennie Cosgrove			LPPub3696			No		
828733	Sally Reynolds Abingdon Carbon Cutters			LPPub903			No		
72186	Alison Shelley			LPPub597			No		
404457	Mr Ken Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub2583		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	CP2	Three main points are raised: 1. There has been a failure to consider unmet need 2. There are allocations in the Green Belt and AONB when alternatives are available 3. An artificial Ring Fence has been proposed preventing the Garden City proposal coming forward

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop	0		LPPub972	1.11	Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	CP2 Duty to Cooperate Comments	<p>A number of comments are made that relate to Core Policy 2 and the Duty to Cooperate. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Oxfordshire Growth Board has agreed to undertake a 'Post SHMA Strategic Work Programme' which sets out how they plan to cooperate (minutes, November 20th). This includes completing an Oxfordshire-wide Green belt review by June 2015. Until this coordinated effort has been made this Plan cannot comply with the duty to cooperate Policy CP2 commits the plan to joint working with other Local Authorities regarding unmet need but provides no firm commitment concerning the timeframe of completing this which does not fully comply with Duty to Cooperate CP2 places an unjustified reliance on a review Additional work outlined in Core Policy 2 needs to be undertaken prior to submitting the Plan to the Secretary of State The policy refers to assessing all reasonable spatial options, including release of brownfield land, potential for new settlements and a strategic review of Oxford Green Belt. These are not issues for the Council to consider in isolation. The county is supportive of the intention to work jointly with other Oxfordshire local authorities to address unmet housing need. But there is a need for an Oxfordshire wide approach which integrates housing provision, employment and infrastructure across the county to ensure coordinated planning. This should be made explicit in the text to ensure the Plan complies with Duty to Cooperate The last sentence of CP2 could rule out other reasonable spatial options which CP2 commits to assessing as part of joint work. Suggest CP2 be amended by deleting the last sentence - "The appropriate approach will depend on the scale of the unmet need to be accommodated". This would allow for a different or modified spatial strategy, if required, and ensure the Plan complies with Duty to Cooperate It is necessary to first demonstrate that brownfield sites are fully utilised in neighbouring authorities' plans before offering VOWH land for development.
872423	Mrs Susan Posnett			LPPub774			No		
828437	Mr Matthew Hall			LPPub2461			No		
831807	Ms Angela Raymond Wanborough Parish Council			LPPub2747			No		
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3301			No		
759310	Mr Peter Martin Western Vale Villages Consortium of Parish Councils	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub4247			No		
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)			LPPub3921			No		
831779	Landowners land at South Cumnor			LPPub3880			No		
872591	Miss Layla Moran Liberal Democrats, Oxford West and Abingdon	724322	Mr Nick Lyzba John Phillips Planning Consultancy	LPPub3973			No		
879104	Leslie Wells			LPPub3790			No		
874720	Philip Rawle	874720	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub3969			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
722498	mrs Annabelle Zinovieff	0		LPPub3780	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	General Comment on Duty to Cooperate	General comments on Duty to Cooperate with adjoining authorities highlighting the shared responsibility of the A420 between the Vale and Swindon Borough Council. Also meaningless consultation has taken place and duty to cooperation needs to be demonstrated before a Local Plan is submitted.
722498	mrs Annabelle Zinovieff			LPPub3777			No		
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub736	1.24	Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	CP2 General Comments	<p>It is stated that land identified as unsuitable currently should also be unsuitable for development to meet other councils' needs.</p> <p>The housing is likely to produce commuter housing to meet the needs of London, not the local area. It will not solve housing issues here but will make them worse and destroy the Vale. Basing the new housing requirements on just one scenario is unsound.</p> <p>The Council have attempted at cooperation but have not been challenged from neighbouring authorities as to ensure brownfield sites are fully utilised. The Plan has very little benefit for the Western Vale and Faringdon.</p>
872577	DR David Forrow			LPPub943			No		
872577	DR David Forrow			LPPub939			No		
72108	Mr Jonathan Noys			LPPub2474			No		
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub677			No		
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop			LPPub972		Paragraph	No		
874401	H Sherman			LPPub2998			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
743654	Mr Peter Gore	0		LPPub626		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	CP2 Green Belt Comments	<p>Government guidance (6 March 2014) states that Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the green belt and other harm to constitute the “very exceptional circumstances”. The Vale has not demonstrated there are exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>This policy states that cooperation with other Oxfordshire Authorities will include a full strategic review of the whole of the green belt. This seems inconsistent with the Vale having carried out their own review and raises the possibility of a succession of reviews each time there is a new housing needs assessment.</p>
827918	Mr John Huddleston			LPPub1249			No		
828453	Mrs Joyce Huddleston			LPPub1262			No		
828988	Dr Christopher Bedford			LPPub1159			No		
873500	Mr Patrick Burnage			LPPub1346			No		
873521	Mrs Susan Burnage			LPPub1352			No		
873922	Mrs Vivienne Summers			LPPub1703			No		
730276	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council			LPPub2381			No		
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub796		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	Yes	Local Plan 2 Timescales	We suggest that timescales for the preparation of Part 2 be provided in accordance with Paragraph 182 of the NPPF.
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub795	1.17	Paragraph	Yes	CP2 Support	<p>A number of comments provide support for Core Policy 2. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are encouraged that the housing target reflect the Objectively Assessed Need for the District as identified by the up-to-date Oxfordshire SHMA and acknowledgement of unmet need, and support the Council’s flexible policy approach to enable cooperation with other LPAs in future. This shows how the Vale of White Horse has exercised its requirement for the Duty to Cooperate We support the proposal to progress the Local Plan (Part 1) on the basis of meeting the District’s objectively assessed housing needs, while working with other Oxfordshire authorities to address unmet needs in the wider Housing Market Area We support the District Council’s pragmatic approach to addressing unmet needs arising elsewhere in the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area (section 2.1.10) The VoWH Local Plan provides the certainty required to
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2839			No		
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2833			No		
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O’Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2861			Yes		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3953			Yes		<p>bring forward development in a timely manner, as well as providing the district with a strong policy basis upon which to determine a planning application. The policy proposed is effective in meeting local needs, justified by local circumstances, and positively prepared by allowing development to come forward in a co-ordinated manner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approach taken is considered fully compliant with PPG guidance We endorse the Council's pragmatic approach to addressing Oxford's unmet housing need once quantified. CP2 is a key policy helping deal with the short-term need for housing whilst securing the framework to underpin the delivery of Oxford's needs in the medium term. The approach adopted by the Council will make an immediate contribution to supporting nationally significant economic development in the Oxford area. The ongoing commitment and consistent approach adopted by local authorities to the duty-to-cooperate, across Oxfordshire Housing Market Area, is reinforced by the Inspector's Note No.2 (Cherwell Local Plan Examination, 2014) The duty-to-cooperate is clearly being fulfilled to deliver any unmet housing need across the Oxfordshire housing market area as far as is reasonably possible. Furthermore, through the Local Plan, the Council has the necessary planning policy hooks in place to accommodate any additional housing need in the district as and when it is jointly identified We support this on-going joint working with other Oxfordshire local authorities, and importantly, the Vale of White Horse District Council's commitment to the process. However, need to be realistic about the timeframe for reaching agreement on the extent of unmet need to be accommodated beyond the administrative boundary of Oxford City and the methodology for the strategic review of the Green Belt.
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3758			Yes		
873484	Redrow Homes Ltd	876188	Mr Robert Barber Pegasus Group	LPPub4091			Yes		
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2941			Yes		
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2337		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	CP2 Cannot accommodate unmet need	<p>A number of responses state that the Vale should not take any of Oxford's unmet need due to lack of infrastructure and impact on heritage and rural character. The strategy breaches NPPF requirements as it does not protect the environment, build healthy and sustainable communities, support sustainable transport and accessibility, or prosperity.</p>
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3228			No		
730237	Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council			LPPub4049			No		
729558	Mr & Mrs W M Wasborough	830006	Mr Mark Richards	LPPub2505		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	CP2 Unmet need comments	<p>A number of comments object to Core Policy 2 and the extent it addresses unmet need for Oxford City. These comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan does not take account of the recognised unmet need arising from Oxford City To provide for Vale's housing needs while disregarding

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2273			No		<p>Oxford's unmet needs is an inappropriate strategy when assessed against alternatives, contrary to the NPPF and DtoC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification is needed as to whether the Local Plan has determined whether it needs to accommodate unmet housing needs from adjoining Districts, or not • The policy is not positively prepared or justified as it does not seek to address unmet housing requirements from neighbouring authorities and is insufficiently flexible to meet the housing target identified • The decision to defer full provision to a review in the future or another development plan document is flawed • In this context, additional housing within the District will be required, and in the short term an increase in the five-year land supply • Policy CP2 should acknowledge that Oxford will be unable to accommodate the whole of its new housing requirement. On the basis that the City will be unable to meet all its needs, a contingency reserve of at least 10% should be planned for as reserve sites. The principle of these contingency sites can be established in the Part 1 Plan and either be identified in it or left to a Part 2 local plan or a partial review. The trigger for the release of these contingency sites can be the acknowledgement that Oxford City is not meeting its needs. This approach will enable the plan to start to meet a portion of these unmet needs as early as possible. Such a change will make the Local Plan more legally compliant, sound and comply with the duty to cooperate.
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2269			No		
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2287			No		
783140	Mr Simon Tofts Blue Cedar Homes			LPPub2930			No		
874656	Mr & Mrs W M Wasborough	830006	Mr Mark Richards	LPPub2497			No		
726565	Mr J Stevens Home Builders Federation Ltd			LPPub3191			No		
729199	University of Oxford	873599	Ms Emma Fellowes Barton Willmore LLP	LPPub3213			No		
853098	Mr Richard House Gladman Developments Limited			LPPub3291			No		
858479	Mr Nick Madden			LPPub3243			No		
877856	TFP Developments Ltd	874670	Douglas Bond Woolf Bond Planning	LPPub3146			No		
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub3520			No		
879102	Greenlight Developments	874720	Philip Rawle PRP	LPPub3334			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
404457	Mr Ken Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	853993	Consultants	LPPub2388			No		
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub715			No		
869005	Taylor Wimpy Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited		Mr Andrew Ross	LPPub1062			No		
879120	Gow Family		Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4523			No		
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd		Mr Geoff Gardner	LPPub4549			No		
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd		Mr Geoff Gardner	LPPub4550			No		
722498	mrs Annabelle Zinovieff			LPPub3779			No		
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2768	1.31	Paragraph	Yes	English Heritage Comments Paragraph 1.31	The Council has worked with English Heritage on the historic environment policy and potential site allocations, which should be mentioned in paragraph 1.31.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3775		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on CP2 Duty to Cooperate	Policy CP2 commits the plan to the following, should it be identified that the Vale needs to accommodate some unmet need as an outcome of the joint work with other Local Authorities: If, following this joint work, it is identified and agreed, either through the Oxfordshire growth board or through an adjoining local plan examination, that any unmet housing need is required to be accommodated within this district, the Council will either: undertake a full or focused partial review of the Local Plan 2031, or allocate appropriate housing sites through a subsequent development plan document in conformity with the Spatial Strategy set out in the local plan 2031. Potentially the latter wording (underlined) could rule out

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									other reasonable spatial options which CP2 commits to assessing as part of the joint work and as a result would not comply with the Duty to Cooperate.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3773		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on CP2 Duty to Cooperate	The Local Plan, CP2, discusses the need for the council to: Work jointly with all of the other Oxfordshire local authorities to address any unmet housing need. This will include assessing all reasonable spatial options, including the release of brown field land, the potential for new settlements and a full strategic review of the whole of the Oxford green belt. These issues are not for the Council to consider in isolation. The county is supportive of this intention but there is a need for an Oxfordshire wide approach which integrates housing provision, employment and infrastructure across the county to ensure coordinated and not piecemeal planning. This should be made explicit in the text to ensure the Plan complies with Duty to Cooperate.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3781		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on CP2 Duty to Cooperate	Policy CP2 commits the plan to joint working with other Local Authorities regarding unmet need but it does not provide a firm commitment concerning the timeframe of completing this which does not fully comply with Duty to Cooperate.
874773	Mr Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3983		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on CP2 Unmet Need	Unmet Need and early review of the Plan. The Plan contains a policy relating to unmet housing need across Oxfordshire (CP2), identifying that the City may not be able to accommodate the whole of its housing requirement within the plan period of 2011-2031. However it has not considered explicitly how any unmet need might be delivered and which could require a need to look at different spatial strategies. There is a need to ensure that the Plan adequately addresses the issue of collaborative working to deal with unmet housing needs. A countywide strategic review of spatial strategy options and associated infrastructure planning is required to accommodate unmet need, the process of which has to be defined. The wording proposed in the policy should be amended to make it more explicit about the need for an Oxfordshire-wide, comprehensive approach, which integrates housing provision, employment and infrastructure across the county. 11. Should it be agreed that all or part of this growth be within the Vale, the impact and infrastructure to support that growth would need to be looked at, potentially through the context of a different spatial strategy to that proposed in the current Plan. 12. The Plan proposes either a review or a Development Plan Document to deal with unmet need in conformity with the Spatial Strategy. The county agrees with this proposition but would like to see flexibility in policy to allow for a different/modified spatial strategy that may be more aligned to the County overall.
725173	Policy Unknown	0		LPPub2177	1.22	Paragraph	No	Oxford City Council	Paragraph 1.22 refers to the Oxford City SHLAA being underway at the time of writing. We can now confirm that this

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Oxford City Council							Comments on CP2 Unmet Need	work has been finalised and published, and takes into account all of the comments made by Vale and the other districts during the 'check and challenge' process. The SHLAA identifies a capacity of 10,212 in the City 2011 to 2031. This is considerably short of the need identified in the Oxfordshire SHMA of 24,000 to 32,000 homes. I would highlight that a draft SHLAA reporting a similar number was circulated to VoWH Council on 1st October, well before the Vale Plan was finalised and published and within 6 months of the publication of the SHMA. It cannot be appropriate for the Vale Plan to ignore the implications of this evidence which was available well before publication of the plan. In light of the background, there is no justification for not making provision in Plan policies or delaying the process. Well before commencement of preparation of the Vale Local Plan, Oxford's unmet needs were known to be of a scale that would require a strategic approach in the context of the Local Plan Part 1: the evidence for this includes the former South East Plan and supporting evidence base (as highlighted in the corresponding Panel Report) and the previous 2007 SHMA. Therefore for paragraph 1.23 to explicitly make provision only for Vale's own housing needs whilst disregarding Oxford's unmet needs is not an appropriate strategy when assessed against alternatives, and is therefore not justified . (This also applies to all other relevant parts of the Plan.)
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2216		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	Oxford City Council Comments on CP2 Unmet Need	Concluding remarks It is with regret that Oxford City Council is obliged to maintain a fundamental objection to the approach taken in the Vale Local Plan Part 1. This is due to the failure to take adequate account in the Plan of Oxford's well-evidenced and substantial unmet housing need. This runs contrary to the NPPF and the Duty to Cooperate which require that the full, objectively assessed needs of the housing market area should be addressed in local plans, working on a cross-boundary basis. The City Council confirms that it wishes to continue to engage with the Vale of White Horse District Council on this and other matters, noting that the Duty to Cooperate applies on an on-going basis, and up until submission in the context of local plans.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2169		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	Oxford City Council Comments on CP2 Unmet Need	Duty to co-operate and overarching soundness issues (in particular relating to meeting Oxfordshire's housing needs) It is to be welcomed that the Duty to Co-operate Topic Paper (para 3.4) recognises that the following are all strategic issues related to making provision for housing needs from Oxford: "Specific comments relating to Vale's duty to cooperate included: - concerns that Vale would need to address some or all of the unmet need expected to arise from Oxford City and potentially from other neighbouring authorities in the housing market area - some comments raised the point that Vale's Local Plan was proceeding prematurely in relation to the above point and questioned its soundness as a result - some general comments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>in support of the inclusion of a policy in the local plan looking at addressing Oxford's un-met need - Oxford City Council objected to the Housing Supply Update consultation in that it did not make provision for any unmet Oxford City needs - request for clear and demonstrable cooperation to take place between relevant authorities regarding the expansion of Oxford Brookes University - some commented on the need for a strategic review of the entire Oxford Green Belt rather than a local review"</p> <p>However we would comment that to simply note these issues without ensuring that they have had sufficient influence on the Plan is inconsistent with the Duty to Co-operate. In terms of joint working and effective outcomes, regard must also be had to the Duty to Cooperate and Tests of Soundness. The NPPF sets out the Tests of Soundness that are supported by PPG: Tests of soundness in NPPF (paragraph 182) (emphasis added):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so while achieving sustainable development, and • effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities. PPG sets out that this process should produce “ effective and deliverable policies on strategic cross boundary matters” (paragraph 001 Reference ID: 9-001-20140306). The City Council acknowledges that there has been effective joint working in jointly commissioning and producing the SHMA. The Oxford and Oxfordshire City Deal was a further example of successful joint working across all the local authorities in the County: this commits the authorities to meeting the Oxfordshire objectively assessed housing need in full. The City Council is actively engaged with the post-SHMA process as a member of the Growth Board and its subsidiary groups. However the Duty to Cooperate is not just about process but also about achieving effective outcomes, and the current wording in the proposed policies is not effective with regards to meeting Oxfordshire's housing needs. It fails to address Oxford's unmet need, which for some years has been clearly and irrefutably evidenced, and pushes into the future any commitment from the Vale District Council to address this. The Duty to Cooperate Topic Paper (para 3.17) refers to the agreed ‘post SHMA’ process, which is being overseen by the Growth Board, and we welcome this process as facilitating a useful dialogue. However that process explicitly refers to the ‘sovereignty’ of Local Plans and does not guarantee any appropriate provision for Oxford’s unmet needs. It therefore falls to individual Local Plans that have not yet been adopted to include outcome-based (rather than future process-based) policies to address the unmet need. I would refer you to the

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									letter from the City Council dated 4th April 2014 to Scott Riley responding to the Housing Delivery Update and our further letter dated 8th August 2014 to Ronan Leydon for evidence of the City Council's clear and longstanding concerns regarding the Duty to Cooperate.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2166		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	Oxford City Council Comments on CP2 Unmet Need	Oxford City Council response to Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 1 Publication Oxford City Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 1. However the City Council has a fundamental objection to the approach taken in the Plan to the Duty to Cooperate, in particular regarding meeting Oxfordshire's housing needs, and to the link between this and the soundness of the proposed Plan. You will be aware from our previous discussions and representations to earlier consultations on the Plan that Oxford is facing a deepening housing crisis, with various national surveys carried out in recent years identifying Oxford as the least affordable city in the country. The severe constraints on land availability within Oxford's administrative boundaries mean that we must look to neighbouring districts, which are geographically much larger than Oxford, to provide housing land within close proximity of Oxford to meet a portion of Oxford's housing needs. It is necessary to urgently begin to address the significant unmet housing need of the City that was most recently identified in the Oxfordshire SHMA 2014. Local Plans must comply with the Duty to Cooperate, which expressly means addressing cross-boundary development needs and achieving outcomes to this within the Plan . There is no support in Government policy, guidance or published best practice for references to future arrangements or future joint working to address cross-boundary needs. The City Council concludes therefore that, overall, the Vale Local Plan Part 1 fails to meet the legal test for the Duty to Cooperate, and cannot be assessed as a sound Plan. It also fails to consider all reasonable alternatives and therefore is legally vulnerable when considered against the SEA Directive. These are complex matters that overlap and are not entirely separate, I have as far as possible cross-referenced each point raised with the relevant paragraph/part of the Plan, and indicated the Test of Legal Compliance or Soundness to which it applies.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2174		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	Oxford City Council Comments on CP2 Unmet Need	1 - Introduction Paragraphs 1.9, 1.11, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 1.32 and Core Policy 2 It is clear that an outcome-based policy is needed to comply with national policy and established best practice in plan-making. The NPPF states in paragraph 47: "To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should... use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>housing strategy over the plan period.” The NPPF is clear that the OAN relates to the Housing Market Area – in this case the county of Oxfordshire. Meeting only the Vale of White Horse’s Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN) as an ‘important first step’ is therefore not compliant with the NPPF which requires that the OAN of the whole Housing Market Area should be addressed. Paragraph 178 of the NPPF makes it clear that the Government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities. Paragraph 179 goes on to say: “Local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. Joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas – for instance, because of a lack of physical capacity or because to do so would cause significant harm to the principles and policies of this Framework.” Reflecting this and recent experience of local plan examinations, a recent Planning Advisory Service publication, “Doing Your Duty – Practice Update” advises: “It is not sufficient for an authority to acknowledge that it may have to address potential unmet needs from within its own HMA and adjoining HMAs by including a proposed contingency approach in their plan to trigger a review with neighbouring authorities to agree a future strategic framework for local plans. The plan has to be assessed on the level of cooperation that has led to the current draft plan and not what may happen in the future.” (subsection 9, page 11) It is clear therefore that the Duty to Cooperate has not been complied with (a legal compliance issue) as it has not produced effective and deliverable policies on strategic cross-boundary matters. This means that it is also not effective (a soundness issue). The City Council would also want to stress that in the event that the Vale Plan is found sound in 2015, the ongoing work of the Growth Board in respect of addressing the Oxford unmet need would meant that the Plan would be out of date within a very short period of time. This would also render the Plan not effective , and is misleading to communities, developers, and Neighbourhood Planning groups. The Vale cites the example of the Inspector currently examining the Cherwell Local Plan as a reason to permit the plan to progress without specific provision for Oxford. It should be remembered that the Cherwell Plan, and the approach taken, has not yet been found sound, and that in any event it is not directly transferrable to the Vale scenario because the joint work has moved on significantly since Cherwell submitted its plan. Most significantly in relation to paragraph 3.40 of the Duty to Cooperate Topic Paper, Oxford City has now published Oxford’s Housing Land Availability and Unmet Needs</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									Assessment (see below).
874773	Mr Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3990	1.3	Paragraph	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Paragraph 1.3	The Local Plan does not align fully with the county council's strategy and the Minerals and Waste Local Plan or reflect the fact that Oxfordshire County Council produces the Minerals and Waste Local Plan for Oxfordshire.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3941	1.6	Paragraph	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Paragraph 1.6	Minor grammatical change. Para 1.6: Details of how..... ARE set out...
729030	Planning Policy South Oxfordshire District Council			LPPub3818	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	Yes	CP2 South Oxfordshire District Council Comment	South Oxfordshire District Council confirm the Councils have worked together however supporting text could be improved to reflect partnership working.
874630	Mr Philip Smith Swindon Borough Council			LPPub2544		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	Yes	Swindon Borough Council Comments	The Vale of White Horse Local Plan identifies a quantum of housing to meet its objectively assessed need as identified in the latest Oxfordshire wide Strategic Housing Market Assessment, including that arising from economic growth. This should ensure that any unmet need is not met within adjacent authorities such as Swindon and is consistent with the approach taken within the Swindon Borough Local Plan. Whilst it is recognised there may be an additional requirement with the VoWH to accommodate unmet need arising from Oxford City, as this has yet to be quantified and given the urgent need to have an up-to-date WOWHDC Local Plan, the proposal to address this through a partial review of the Plan is a pragmatic one under the circumstances. However it is recommended a time frame is included for such a review, to enable some certainty to the process. Also it is recommended that a housing trajectory is included within the Local Plan itself in order for ease of reference, rather than within a topic paper as presently shown.
872900	Mr Andrew Jeffries			LPPub1266		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Local Plan general objection	Object to the Local Plan for a number of reasons as outlined in additional comments
871668	Mr Alistoun			LPPub1081			No		
872079	Mr Sean Mannall			LPPub484			No		
873519	Mr Michael Knott			LPPub1355	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Local Plan Plan period	Local Plan should plan for a shorter period then review the situation.
749047	Fraser			LPPub2504	0	Local Plan	No	Local Plan	It is essential the whole procedure is transparent. One comment

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
741327	Old David Wilson Homes Southern	873720	Ms Donna Palmer Boyer Planning Ltd	LPPub2636		2031 Publication Version	Yes	Procedure	raised whether the production for the Plan in two parts is the most appropriate procedure given government guidance advises LPA to prepare a single LP for its area, while site allocations are produced through additional LP's or AAP's.
872108	Mr Jonathan Noys			LPPub2471	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	General Plan Comment	Over population will lead to social unrest and the Plans fails to accommodate self-builds.
404457	Mr Ken Dijksman Dijkman Planning LLP			LPPub4102			No		

Summary of Representations: Chapter 2 Key Challenges and Opportunities

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub306	2.14		No	Allocation at Harwell and impact on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Two objections state that the plan is inconsistent with Paragraph 2.14, which refers to the high quality rural nature of the district (including designations such as AONB). It is stated that there are two allocated sites within the North Wessex Downs AONB as this will not protect or enhance the special characteristics of the AONB, will have a serious negative impact on the landscape and the environment, the Landscape Study recommended that the site has low landscape capacity and no part of the site is suitable for development. Clear non-compliance with paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF, the CROW Act 2000 Section 85, and Core policy 44: Landscape.
831397	B Read			LPPub3962			No		
730229	Mr Nigel Warner		Abingdon Town Council	LPPub2067	2.80	Paragraph	Yes	Building healthy and sustainable communities	Two general comments were received regarding the 'building healthy and sustainable communities' section. These stated that there is a need to consider restricting permission for removal/conversion of bungalows for the increasing population of people aged over 55 and that the plan fails to provide the necessary safeguards to protect our villages, development has spread in unachievable packets which will gravely damage the Vale as a desirable area to live.
756175	Mr Robin Draper			LPPub1228		Chapter 2: Key Challenges and Opportunities	No	Building healthy and sustainable communities	Comments were received that state that the Plan proposes too many houses that is unrealistic, and not in line with Government Projections, and not deliverable, thus ineffective and no consideration has been made of the Plan's cumulative impact on the Vale as a whole and the local communities. It is also stated that development will be developer led.
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub1079			No		
872770	Mr Andrew Skinner			LPPub1182			No		
756175	Mr Robin Draper			LPPub1075			No		
725173	Policy Unknown		Oxford City Council	LPPub2182		Paragraph	No	Oxford City Council ccmments on Building healthy and sustainable communities and housing requirement	Paragraphs 2.8 and 4.10 refer to the 'key challenge' of 'providing for our housing need'. The Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN) for VoWH of 20,560 homes is referred to. In order to provide the right context and ensure the Plan is effective , this must also refer to the unmet need with the Housing Market Area particularly that arising from Oxford.
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2066 LPPub2064			Yes Yes	Building healthy and sustainable communities	Two comments relating to the 'building healthy and sustainable communities' section, state that social facilities and the standard of living, referred to in Paragraph 2.8, does not mention the importance of public houses as social facilities and Paragraph 2.7 neglects to mention there are areas with high levels of deprivation.
724877	Mr Martin Small English			LPPub2769 LPPub2771 LPPub2770			Yes Yes Yes	English Heritage Comments on Conserving our	Although not an issue of soundness, the section on promoting tourism on page 25 could helpfully refer to the historic character of the Vale and the heritage assets therein being an important

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Heritage South East Region							Historic Environment	attraction for tourists. English Heritage welcomes the section on “Conserving our historic environment” on page 27. English Heritage welcomes the reference to the conservation areas in the district in paragraph 2.14 and the recognition of the importance of development protecting and maintaining the special characteristics of the built and natural environment, but we would prefer “.....protecting, maintaining and enhancing the special characteristics of the built, historic and natural environment of the Vale.....” as not all historic features are “built” or “natural”.
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub966		The Vale of White Horse District and its wider setting	No	Figure 2.1	Figure 2.1 needs remedying to not define Botley as a town.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs		Oxfordshire County Council	LPPub3944			Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Figure 2.1	Fig 2.1 should show the route of East West rail and para 2.12 should refer to East West rail providing access to destinations beyond Oxford
725173	Policy Unknown		Oxford City Council	LPPub2183			No	Oxford City Council Comments on Supporting sustainable transport and accessibility	Paragraph 2.13 refers to the ‘key challenge’ of delivering a shift towards more sustainable modes of travel, and then lists the ways in which this could be achieved. However there is no recognition of the significant level of out-commuting, nor the importance of locating development close to the main urban centre of Oxford to achieve this. The City Council notes the latest Census 2011 analysis of commuting patterns that shows an average 10,800 journeys per day from Vale of White Horse to Oxford (around three times as many as travelling to the second most popular destination, South Oxfordshire). This is an increase of 430 journeys (4% increase) since 2001.2 Lack of consideration of this issue means that the Plan is not effective .

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub164	2.10		No	Potential Harwell Local Development Order and impact on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Twenty nine comments related to a potential Harwell Local Development Order and impact on the AONB, specifically; the use of LDO's to speed up delivery must be questioned within the AONB; although the Oxford Harwell Campus is considered a brownfield site, any new development within the site boundary should still take into account the impact on the North Wessex Downs AONB; and therefore, the appropriateness of using LDO's within the AONB setting needs to be questioned.
829387	Mr Keith Russell			LPPub459			No		
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub140			No		
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group			LPPub269			No		
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub305			No		
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub640			No		
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub349			No		
872051	Mr Ian Page			LPPub434			No		
872161	Mr Keith Minter			LPPub565			No		
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub854			No		
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews			LPPub1785	2.10		No		
871887	Mrs Caroline Liddle			LPPub2116			No		
874461	Paul Turner-Smith			LPPub3051			No		
831397	B Read			LPPub3951			No		
828246	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4292			No		
828996	Mr Richard Benton			LPPub4445			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829482	Mr Paul Beasley			LPPub4425			No		
831003	Steven and Jane Hale			LPPub4393			No		
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp			LPPub4246			No		
874124	Mr David Tilbury			LPPub4122			No		
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg			LPPub4197			No		
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies			LPPub4220			No		
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4505			No		
872717	Mr Brian Morris			LPPub4297			No		
872790	Mrs Lorraine Elliott			LPPub4335	2.10		No		
874622	Mr Kenneth Slater			LPPub4340			No		
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley			LPPub4389			No		
874696	Mr Tom Davies			LPPub4280			No		
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4379			No		
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3320	2.14	Paragraph	Yes	Protecting the environment and responding to climate change	Comments regarding 'protecting the environment and respecting and responding to climate change' relating to; Oxfordshire County Council state the challenge should be 'Protecting and enhancing biodiversity', South Oxfordshire Council state this section should acknowledge the need to work with neighbours, particularly to link key wildlife habitats and in protecting designated sites close to the District boundary; and

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									there is support for the intention to protect biodiversity including the retention of wildlife corridors on existing and new build sites, especially in relation to gardens. It is also suggested that there is a need in the framework that landscape protection should be in accordance with a criteria based policy and the relative weight to be applied to the landscape designation should be commensurate with the landscape status of the site, whether that is international, national or local.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs		Oxfordshire County Council	LPPub3907			Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comment on Protecting the environment and responding to climate change	P 27 Challenge should be 'Protecting and enhancing biodiversity'
729030	Planning Policy		South Oxfordshire District Council	LPPub3826	2.14	Paragraph	Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council Comment on Protecting the environment and responding to climate change	Protecting biodiversity - This section should acknowledge the need to work with neighbours, particularly to link key wildlife habitats and in protecting designated sites close to the district boundary.
879120	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning			LPPub4526	2.14	Paragraph	No	Protecting the environment and responding to climate change	Protecting high quality landscapes are recognised, but there is a need in the framework that landscape protection should be in accordance with a criteria based policy and the relative weight to be applied to the landscape designation should be commensurate with the landscape status of the site, whether that is international, national or local.
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services			LPPub2343	2.14		Yes	Thames Water Comment - Protecting Water Resources	Thames Water support the section on 'Protecting Water Resources' on page 27. Specifically the section which references waste water treatment facilities and the need to upgrade them in order to facilitate new housing and employment growth
729030	Planning Policy		South Oxfordshire District Council	LPPub3826	2.14		Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council Comment on Protecting Water Resources	Protecting water resources – It may be helpful to acknowledge that this is an area of water stress, if the water cycle study confirms this.
729030	Planning Policy		South Oxfordshire District Council	LPPub3826	2.14		Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council comment on biodiversity	Protecting biodiversity - This section should acknowledge the need to work with neighbours, particularly to link key wildlife habitats and in protecting designated sites close to the district boundary.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729030	Planning Policy		South Oxfordshire District Council	LPPub3851	2	Chapter 2: Key Challenges and Opportunities	Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council Comment on Supporting Economic Prosperity	This overview implies that Science Vale is only concerned with employment. It would be helpful to refer to the Science Vale area stretching across parts of both Vale and South and its mission to provide employment and housing opportunities, to be an attractive and thriving place, to attract infrastructure and investment
729030	Planning Policy		South Oxfordshire District Council	LPPub3822	2.12		Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council Comment on Supporting sustainable transport and accessibility	It would be helpful to mention the proximity of other stations, particularly Oxford, Didcot and Swindon which give direct access to the mainline network.
729030	Planning Policy		South Oxfordshire District Council	LPPub3825	2.12		Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council Comment on Supporting sustainable transport and accessibility.	Supporting sustainable travel 4 bullet With partners supporting improvements. A number of these improvements will need the close cooperation of SODC and OCC to implement this should be acknowledged
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater			LPPub4681	2.10		No	Supporting Economic Prosperity	Comments regarding 'supporting economic prosperity' relating to; economic prosperity is too focused on the Eastern Vale and Science Vale with transport focussed on congestion on the A34; the Plan fails to recognise too many jobs exist in the District which results in high housing cost; and that an Local Development Order (LDO) is an inappropriate mechanism to control development at Harwell Campus, which is located within the AONB.
874401	H Sherman			LPPub3003	2.10		No		
872752	Mr Peter Smith			LPPub1121			No		
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4505			No		
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4622			No		
876244	K Slater			LPPub4658			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831469	Mr Nick Small	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub1122	2.12		No	Supporting sustainable transport and accessibility	A number of comments were received regarding 'supporting sustainable transport and accessibility' relating to; there is no recognition of the significant level of out of commuting; the Plan does not adequately set its objectives in conformity with Para 41 of NPPF regarding investments in public transport; ; Stagecoach support the intent of the Plan and recognise the tighter focus on a hierarchy of modes, and the greatly enhanced role that public transport needs to play to deliver sustainable development on the scale required however the language following para 2.13 does not follow from these stated objectives strongly enough and thus the Plan is not sufficiently effective in providing the clear rationale for subsequent public transport scheme that will need to be identified and funded; and that development in rural areas should not be resisted simply on transport grounds, the lack of development in rural areas has led to a loss of rural bus services.
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1120			No		
879120	Gow Family			LPPub4525 LPPub4525			No No		
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council		Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning Abingdon	LPPub2083			Yes		

Summary of Representations: Chapter 3 Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2773			No	English Heritage Comments on Spatial Vision	English Heritage welcomes the references in the Spatial Vision to new development respecting local character, protecting the Vale's outstanding and distinctive natural and built environment and conserving and enhancing its important heritage. However, the Vale's important heritage should be conserved and enhanced through other measures, not simply through new development, and this should be an objective in its own right as part of a positive and clear strategy for the conservation, enjoyment and enhancement of the historic environment as required in local plans by the NPPF and in line with the tenth core planning principle in the Framework to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.....". We would also prefer "protecting...natural, historic and built environment...." as not all historic features are "built".
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2806			Yes	English Heritage Comments on Strategic Objective 3	English Heritage consider that SO3 should be amended to read "built, natural and historic....". A new specific objective should be added: "Conserve and enhance the historic environment including designated and non-designated heritage assets". These amendments would help ensure that the Plan sets out the positive and clear strategy for the conservation, enjoyment and enhancement of the historic environment required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the NPPF.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2184			No	Oxford City Council Comments	These objectives steer towards a spatial strategy that includes development close to the main urban centre of Oxford, which is the greatest travel generator in the area, and would provide the best opportunity for achieving high sustainable mode shares, reducing the need to travel and making most efficient use of infrastructure.
727675	Mr Henry Venners JPPC			LPPub3714		Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	No	Spatial Vision	<p>A number of comments were received relating to the Spatial Vision, include those who supported the vision as drafted. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that the vision is silent to the need for Green Belt release and therefore does not meet the 'justified' test. The Vision should focus on Harwell Campus as being at the centre of a new community, where additional residential and social development will take place to create a more sustainable international science hub. It is underplaying the important contribution certain locations make in providing new housing. English Heritage consider that the third paragraph of the Vision should be amended to read: "The important historic heritage of the Vale will have been, and will continue to be, conserved and enhanced. New development will have respected the local character of
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2707			No		
872577	DR David Forrow			LPPub942			No		
831469	Mr Nick Small Welbeck Strategic Land LLP			LPPub1124			No		
737200	Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan	LPPub2913			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
758106	Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership	724452	McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning Mr Steven Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4524 LPPub4527 LPPub4763			Yes No No		the Vale, protecting its outstanding and distinctive natural, historic and built environment. High design climate change.” This would accord with paragraphs 17 and 126 of the NPPF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is stated that the Spatial Vision is not a community vision. It is a vision of a small number of council bureaucrats. The Spatial Vision should include reference to an unprecedented uplift in the provision and usage of local public transport, which is required to ensure the plan delivers sustainable development. Modify the Spatial Vision to better reflect the fact that certain larger villages will also perform a vital role in accommodating new development to further support and enhance local services.
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3954		Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	Yes	Spatial Vision & Strategic Objectives	A number of comments provide support to the Spatial Vision and Startegic Objectives as drafted, including those who assert that they are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy.
873484	Redrow Homes Ltd	876188	Mr Robert Barber Pegasus Group	LPPub4095			Yes		
874676	Greg Shaw			LPPub3665			Yes		
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3954			Yes		
874460	Mr James Colgate			LPPub1960			Yes		
758106	Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership	724452	Mr Steven Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4763		Spatial Vision	No	Strategic Objective 6	Support for SO6
872822	Mr Ben Reynolds			LPPub1224			No	Strategic Objective 10	It is suggested that Strategic Objective 10 is unachievable given the scale of development proposed much of which is on green field sites. The density and total number of houses being proposed needs to be seriously reduced so that new development does not adversely impact on the natural environment.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353		LPPub2918		Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	Yes	Strategic Objective 11	Strategic Objective 11 appears to imply that there is a Council standard to be met regarding design, which could potentially be prescriptive and contrary to national guidance. It could also lead to a disproportionate level of weight being applied to landscape assets.
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin		Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub3504			No		
870007	Mr Stephen Biggs			LPPub514			No	Strategic Objective 12	Considers the plan to be unsound in relation to SO12 reduce greenhouse emissions. The building of residential properties to the north of Abingdon, out of walking or cycling distance of employment areas, will increase traffic; public transport links are already over-crowded at rush hour. The extra car movements will increase congestion on the A34 (and so greenhouse emissions).
783140	Mr Simon Tofts Blue Cedar Homes			LPPub2934			No	Strategic Objective 2	Strategic Objective 2 should be strengthened to make reference to providing retirement homes as housing for the elderly is identified as a key issue in the District.
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3923	3	Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	No	Strategic Objective 3	Support is stated for Strategic Objective 3 to direct growth to the most sustainable locations in the District, ensuring development is integrated with and respects the built and natural heritage and creates attractive places in which people will want to live, as well as being supported by a sufficient range of services and facilities.
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub3491	3	Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	No	Strategic Objective 6	The respondents strongly support the need for the continued development of the Science Vale area, given its national and international importance.
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub710			No	Strategic Objective 8 - Abingdon	It is stated that the proposed development in North Abingdon is not consistent with Strategic Objective 8 as around 70 % of new jobs are located within the Science Vale area, not within Abingdon and these areas are not well connected by public transport.
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4709			No		
872822	Mr Ben Reynolds			LPPub1223			No	Strategic Objective 9	The plan gives very little detail around what that infrastructure should be or what triggers its implementation. Triggers for infrastructure development (roads, schools, leisure, transport, etc.) need to be specified and housing development should not be allowed to take place without the completed supporting infrastructure.
874401	H Sherman			LPPub3005			No	Strategic Objectives - Faringdon	Strategic Objectives do not adequately address the needs of Faringdon. They are too focused on the Science Vale area.
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub3487 LPPub3488 LPPub3489 LPPub3484		Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	No No No No	Strategic Objectives 1 to 4	The respondents support the strategic objectives as drafted and consider that the proposed allocation new housing development at Harwell Campus will help in meeting these general objectives

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
879120	Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4528	0	Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	No	Strategic Objectives 8 & 9	Strategic Objectives 8 and 9 are insufficiently strongly-worded, inspecific, and lack the focus required to drive through the step changes in public transport accessibility, priority and service quality needed to rebalance transport towards more sustainable modes.
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1125			No		
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2918			Yes		
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub3493 LPPub3496 LPPub3500			No No No		
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub702			No		
872593	Dr Jacoba de la Porte			LPPub971			No	Supporting economic prosperity	It is suggested that the Strategic Objectives do not provide sufficient support to the agricultural sector.

Summary of Representations: Chapter 4 Spatial Strategy

Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub722		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Add Didcot to the Settlement Hierarchy	Add Didcot to the Settlement Hierarchy
874830	Miss Charlotte Goodrum Daniel Watney LLP			LPPub3559		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Chilton settlement boundary	Chilton is allocated through the new Local Plan as a 'smaller village' where development is considered less suitable. Whilst we consider land at Pond Cottages is more likely to be included in a new settlement boundary for Harwell Oxford Campus, a new settlement boundary for Chilton should also be drawn to inform the new Local Plan 2031.
853108	Ian Gillespie			LPPub3432		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Classify Harwell Campus a Local Service Centre	Given that employment opportunities at Harwell Campus cannot be described as 'more limited in range'. There is strong justification for the Harwell Campus to be classified as a Local Service Centre.
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2866		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes		
872360	Mr Peter Hobin			LPPub2948		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	CP3 wording inconsistent	The plan is inconsistent. Core Policy 3 and saved policy NE10 (assessed as fully consistent with NPPF) aim to protect land around Harwell village (not Harwell Parish) from urban sprawl by ensuring there is a rural gap. Whereas NE10 is explicit about this, CP3 says that development in and around larger villages will be limited to that which supports the local needs of the village. Fig 4.1 says the strategy will promote thriving villages...whilst safeguarding...the village character.
726565	Mr J Stevens Home Builders Federation Ltd			LPPub3192		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Delivery	The apportionment of the housing among settlement categories is unsound because it will fail to deliver the overall housing requirement. The Council will need to provide evidence that the 1,000 dwellings can be delivered in an alternative way. This cannot be left to the Part 2 Plan because there is no guarantee that this will be produced quickly enough to enable the delivery of the remaining 1,000 dwellings in time. Greater consideration needs to be given to delivery across the plan period. Smaller sites have shorter lead in times. Allocating such sites in key locations could help bridge the gap in supply until the larger strategic allocations start to deliver units. Given concerns regarding the timescales for the Local Plan Part 2 and restrictions under Core Policy 3 this adds further weight to the recommended approach of a single Local Plan.
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	873720	Ms Donna Palmer Boyer Planning Ltd	LPPub2647			Yes		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley			LPPub99		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Designation of Harwell Oxford Campus as Larger Village	The Settlement Hierarchy is not justified by robust evidence or consistent with National Planning Policy.
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley			LPPub113			No		Delete Harwell Campus, Milton Heights and Rowstock from the list of Larger and Smaller Villages. Harwell Campus is a Science Park not a village, more characteristic of Milton Park and Culham Science Centre than a settlement. Neither Milton Heights nor Rowstock have the characteristics of other villages in the Vale.
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub142			No		Designating Harwell Oxford Campus as a 'Larger Village' in the Local Plan is misleading as the Campus is primarily an employment site on private land. Designate the Harwell Oxford Campus as an employment site.
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub166			No		Paragraph 4.3 fails to mention that a significant proportion of the South East Vale is within the North Wessex Downs AONB, including the Harwell Oxford Campus.
472647	Mr Andrew Lord North Wessex Downs AONB			LPPub262			No		
829387	Mr Keith Russell			LPPub461			No		
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group			LPPub277			No		
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub307			No		
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub644			No		
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub351			No		
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub870			No		
872161	Mr			LPPub567			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831022	Keith Mintern								
872363	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley			LPPub1239			No		
873924	Dr James Vincent			LPPub915			No		
873984	Mrs Patricia Chung			LPPub1714			No		
871887	Mrs Valerie Andrews			LPPub1792			No		
756760	Mrs Caroline Liddle			LPPub2118			No		
737357	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub2478			No		
874461	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2711			No		
831397	Paul Turner-Smith			LPPub3056			No		
875989	B Read			LPPub3968			No		
730242	Mr Derek Tisdall			LPPub4096			No		
828246	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4478			No		
	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4346			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828246	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4299			No		
828246	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4301			No		
828996	Mr Richard Benton			LPPub4447			No		
829258	Miss Josephine Cormier			LPPub4263			No		
829482	Mr Paul Beasley			LPPub4427			No		
829482	Mr Paul Beasley			LPPub4428			No		
831003	Steven and Jane Hale			LPPub4397			No		
831003	Steven and Jane Hale			LPPub4400			No		
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp			LPPub4258			No		
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp			LPPub4253			No		
874124	Mr David Tilbury			LPPub4144			No		
874124	Mr David Tilbury			LPPub4146			No		
874609	Dr			LPPub422			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874609	Jonathan Hogg			1					
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg			LPPub4219			No		
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies			LPPub4225			No		
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies			LPPub4223			No		
875989	Mr Derek Tisdall			LPPub4094			No		
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4514			No		
872717	Mr Brian Morris			LPPub4308			No		
872790	Mrs Lorraine Elliott			LPPub4341			No		
872790	Mrs Lorraine Elliott			LPPub4344			No		
874622	Mr Kenneth Slater			LPPub4343			No		
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley			LPPub4394			No		
874696	Mr Tom Davies			LPPub4284			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4382			No		
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4516			No		
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4625			No		
876244	K Slater			LPPub4661			No		
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater			LPPub4684			No		
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4514			No		
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4624			No		
876244	K Slater			LPPub4660			No		
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater			LPPub4683			No		
730292	Mrs Julia Evans West Hendred Parish Council			LPPub2167			No		
829923	Dr			LPPub354			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Stephen Webb Wantage Constituency Labour Party			6					
874830	Miss Charlotte Goodrum Daniel Watney LLP			LPPub356 1		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Designation of Harwell Oxford Campus as Larger Village (Remove Caveats)	Core Policy 3 designates Harwell Campus as a 'Larger Village' within the Settlement Hierarchy, subject to a caveat which states that Harwell Campus has facilities and services equivalent to a Larger Village. We consider that this caveat introduces ambiguity and could infer that Harwell Campus, whilst having the facilities and services equivalent to a Larger Village, is not considered appropriate for the scale of development supportable at other Larger Villages. Removing the caveat would result in a policy which is clear and practical, ensuring that growth is promoted in all suitable settlements including Harwell Campus.
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub228 9		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	East Challow Settlement	Object to Core Policy 3 on the basis that East Challow is erroneously included within the Western Vale Sub Area.
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub401 5 LPPub336 9		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No No		The Challow Park site sits right on the boundary and would relate to and serve both Sub-Areas. East Challow is a Local Service Centre, but is not allocated any strategic housing development despite its Local Centre status. This approach clearly disregards the settlement classifications set out under Core Policy 3.
758213	The Manor Preparatory School	874466	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub342 4		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Exclusion of Shippon from Larger/Smaller Villages designation	Manor Preparatory School is seeking a policy framework in the emerging Local Plan that will allow it to meet its operational needs. Policy CP3 has not been positively prepared; is not justified or effective; and is inconsistent with national policy. To remedy these defects make Shippon an "inset" village, which will allow the School to plan positively for the future having regard to the requirements of relevant development management policies.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831397	B Read			LPPub4077	4.7	Paragraph	No	Expansion of Chilton village into the AONB	<p>Chilton has been designated a “Smaller Village”, defined as a village “with a low level of services and facilities, where any development should be modest and proportionate in scale and primarily be to meet local needs.” Chilton has increased in size by 80% with the completion of 275 new houses at Chilton Field by Autumn 2014. Use of out of date maps and aerial photographs is of concern. Omitting the recent development from the Local Plan maps is misleading and makes it harder to assess the impact on the AONB and local character.</p> <p>The plan to expand the smaller village of Chilton, within the legally protected landscape of North Wessex Downs AONB, does not comply with Paragraph 4.7 and will undermine Spatial Strategy Sustainable Development Core Policy 1 aim “Promote thriving villages and rural communities whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character”, making the Plan unsound.</p>
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub143		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No		
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub167			No		
829387	Mr Keith Russell			LPPub462			No		
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group			LPPub278			No		
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub308			No		
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub647			No		
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub352			No		
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub875			No		
872161	Mr Keith Minter			LPPub568			No		
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung			LPPub1715			No		
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews			LPPub1793			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874461	Paul Turner-Smith			LPPub3058			No		
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4439			No		
874629	Mr Mark Taylor			LPPub4254			No		
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4516			No		
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4383			No		
869005	Taylor Wimepy Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	853993	Mr Andrew Ross	LPPub1056		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Functional Relationship of Grove with Wantage	Whilst it may be correct to classify Grove as a ' Local Service Centre ' in isolation (and at this time), the specific functional relationship with Wantage and the level of committed development require clarification as part of this policy, so as to ensure that it and the plan as a whole is effective (and sound). Include Grove within Wantage Market Town, so the rate of house completions in Wantage/Grove can be monitored together as being within a Market Town.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub2477			No		
758117	Mr Eddie Wilkinson West Hanney Parish Council			LPPub2399		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Landscape and rural character	CP3 would significantly increase the % of new development in Larger and Smaller Villages. Developments of over 50 dwellings in Larger and Smaller Villages with under 500 dwellings is likely to affect the character, appearance and countryside setting, esp. in AONB, of existing settlements. Relative to small villages, limited development needs to be defined more accurately to ensure our rural villages are not destroyed in the future by excessive over-development. To impose this level of new housing across the Vale needs to be managed sympathetically.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub3524			No		
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley			LPPub1239			No		
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1874		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Larger Village designation regarding Great Croxwell	Great Coxwell is described correctly in CP3 as a "Smaller Village", where any development should be modest and proportionate in scale and primarily be to meet local needs", but in CP4 as a "Larger Village" with an allocation of 400 houses. This does not meet the criteria in Core Policy 3.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831065	Professor Francis Frascina	724322	Mr Nick Lyzba John Phillips Planning Consultancy	LPPub4782		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Larger Village Designation regarding Cumnor	Cumnor lacks the facilities to be designated a Large Village and to support development on the scale proposed. Cumnor Parish is large, but Cumnor village, which acts as the the village element, containing historic buildings, churches, shops, memorials, and community buildings, is very small. To develop area 6 extensively would create an irreversible semi-urban area where the traditional components become irrelevant.
873853	J Kenwright			LPPub1627			No		
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2638			No		
872362	Dr Charles Cottriall			LPPub3701		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No		
831779	Landowners land at South Cumnor			LPPub3883			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
877853	Mrs Susan Moss			LPPub4612		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Larger Village Designation regarding East Hanney	East Hanney does not meet all the necessary criteria to be categorised as a Large Village. East Hanney just scored in the large village category with a score of 14. If it loses the mobile library as is threatened then it will fall out of the Larger Village category by the Vale's criteria and would not be considered for development. The village has one shop, staffed by volunteers, and lacks facilities and infrastructure to support new development.
870814	Mrs Margaret Hanlon			LPPub199			No		
871182	Mr William S.D McCall			LPPub406			No		
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub814			No		
829953	Dr Paul Birkby			LPPub1116			No		
871052	Mr Mike Roberts			LPPub1205			No		
874268	Mr & Mrs Clarke			LPPub2175			No		
868539	Mrs Jacqueline Price			LPPub3050			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3464			No		
829007	Mr Don Smith			LPPub2134		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Larger Village Designation regarding Harwell Village	The designation of Harwell Village as a 'Larger Village' in the Local Plan is questioned since it has a low level of facilities. Harwell Village should be re-defined as a 'Smaller Village'; based on the definitions within the Plan and the housing allocation reassessed according to "development should be modest and proportionate in scale and primarily be to meet local needs". The Plan makes a distinction between Harwell Village and Harwell Campus and the employment opportunities afforded by the Campus should not be considered in the housing demand for the Village.
756610	Mrs Linda			LPPub3120		Core Policy 3: Settlement	No	Larger Village Designation	Sutton Courtenay should be removed from the larger villages list on the basis of lack of sustainability. There is

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Martin Sutton Courtenay Parish Council					Hierarchy		regarding Sutton Courtenay	inadequate road, water, sewerage and public transport, so the village is not in reality a site for sustainable development.
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2691	3	Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	No	Larger Village Designation regarding Uffington	Uffington should not be classified as a 'larger village'.
871011	Mr barry godsell			LPPub67		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Larger Village/Local Service Centre Designation regarding Uffington	<p>Information relating to a hierarchy of settlements in the Western Vale is inconsistent. Core Policy 3 refers to Uffington as a “Local Service centre”. Fig 4.2 describes it as a “large village”. All previous plans have described it as a Large Village. Uffington is much smaller with far fewer services (hardly any in fact) than places like Botley and Grove. There seems to be a similar error in relation to other places including East Challow and Watchfield. Lack of evidence to support classification of settlements in the hierarchy. For example, how can both Botley and Uffington be “Local Service Centres” when the latter is a small rural village in an important historic environmental setting has “a more limited range of employment, services and facilities”, virtually no employment opportunities and very limited services?</p> <p>Uffington should be reclassified as a Smaller Village rather than a Larger Village because of its unique proximity to the AONB and and White Horse Hill and the rural nature of roads serving the village.</p>
871667	Mr Michael Thomas			LPPub208			No		
828742	Mr Michael Lord			LPPub686			No		
872107	Mr Robert Hart			LPPub535			No		
872924	Mr Piers von Simson			LPPub1304			No		
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2342			No		
831326	Henry Snell Woolstone Parish			LPPub2910			No		
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4108			No		
874483	A Gilbert			LPPub2398		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Larger Villages designation	Too much emphasis is placed on “larger villages” . There is no such definition in law and their arbitrary designation is not sufficient to support adding several thousand houses identified in another part of the plan to existing communities of 450 houses.
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	873720	Ms Donna Palmer Boyer Planning Ltd	LPPub2647		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Local Service Centre definition	The definition of Local Service Centres is unclear in its reference to Local Service Centres being defined as larger villages which are themselves a separate category of settlement.
870205	Mr Neil Wells			LPPub64		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Local Service Centre Designation regarding East	There is a discrepancy between the printed copy of the Local Plan and the web-based version. In the printed copy East Challow is a Local Service Centre. In the web-based copy there is no mention of Local Service Centres, simply

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871042	Mr Geoffrey Keene			LPPub68			No	Challow, Shrivenham, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Uffington and Watchfield	larger villages. This may be a mis-print, but if not, it is inappropriate that East Challow should be considered as a Local Service Centre. Due to its proximity to Wantage it cannot even support a local shop. The Settlement Hierarchy on Page 37 is incorrect for the Western Vale Sub-Area as it shows East Challow, Shrivenham, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Uffington and Watchfield under Local Service Centre when you really mean they are Larger Villages. Core Policy 3 is inconsistent with Figure 4.2. Core Policy 3 describes East Challow, Shrivenham, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Uffington and Watchfield as 'Local Service Centres'. This cannot be correct; all previous plans have described these as Large Villages.
828701	Clerk West Challow Parish Council Debbie Lewis-Pryde West Challow Parish Council			LPPub1237			No		
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2340			No		
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3239			No		
874401	H Sherman			LPPub3006		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Market Towns – Faringdon	Core Policy 3 Settlement Hierarchy : states that market Towns have the ability to support the most sustainable patterns of living through their current levels of facilities, services and employment opportunities. This is not true for Faringdon.
829858	Mrs P Maltby			LPPub909		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Methodology	The methodology for classifying larger and smaller villages is flawed. Sustainability points take no account of the capacity of facilities which may be outside Council control. If a bus service or post office closes, sustainability (based on the Vale Town and Village Facilities study) could fall and move a village from the larger to the smaller category. By the Vale's classification this would render it unsustainable for the same level of development. There is a big difference within the larger village category between the size, character and facilities of each village. Cumnor has more in common with Appleton than with Kennington or Wootton, yet Cumnor and Kennington and Wootton have the same classification, whereas Appleton does not. This approach is an inadequate basis for assessing sustainability. We question a hierarchy which places Botley (as a Local Service Centre) lower down than Faringdon (a Market Town) when you compare their relative facilities, services and employment opportunities. The classification of “Market Town” assumes facilities, services and employment opportunities are similar for Abingdon, Wantage and Faringdon when they are not.
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub856			No		
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub853			No		
730237	Mrs Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council			LPPub4055			No		
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2340			No		
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub821		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Milton Heights	Development at Milton Heights would extend Didcot westwards and be in open countryside unrelated to a Large Village. It would adversely affect the setting between Didcot, Harwell Village and East Hendred. Sites 12 & 13 comprise Large Scale development in the AONB which the NPPF requires to be justified by special circumstances. There are

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									no special circumstances given that Harwell Campus (c.285 hectares) provides sufficient land employment, and the existing 2006 Local Plan allocation for 400 dwellings, which has not been implemented over 8 years of the Plan period.
874670	Douglas Bond			LPPub3539		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	North Hinksey mapping	Figure 5.1 Subject to comments on policies Core Policy 3 omit North Hinksey as “smaller village” from the Figure map. The identification of North Hinksey as smaller village on figure 5.1 is inconsistent with the higher level Adopted Policies Map which makes no reference to North Hinksey on the basis that it forms part of the Botley inset,
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd,			LPPub2906		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Revise East Challow and Wantage settlement boundaries	Settlement Boundary for Wantage and Grove should be updated to reflect recent development at Stockham Farm
879104	Leslie Wells	874720	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub3793		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Role of Larger Villages and Local Service Centres	Further explanation of the role Local Service Centres and Larger Villages can play is required. Larger villages are sustainable enough to accommodate District wide housing growth. The policy needs to state this. The explanatory text for Large Villages states that unallocated development will be limited to providing for local needs and to support employment, services and facilities within local communities. The word 'local' should be removed from this explanatory text which should state that Large Villages have good long-term potential for development to provide homes to help sustain, and where appropriate, enhance their services and facilities to support viable, sustainable communities in a proportionate manner. Core Policies 3 & 4 should be amended to exclude the limitations to local needs requirement for such sites only to be accepted through a local plan or neighbourhood development plan.
872752	Mr Peter Smith			LPPub1143	4.8	Paragraph	No	Role of Smaller Settlements	Shippon is classified as neither a large or small village within the Local Plan. P37 states ‘...villages not included within the categories described above are considered to form part of the open countryside where development will not be appropriate, unless consistent with the exceptions policies set out in the Local Plan.’ The Parish Council is concerned that two redundant farmyards [brownfield sites], which have had some commercial use on them, have been excluded from consideration in the current Local Plan, Part I despite them being recommended for redevelopment in the Shippon Village Plan and sustainable developments within the brown line defining the village area. To how many other villages within the Vale would this apply to? Restricting housing development in the smaller villages and towns, forces development into settlements in the Green Belt and AONB. This may generate legal challenges and widespread opposition and render the plan's objectives
730281	Mr George Edmonds-Brown St Helen Without Parish Council			LPPub2114		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No		
875603	Mr Jeremy Flawn			LPPub3133			No		
874670	Douglas			LPPub352			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
875960	Bond	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	7			No		undeliverable. Show more flexibility over housing development in the smaller communities. Core Policy 3 fails to recognise the important role development at the lowest order settlements (ranked below the four tiers of the settlement hierarchy) have played in in maintaining the supply of housing in the Vale. The plan's Glossary states "Smaller villages have a low level of services and facilities, where any development should be modest in scale and primarily be to meet local needs". Accordingly there is no need in the policy to limit development within smaller villages to "infill". It should only be development that is limited and as the Glossary confirms "modest in scale" having regard to the location of the settlement and access to services and facilities. There needs to be sufficient flexibility to deliver development in the most sustainable locations. Our client seeks the following amendment to the plan (bold text is new proposed text): "Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy Smaller Villages The Smaller Villages have a low level of services and facilities, where any development should be modest and, proportionate in scale and to the level of sustainability for each smaller village and should primarily meet local needs supporting village services and facilities." Regarding your proposals for the Smaller Villages within the Vale, we refer you to our response to your February 2013 consultation where we believe the detail needs to be firmed up. We agree with your policy for the villages not included within the settlement hierarchy categories, ie Bourton, that they are considered to form part of the open countryside where development will not be appropriate.
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub4009			No		
875603	Mr Jeremy Flawn			LPPub3128		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Role of windfalls	Paragraphs 4.7-4.15 fail to reflect the role that windfalls in settlements ranked below the four tiers of the settlement hierarchy (para 4.7) have played in the past in maintaining the supply of housing in the Vale
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4478		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Science Vale Area and AONB	The VWHDC Plan uses the basis of speculative potential employment opportunities at Harwell Oxford Campus as a justification to build 1400 of houses adjacent to the site within North Wessex Downs AONB. This building would result in the creation of a new "Larger Village" or "Small Town" predominately within the AONB Lack of detail in the overarching policy document could be a source of confusion over the protection given to AONBs The diagram on page 41 of the local plan highlights the Science Vale area but fails to show the AONB, thereby giving the impression that a large amount of land within the AONB could be available to development.
729552	Mr Terry Gashe			LPPub2594	3	Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic	No	Settlement Hierarchy	The hierarchy concentrates new development on locations which appear to be sustainable in their own right but seems to ignore the fact that the whole District is really just a

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Ferax Planning					Objectives			number of large housing markets, none of which is a single settlement. Sustainable communities are formed by groups of settlements working together and it is damaging to try to reject any form of new development apart from “exception cases” because all settlements of whatever size can, and do contribute to the liveliness variety and interest of the whole area. One of the problems with relying on large allocations of land for housing is the fact that only the large national housebuilders are able to develop such sites. Small local builders are squeezed out of the market. This reduces the variety and range of dwellings available and erodes local distinctiveness. The very small settlements which fall below the threshold of “smaller village” are an important part of the character of the Vale, and they do contribute to, and support nearby larger settlements. The opportunities for new development in such locations is very limited but they will shrink and lose their identity if they are forced to rely just on the “exceptions” policy. The policy should allow for one or two dwellings in such settlements with perhaps an annual limit.
874670	Douglas Bond			LPPub3515		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Settlement Hierarchy and North Hinksey and Botley	North Hinksey is functionally and physically part of Botley. This should be reflected in the Settlement Hierarchy Policy. In the alternative, North Hinksey is within a short walking/cycling distance of facilities offered in a higher order settlement (See Plan WB1) that should be acknowledged in the settlement hierarchy to be effective and sound.
879120	Gow Family Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4535	Figure 5.1	Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Smaller Village Designation regarding Appleton	Appleton as a Smaller Village is not justified, when assessed against the evidence base. The village should be seen as a large village in that it has more in common with a ‘small’ larger village.
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1874		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Smaller villages designation regarding Great Coxwell	Great Coxwell is described correctly as a "Smaller Village" but, in Core Policy 4, as a "Larger Village" in the Western Vale Sub- Area.
874401	H Sherman			LPPub3008		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No		Great Coxwell's Neighbourhood Plan awaits referendum and does not incorporate or agree with these proposed developments.
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3955		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Sub Area Classification regarding Sutton Courtenay	An inconsistency in the plan needs addressing. The mapping shows the village within the South East Vale Sub-Area, but Policy 3 shows the village within Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub- Area. We support the inclusion of Sutton Courtenay in South-East Vale sub-area, due to its wider rural setting and characteristics, geographical location and evidence within the Landscape Character Assessment.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
879104	Leslie Wells	874720	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub379 3		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Support designation of East Hendred as a Larger Village	Agree that the Settlement Hierarchy should designate East Hendred as a Large Village. Overreliance on strategic developments led to the detriment of further development in the villages, notably East Hendred.
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub381 4		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No		Notably the larger villages of Great Coxwell, Shrivenham and Stanford-in the-Vale, which are receiving an astonishing 1,100 new houses between them, yet East Hendred, which sits alongside them in settlement hierarchy is receiving no houses. Larger Villages should only be accommodating 'local need'
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub799		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Support designation of Abingdon as a Market Town	Support the Council's approach in classifying each settlement within the settlement hierarchy, with growth being directed to those considered more sustainable. We especially support the identification of Abingdon-on-Thames as a Market Town.
874473	Mr Richard Burke Commercial Estates Group (CEG)	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub401 8			Yes		Support the Council's view that Abingdon should be a key focus for sustainable housing growth within the Vale. The Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Strategies and Settlement Hierarchy which focus strategic housing growth at the three Market Towns (including Abingdon) is supported and is considered to comply with the Government's drive for delivering sustainable development.
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Oxford Preservation Trust			LPPub143 3		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Support designation of Botley as a Local Service Centre	Oxford Preservation Trust raises additional concerns on the future development of Botley. We support the categorisation of Botley as a Local Service Centre which given its location on the fringes/within the suburbs of the city of Oxford works with the wider designations for the Vale of White.
758245	Bloor Homes	864481	Mr James Stewart-Irvine Savills	LPPub407 8		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Support designation of Drayton as a Larger Village	Support for the categorisation of Drayton as a larger village.
879102	Greenligh Developments Greenlight Developments	874720	Philip Rawle	LPPub335 6		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Support designation of East Challow as Local Service Centre and Wantage as a Market Town	Support East Challow being classified as a Local Service Centre, and Wantage as a Market Town.
879524	Mr Andrew Liddiard	827898	Mr George Paton WebbPaton	LPPub241 5		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Support designation of Faringdon as Market Town	Support is given for the identification of Faringdon as a Market Town within the settlement hierarchy.
873484	Redrow Homes Ltd	876188	Mr Robert Barber Pegasus Group	LPPub408 4		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Support designation of Kennington and Radley as Larger	Support the designation of Kennington and Radley as 'Larger Villages' in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								Villages	
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3734		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Support designation of Radley as Larger Village	Development of the proposed North West Radley allocation, or the potential development of an enlarged allocation incorporating the omitted North Radley site, will serve to support and enhance the vitality of the village and deliver growth in a sustainable fashion in order to sustain and improve existing facilities to the benefit of both new and existing communities. Policy CP3 is considered sound.
874384	Oxford Diocese Board of Finance	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2517		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Support designation of Shrivenham and Cumnor as Larger Villages	Draft Core Policy 3 classifies Shrivenham and Cumnor as Larger Villages. We support the position of these settlements in the hierarchy and note that in addition to allocated development – new development will be permitted where it meets local needs and to support employment, services and local communities.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2920		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Support designation of Shrivenham as a Local Service Centre	Shrivenham's designation as a Local Service Centre in Core Policy 3 is supported. However, the designation conflicts with Figure 4.2 and other parts of the Plan which show it as a Larger Village. These anomalies need to be addressed.
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3955		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Support designation of Sutton Courtenay as a Larger Village (Comment split from LPPub3955)	The designation of Sutton Courtenay as a Larger Village is supported.
735386	Lands Improvement Holdings Ltd	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4069		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Support identification of Wantage as focus for sustainable growth	Support Core Policy 3 in recognition of the sustainable location of Wantage for housing growth.
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3925			No		
853514	Linden Homes Linden Homes	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijksman Dijksman Planning LPP	LPPub2306		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Support Policy CP3	Support for the neighbouring Shrivenham allocation for 500 houses and Core Policy 3 which classifies Shrivenham as a Local Service Centre within the Western Vale sub area.
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2955		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Support the Settlement Hierarchy	Support the Council's view that Abingdon should be a key focus for sustainable housing growth within the Vale. The Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Strategies and Settlement Hierarchy which focus strategic housing growth at the three Market Towns (including Abingdon) is supported and is
783140	Mt			LPPub293			No		considered to comply with the Government's drive for

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874676	Simon Tofts Blue Cedar Homes Greg Shaw			5 LPPub358 5			Yes		delivering sustainable development. The settlement hierarchy appears to be satisfactory. Development should be concentrated in accordance with the hierarchy and there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	326118	Mr David Barnes Star Planning & Development	LPPub420 6		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	Yes	Support the Settlement Hierarchy and designation of Faringdon as a Market Town	Support the spatial distribution and settlement hierarchy, specifically the identification of Faringdon as a Market Town within the Western Vale Sub Area.
58199	John Richards Dandara Ltd,			LPPub258 6		Map showing the strategic growth planned across the Vale of White Horse District	No	General Comment on Settlement Boundaries	Concerns the council have failed to revise its settlement boundaries, which was highlighted in the VOWH draft plan 28th of March, in light of planning permissions and implementations granted by the council since the 2006 LP. For CP4 to be sound and justified the settlement boundaries need to be updated otherwise a number of allocated sites are not fit for the intended purposes of CP4. As part of the up-to-date settlement boundaries, there is an opportunity for the Vale to include possible alternative sites that currently fall outside the settlement boundary, but would provide and alternative more environmentally sensitive location that would reduce the Vales housing need.
872491	Jewson Holdings Limited	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub217 8		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	General Comment on Settlement Hierarchy	The green belt review to address Oxford's unmet housing need is unsound.

Core Policy 4: Meeting our Housing Needs

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874041	Mr Gervase Duffield			LPPub1889		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Coalescence	Need to prevent coalescence between settlements and help them retain a distinct identity and character, eg between Faringdon/ Great Coxwell and Didcot and surrounding villages.
829007	Mr Don Smith			LPPub2138		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Coalescence	<p>The Plan offers no protection to the ancient village of Harwell from coalescence with Didcot. There is no clear boundary map within which building will not be permitted – words cannot offer clear interpretation. A map should be provided.</p> <p>Include a policy in the Local Plan to prevent building on important areas of green space between villages to prevent coalescence, ie as in Shrivenham and Watchfield now only divided by a golf course. Other villages will also need this protection.</p>
722498	Mrs Annabelle Zinovieff			LPPub3772		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Coalescence	
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2345		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Coalescence	
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1509		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery - continued from previous page	No	Consultation	
829213	Ms Celina Sykes			LPPub232		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	<p>Around 125 comments regarding consultation. The report about the consultation process ignores important procedural and policy challenges, and understates public opposition. The Plan is unsound because it is not justified by robust evidence. Therefore lower housing figures (based on Government household projections) should be used and site allocations removed from the Green Belt and AONB.</p>
829611	DR Michael Willis			LPPub609		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
872079	Mr Sean Mannall			LPPub495		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	<p>Concern that VWHDC denied the general public access to comments made as part of the earlier Local Plan consultation until literally days before the current Nov '14 exercise began. Consultation has been flawed because 500 responses about the proposals for Radley were counted as one objection.</p>
872502	Andrew and Sharon Allen			LPPub873		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	<p>Concentrate on areas where expansion would be beneficial. Consider Garden Cities.</p>
872513	Mr Roy Jones			LPPub879		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	<p>Consultation has been inadequate for changes of the magnitude proposed and suggested lack of engagement between the council and developers risks the intent of strategic statements</p>
871668	Mr Alistoun			LPPub1093		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	<p>Online submission system is almost impossible to use with many problems with the Vale's website.</p> <p>The consultation process imposed by the VOWH is seriously flawed, misleading and complex, excluding a</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872900	Mr Andrew Jeffries			LPPub1276		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	<p>vast majority of the community with too much information released, short time span in particular for parish councils to notify local residents, consultation meetings were inadequately resourced, not enough warning and not enough detail on the leaflets in particular the implications around the greenbelt.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding a number of views being ignored and lack of notice in regards to the proposed sites, in particular the views from Cumnor, Peachcroft residents were unaware of the plan to build on Twelve Acre Drive, representations were ignored with respect to the scale of development, impact on AONB and Green Belt and concerns over A420</p>
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1549		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
873884	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1692		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
873988	Mrs Edda Smith			LPPub1812		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
828725	Mr Andrew Litherland			LPPub1980		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2335		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874391	Mrs Helen Rees			LPPub2051		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874706	Deidre Jones			LPPub2016		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874708	Mike Davies			LPPub2011		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
828390	David and Norah Charlesworth			LPPub2420		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
828624	Lt Col (ret'd) Richard Bartle			LPPub2432		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
829381	Mrs Gemma Fraser			LPPub2516		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831358	Clair Chinnery			LPPub2708		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
831358	Clair Chinnery			LPPub2703		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
831807	Ms Angela Raymond Wanborough Parish Council			LPPub2749		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
831807	Ms Angela Raymond Wanborough Parish Council			LPPub2744		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2658		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874094	Mr Robert McGurrian			LPPub2672		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874103	Mr Peter Lister			LPPub2698		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874266	Mr and Mrs Danny Fisher			LPPub2562		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874282	Mrs Alice Pinkney			LPPub2511		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874416	Mr Daniel Essen			LPPub2789		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
742134	Mr Robert Warne S.P.A.D.E			LPPub3038		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
829471	Mr Gordon			LPPub3274		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Consultation	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Stokes					Housing Needs			
831994	Mr Charles Cotttriall			LPPub3102		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874128	A Smith			LPPub3029		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874528	V Johnson			LPPub3081		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
827361	Mr Robin Mooney			LPPub3446		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
829968	Dr Yuka Kobayashi			LPPub3579		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
831190	Mr Simon Jenkins			LPPub3384		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
831190	Mr Simon Jenkins			LPPub3367		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
831307	Ms Carolyn Francis			LPPub3450		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874154	A Anson			LPPub3441		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874669	Mrs Jinty Biggs			LPPub3288		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3605		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3623		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Consultation	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Housing Needs			
874487	Dr Anthony Webster			LPPub3512		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
730237	Mrs Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council			LPPub4047		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
759310	Mr Peter Martin Western Vale Villages Consortium of Parish Councils			LPPub4240		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
759310	Mr Peter Martin Western Vale Villages Consortium of Parish Councils			LPPub4249		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874424	Mr Peter Harbour			LPPub3898		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
831631	Marguerite Osbourne			LPPub1811		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery -	No	Consultation	
874110	D Beer			LPPub3240		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Consultation	
730276	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council			LPPub2385		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub3254		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2661		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
873922	Mrs Vivienne Summers			LPPub1708		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
873922	Mrs			LPPub1709		Core Policy 4:	No	Consultation	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Vivienne Summers					Meeting Our Housing Needs			
873733	S Collison			LPPub1519		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Consultation	
873730	P and K Dixon			LPPub1492		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Consultation	
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4720		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
830181	Mr Peter Hamilton			LPPub4585		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874419	Ken Howard			LPPub4591		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
879287	Alison Smith			LPPub4744		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
874665	Ms Felicity Todd			LPPub4751		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
831065	Professor Francis Frascina			LPPub4779		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Consultation	
872807	ms annabel eyres			LPPub2155		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Consultation	
874271	Mr & Mrs Adrian & Joanne Samuels			LPPub2533		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Consultation	
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub515	1.33	Paragraph	No	Consultation	
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3752	1.33	Paragraph	No	Consultation	
872362	Dr Charles Cottriall			LPPub3705		Core Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of	No	Consultation	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Sustainable Development			
874694	Mrs Sue Davies			LPPub3573		Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	No	Consultation	
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottrill			LPPub2618		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottrill			LPPub2642		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872105	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council	872103	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council	LPPub2476		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
723546	Dr Susan Nodder Watchfield Parish Council			LPPub2725		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
829968	Dr Yuka Kobayashi			LPPub3103		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872458	Mr Ian Wilkinson			LPPub3218		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872458	Mr Ian Wilkinson			LPPub3216		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
831307	Ms Carolyn Francis			LPPub3447		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
871648	Mrs Jennifer Rolfe			LPPub3411		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
874174	H Rees			LPPub3454		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	Yes	Consultation	
874304	John			LPPub3332		Local Plan	No	Consultation	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Fathers					2031 Publication Version			
722498	mrs Annabelle Zinovieff			LPPub3776		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4720		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
874424	Mr Peter Harbour			LPPub3886		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
874424	Mr Peter Harbour			LPPub3887		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3733		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872911	Professor James Triffitt			LPPub1278		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
873500	Mr Patrick Burnage			LPPub1348		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
873521	Mrs Susan Burnage			LPPub1354		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
873535	Mr William Laing			LPPub1402		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
873536	Miss Katherine Laing			LPPub1401		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
873539	Mr Andrew Laing			LPPub1399		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
873540	Mrs			LPPub1400		Local Plan	No	Consultation	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Anne Laing					2031 Publication Version			
873700	Mr Peter Sissons			LPPub1460		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
729356	Ms Gene Webb			LPPub1769		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
829495	Mr. Martin Dowie			LPPub1626		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
866288	Mrs Maxine Bullock			LPPub1668		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
867424	Prof Alan Atkinson			LPPub1608		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
873682	Mrs Lorene Ashby			LPPub1471		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
873806	Dr Diana Tubbs			LPPub1564		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
874127	Mrs Judith Heathcoat			LPPub2069		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
874128	A Smith			LPPub2156		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
874140	Mr David Launchbury			LPPub2036		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
874154	A Anson			LPPub2262		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
820249	Mr			LPPub2439		Local Plan	No	Consultation	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Gareth Morgan					2031 Publication Version			
827959	Mr James Krol			LPPub2610		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
828972	Mr/Mrs Nic/Rose Hallam			LPPub2450		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub2447		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub2452		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872100	Mr Ian Bannerman			LPPub2448		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
831807	Ms Angela Raymond Wanborough Parish Council			LPPub2743		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872559	Mrs Susan Holroyd			LPPub1071		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop			LPPub1019		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872597	Dr Paul Smith			LPPub982		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4105			No	Consultation	
868665	Mr Stuart Lovegrove			LPPub35		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872108	Mr Jonathan Noys			LPPub544		Local Plan 2031 Publication	No	Consultation	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Version			
872114	Mr Peter Zimmerman			LPPub546		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
758845	Linda J Tillotson			LPPub983		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
832268	Lynda Pasquire Crowley			LPPub768		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872073	Mrs Elizabeth Davies			LPPub698		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872159	Mr L Huxtable			LPPub569		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872180	Ms J Kelly			LPPub585		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872186	Alison Shelley			LPPub613		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872205	John Allan			LPPub625		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
872561	Mr James Walton			LPPub895		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
829740	Mrs Isabel Kent			LPPub260		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Consultation	
828243	Linda J Tillotson			LPPub984		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	CP15 regarding Wantage and Grove	The proposals double the size of Wantage and Grove. Developers should be penalised for landbanking.
876244	K Slater			LPPub4657		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Harwell Campus	The proposed allocation of 1,400 houses, the majority on greenfield land, in North Wessex Downs AONB, the

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Housing Needs			largest greenfield allocation in any National Park or AONB in the UK, is not the most appropriate when considered against alternatives, conflicts with the NPPF and CROW Act and is therefore unsound.
872717	Mr Brian Morris			LPPub4601		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Harwell Campus	The environmental impact of the two proposed sites within the North Wessex Downs AONB have not been properly assessed and the increased light, noise and pollution cannot be fully mitigated. The cumulative environmental impact of the East Harwell Campus and the North Harwell Campus have not been considered.
876244	K Slater			LPPub4671		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Harwell Campus	
876244	K Slater			LPPub4673		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Harwell Campus	
831397	Mrs Judith Goodall			LPPub1412		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Harwell Campus	<p>In the various landscape assessments of the AONB sites, there is no evidence of “great weight” being applied to AONB characteristics when evaluating the selection of sites.</p> <p>Rather than propose to build 1,400 houses at Harwell Campus East and Harwell Campus North develop Valley Park and Didcot A which have the capacity.</p> <p>Delivery of housing will not match employment growth at Harwell Oxford Campus, making the plan unsound. Harwell Oxford Campus have their own more sustainable vision for the Campus, supported by local people. Their masterplan integrates housing within the Harwell Oxford Campus perimeter and enables the Harwell Oxford Campus to house visiting academics and contract workers.</p>
869005	Taylor Wimpey Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	853993	Mr Andrew Ross	LPPub1063		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	SHMA - Smaller Sites	It is concerning that the Council's evidence base does not identify clearly the 3,169 “known commitments” which form part of the provision to meet the overall 20,560 dwelling requirement. It would assist all parties for this information to be made available, as without scrutiny it is not clear what this part of the supply is specifically comprised of (and whether there is any double counting), and if this results in any shortfall that may need to be addressed (to make the plan effective and sound) by additional Part 1 or Part 2 allocations.
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3743		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Support	The Freeholder supports CP4 and considers it to be sound.
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2291		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	CP4 – Unmet Need	The housing requirement of Core Policy 4 is unsound for failing to address Oxford's unmet housing needs at the current time.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs			LPPub3783		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	Yes	CP4 – Unmet Need	Policy CP4 (footnote) refers to joint working with other Local Authorities regarding unmet need. Imprecise

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Oxfordshire County Council					Housing Needs			wording could lead to delays in meeting Oxfordshire's unmet housing need. The Plan would not comply with Duty to Cooperate.
729199	University of Oxford University of Oxford	873599	Ms Emma Fellowes Barton Willmore LLP	LPPub3204		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	General Comment	Housing requirements Core Policy 4 (Meeting our housing needs) acknowledges that 1,900 dwellings remain to be identified and will be allocated through the Local Plan Part 2, Neighbourhood Plans or the Development Management process. Given the level of housing need the plan should be as flexible as possible in allowing this housing need to be met as soon as possible. Houses already built need to be included in the average projected numbers Part 1 + Part 2
874670	Douglas Bond			LPPub3518		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	General Comment	
875809	Mrs Jennie Cosgrove			LPPub3707		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	General Comment	
872186	Alison Shelley			LPPub595		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	General Comment – Affordability	
875875	Mrs Carol Altman			LPPub3754		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	General Comment – Affordability	Housing in Abingdon is expensive. Will the developers be able to sell the new ones? New jobs will go to young(ish) people entering the job market. Many are paying off student loans so will not be able to buy these houses. Is there a link between average salaries and house prices? Building more houses does not improve their affordability. The Plan will only boost the profit of housebuilders. Building large numbers of homes won't meet local need but will attract more people to Oxfordshire who work in London pushing prices up and making housing less affordable to local people.
874154	A Anson			LPPub3459		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	General Comment – Affordability	
871068	Mr Chris Fox			LPPub1699		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	General Comment – Affordability	
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3312		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Delivery	Overreliance on the private sector and lack of measures to assess how objectives will be achieved and developers will deliver what they have promised.
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	LPPub4553		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Delivery	To address the current severe housing delivery shortfall (some 5,000 homes required on new sites within 5 years in addition to existing commitments) it is necessary that some assessment is made of delivery 2015 - 2020 from each identified site, but there is none. There must be serious doubt that such delivery can be achieved so that the Framework's requirement will not be satisfied
875813	Mr M Palmer			LPPub3710		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	Over 400 comments were received relating specifically to the housing target set out within the SMHA. The main comments received include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis of the Local Plan job growth and housing requirement is unsound. The SHMA overstates housing need in the Vale. The level proposed – 20,560 homes by 2031 - is twice the government's
875867	Mrs Susan Cobham			LPPub3746		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Needs			<p>household projection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The projection for job growth which informs housing figure is unsustainable and unrealistic. Issues include: double counting, inconsistency between economic and housing growth assumptions. Inadequate consideration has been given to social, environmental factors or infrastructure. Uncritical acceptance of the SHMA figures as targets has led to the inappropriate allocation of sites within the Green Belt and North Wessex Downs AONB. Concern that Central Government can impose on a town a requirement to build huge numbers of houses whose existence will totally alter the character of the existing settlement. There seems to be a great deal of speculative thinking to produce huge numbers of jobs and houses, but no provision made for periodic recession, and reductions in growth. The SHMA is flawed. Review the SHMA but do not sacrifice the Green Belt. According to Planning Inspector Jonathan King the SHMA must be rigorously tested in order to establish that it is robust. SHMA figures should only be taken into account, alongside figures derived from government household projections using most probable values for input parameters rather than extreme figures. build rates to achieve the target are unrealistic – this policy takes no account of the availability of raw materials such as bricks, or skilled building labour needs – both in short supply. The SHMA has been taken too strict/exact with no room for flexibility and should have been analysed against social, environmental and infrastructure considerations. Suggest that a housing target range should be used. More thought should be given to changing housing market and industry structures to provide genuine solutions to those in need of affordable housing. Suggested that houses in the Vale remain unsold so why the need to propose more. Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), which is the basis of the SHMA, has not been subject to public consultation or any independent scrutiny. Need confirmation that the expected economic and population growth forecasts will at least be true for the first two years of the Plan period.
828554	MR Keith Bushnell			LPPub2679		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872415	Ms Clare Smith			LPPub2480		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872559	Mrs Susan Holroyd			LPPub2485		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872102	Mr John Platts			LPPub2462		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874282	Mrs Alice Pinkney			LPPub2495		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874384	Oxford Diocese Board of Finance	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2534		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
0				LPPub1424		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
0				LPPub1583		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830710	Mr Chris Lane			LPPub1551		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873535	Mr William Laing			LPPub1382		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873536	Miss Katherine Laing			LPPub1381		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873539	Mr Andrew Laing			LPPub1380		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873540	Mrs Anne Laing			LPPub1379		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873616	Mrs Margaret			LPPub1416		Chapter 4: Spatial	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Hughes					Strategy		SHMA	
873682	Mrs Lorene Ashby			LPPub1439		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872819	Mr Gordon Garraway			LPPub1765		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872807	ms annabel eyres			LPPub2150		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828768	Mr Christopher Bryan			LPPub2372		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828768	Mr Christopher Bryan			LPPub2368		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874692	Ruth Stringer			LPPub2228		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730245	Ms Tina Brock Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3554		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756654	Ms Margaret Killick			LPPub242		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756760	Ms Margaret Killick			LPPub249		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756760	Mr Brian Spear			LPPub631		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
758199	DR Michael Willis			LPPub602		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
758845	DR Michael Willis			LPPub606		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
826255	Mr Sean Mannall			LPPub489		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827350	Mr Oliver			LPPub1022		Core Policy 15: Spatial	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Gardiner					Strategy for South East		SHMA	
829611	Andrew and Sharon Allen			LPPub866		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829611	Mr Alistoun			LPPub1086		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830994	Mr Timothy Howse			LPPub1109		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831003	Mr Adrian Gainer			LPPub1127		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831469	Mr Andrew Jeffries			LPPub1270		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831677	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1682		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831677	PJV Rounce			LPPub1871		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East V	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
848989	Mr David Marsh Harwell Parish Council			LPPub3109		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
853514	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1531		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
853514	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1524		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub1101	4.1	Paragraph	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872822	Mr Ben			LPPub1226	4.1	Paragraph	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Reynolds							SHMA	
865452	Mr Robin Border			LPPub4		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
865452	Mr Robin Border			LPPub5		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
865452	Mr Robin Border			LPPub6		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
868665	Mr Stuart Lovegrove			LPPub30		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827535	Mrs Nicola Livingstone			LPPub90		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
726446	Mr Fraser Old			LPPub545		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828243	Dr Ron Colyer			LPPub270		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828243	Dr Ron Colyer			LPPub273		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828703	Mr Tim Pottle			LPPub541		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828972	Mr/Mrs Nic/Rose Hallam			LPPub513		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829213	Ms Celina Sykes			LPPub228		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829929	Mr Richard Peel			LPPub203		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Needs			
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub739		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
870055	Dr Glyn Evans			LPPub52		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871068	Mr Chris Fox			LPPub69		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871669	Mr Russell Irving			LPPub210		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871670	Mrs Julie Irving			LPPub213		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871677	Mr Woodford David			LPPub893		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871740	Yvette and John Earl			LPPub221		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871772	Ms Margaret Killick			LPPub246		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871779	Mr Brian Thomas			LPPub252		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub518		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub511		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730195	Councillor Dudley Hoddinott Vale of White			LPPub729		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Horse District Council					Needs			
756175	Mr Robin Draper			LPPub999		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827350	Mr Brian Spear			LPPub633		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827407	Mr John Ross			LPPub670		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829011	Mr Rogan Meadows			LPPub635		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829294	mrs Julie Pottle			LPPub723		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829294	mrs Julie Pottle			LPPub725		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub679		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829457	Mr Robin Wimborne			LPPub394		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829611	DR Michael Willis			LPPub599		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829677	Mrs Susan Gaskell			LPPub549		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829942	Mrs Lucille Peel			LPPub537		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871974	Ms Lynda Pasquire			LPPub380		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Crowley					Housing Needs		SHMA	
871991	Mrs Sarah Wimborne			LPPub411		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872051	Mr Ian Page			LPPub441		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872067	Mr Kingsmill Bond			LPPub455		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872079	Mr Sean Mannall			LPPub486		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872084	Mr Chris Henderson			LPPub503		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872095	Dr Sarah Eccles			LPPub543		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872100	Mr Ian Bannerman			LPPub512		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
752247	Mrs Anne Feather Kennington Parish Council			LPPub989		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756280	Mr Richard Waters			LPPub1011		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756473	Mr Oliver Gardiner			LPPub1021		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
56600	Mr Alan Wagner			LPPub1077		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756654	Mrs Alice			LPPub1042		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Gardiner					Housing Needs		SHMA	
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub819		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
832268	Lynda Pasquire Crowley			LPPub764		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872105	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council	872103	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council	LPPub719		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872161	Mr Keith Mintern			LPPub573		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872205	John Allan			LPPub617		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872205	John Allan			LPPub628		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872241	Mrs Patricia Meadows			LPPub641		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872370	Mrs Anne Parker			LPPub758		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872383	Mr Stephen Harvey			LPPub763		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872436	Mr Terry Macmillan			LPPub782		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872446	Mr Bernard Pottle			LPPub786		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872450	Mrs Delia			LPPub798		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Weston					Housing Needs		SHMA	
872452	Ms Anna Hoare			LPPub911		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub841		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872542	Mr Graham Deacon			LPPub894		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827918	Mr John Huddleston			LPPub1250		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828453	Mrs Joyce Huddleston			LPPub1263		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829371	Mrs Fiona Newton			LPPub1052		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub1107		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830773	Dr Margaret Selinger			LPPub1118		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley			LPPub1240		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub997		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub998		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871668	Mr Alistoun			LPPub1083		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Housing Needs		SHMA	
871852	Mrs Clare Wagner			LPPub1067		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872355	Mrs Ticia Lever			LPPub960		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872579	Mrs Helen Devenport			LPPub967		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872587	Mr David Perrow			LPPub952		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop			LPPub974		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop			LPPub976		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872661	Mr Mark Atkins			LPPub1023		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872691	Mrs J Thakker			LPPub1038		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872741	Mr Adrian Gainer			LPPub1126		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872777	Mrs Andrea Spencer			LPPub1156		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872778	Mr Andrew Fautley			LPPub1141		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828992	Mr Peter			LPPub1495		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Vezev					Housing Needs		SHMA	
828993	Mrs Wendy Vezev			LPPub1500		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830390	Philip Deer			LPPub1587		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872880	Mr David Hastings			LPPub1232		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872900	Mr Andrew Jeffries			LPPub1267		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872924	Mr Piers von Simson			LPPub1301		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872926	Mr John Bleasdale			LPPub1307		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873089	Mr Andrew Turner			LPPub1336		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873519	Mr Michael Knott			LPPub1363		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873521	Mrs Susan Burnage			LPPub1353		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873700	Mr Peter Sissons			LPPub1456		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873701	Mrs Catherine Warren			LPPub1464		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873705	Mrs Deborah			LPPub1468		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Baird					Housing Needs		SHMA	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken			LPPub1738		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken			LPPub1739		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829402	Ms Janet Pottle			LPPub1660		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831232	Dr Brian Gasser			LPPub1578		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871068	Mr Chris Fox			LPPub1701		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873801	Miss Camille Deer			LPPub1575		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873802	Harry Powell			LPPub1560		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873806	Dr Diana Tubbs			LPPub1558		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873847	Mr David Nowakowski			LPPub1599		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873866	Dr J Watterson			LPPub1641		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873884	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1676		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873885	Mr Christopher			LPPub1677		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Ing					Housing Needs		SHMA	
873886	Mr Simon Warren			LPPub1674		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828725	Mr Andrew Litherland			LPPub1971		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828725	Mr Andrew Litherland			LPPub1972		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1868		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873888	Diana Robertson			LPPub1683		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873903	Linda Procter			LPPub1770		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873922	Mrs Vivienne Summers			LPPub1728		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung			LPPub1722		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874111	Mrs Anne Prior			LPPub1893		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874272	Mr Geoffrey Smith			LPPub1899		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730282	Mr Michael Dew Stanford in the Vale Parish Council			LPPub2052		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730292	Mrs Julia Evans			LPPub2162		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	West Hendred Parish Council					Housing Needs		SHMA	
828725	Mr Andrew Litherland			LPPub1976		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828725	Mr Andrew Litherland			LPPub1981		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828746	Mr John Ammundsen			LPPub2313		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2336		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831961	John Grimshaw			LPPub1985		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
848989	Mrs Anne Davies Clifton Hampden and Burcot Parish Council			LPPub2037		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872807	ms annabel eyres			LPPub2148		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873419	Mr and Mrs Jones			LPPub2031		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874098	Mr Hugh Baxter			LPPub2259		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874101	Mr Tom Gowers			LPPub2297		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874128	A Smith			LPPub2145		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874131	Mr John			LPPub2044		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Earwicker					Housing Needs		SHMA	
874140	Mr David Launchbury			LPPub2032		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874154	A Anson			LPPub2275		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874154	A Anson			LPPub2285		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874298	Dr Robin Rees			LPPub2237		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874391	Mrs Helen Rees			LPPub1997		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target - SHMA	
874442	Mr Jonathon Acres			LPPub1992		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874680	Ricky Cunningham			LPPub2017		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874706	Deidre Jones			LPPub2012		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874708	Mike Davies			LPPub2007		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
726370	Ms C Quarini			LPPub2347		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730276	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council			LPPub2383		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
749572	Mrs Joyce			LPPub2519		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Doughty					Housing Needs		SHMA	
756188	Mrs C Cornish			LPPub2349		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756208	Cllr Richard Webber			LPPub2568		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756662	Mrs Elaine de Ridder Blewbury Parish Council			LPPub2584		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
805299	Mr Frank Dumbleton			LPPub2491		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
820249	Mr Gareth Morgan			LPPub2440		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
821371	Dr David Illingworth			LPPub2550		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827959	Mr James Krol			LPPub2604		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827959	Mr James Krol			LPPub2605		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828390	David and Norah Charlesworth			LPPub2409		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828390	David and Norah Charlesworth			LPPub2413		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828437	Mr Matthew Hall			LPPub2455		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828437	Mr Matthew			LPPub2458		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Hall					Housing Needs		SHMA	
828624	Lt Col (ret'd) Richard Bartle			LPPub2430		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2341		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock			LPPub2365		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
832368	Kathryn Nisbet			LPPub2359		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871676	Mr Ashley Poyton			LPPub2441		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872098	Dr Edward Impey			LPPub2396		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872642	Mr Philip Sandford			LPPub2370		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874483	A Gilbert			LPPub2395		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874535	Mr Anthony Parsons			LPPub2369		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874551	Mr Colin Goodall			LPPub2350		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874711	MD Austin			LPPub2144		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2664		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Housing Needs		SHMA	
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2689		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828863	mrs catherine Mott			LPPub2683		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829381	Mrs Gemma Fraser			LPPub2513		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829960	Dr Robert Amess			LPPub2772		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830181	Mr Peter Hamilton			LPPub2626		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831190	Mr Simon Jenkins			LPPub2795		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831206	Maxine and Ray Bowden			LPPub2676		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831358	Clair Chinnery			LPPub2709		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
832024	Mr and Mrs Roger and Sheila Clarkson Webb			LPPub2593		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottrill			LPPub2620		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2649		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2643		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Housing Needs		SHMA	
872073	Mrs Elizabeth Davies			LPPub2475		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872667	Mrs Maria Bushnell			LPPub2596		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873626	Mr Peter Bowell			LPPub2538		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874094	Mr Robert McGurrin			LPPub2667		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874094	Mr Robert McGurrin			LPPub2669		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874103	Mr Peter Lister			LPPub2692		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874266	Mr and Mrs Danny Fisher			LPPub2555		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874271	Mr and Mrs Adrian and Joanne Samuels			LPPub2524		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874412	A Gaydon			LPPub2700		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874416	Mr Daniel Essen			LPPub2775		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874419	Ken Howard			LPPub2650		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874489	Mrs Sandra			LPPub2737		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Gee					Housing Needs		SHMA	
874545	A Swarbrick			LPPub2641		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874623	Ms Susan Hamilton			LPPub2560		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2752		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2753		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2755		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2756		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2758		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2759		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
723546	Dr Susan Nodder Watchfield Parish Council			LPPub2710		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
723546	Dr Susan Nodder Watchfield Parish Council			LPPub2722		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
726445	Mr K Beswick			LPPub2644		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
728489	Mr David Marsh Harwell Parish Council			LPPub3107		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
728817	Mrs Elizabeth Bennett			LPPub3027		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
728843	Mr James Halliday Foreman Laws LLP			LPPub3111		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828512	Mr Peter Canavan			LPPub3153		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829960	Dr Robert Amess			LPPub2982		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830088	Dr Jane Impey (Mellanby)			LPPub3059		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830088	Dr Jane Impey (Mellanby)			LPPub3067		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830262	Dr Martin Smith			LPPub3033		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831595	Clive Ricks			LPPub2902		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831595	Clive Ricks			LPPub2903		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831624	Mrs RC Fisher			LPPub3151		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872360	Mr Peter			LPPub2965		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Hobin					Housing Needs		SHMA	
874445	Mr Timothy Roberts			LPPub2953		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
755329	Mr Peter Evans Hinton Waldrist Parish Council			LPPub3188		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829471	Mr Gordon Stokes			LPPub3268		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829471	Mr Gordon Stokes			LPPub3269		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829655	Mrs Natalie Kerby			LPPub3258		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830045	Mrs Judy Roberts			LPPub3189		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830045	Mrs Judy Roberts			LPPub3195		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831624	Mrs RC Fisher			LPPub3161		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831994	Mr Charles Cotttriall			LPPub3091		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872458	Mr Ian Wilkinson			LPPub3211		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874128	A Smith			LPPub3018		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874401	H Sherman			LPPub3000		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Housing Needs		SHMA	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith			LPPub3070		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874500	Mr Alex Money?			LPPub3043		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874514	Mr Ian Jackson			LPPub2986		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874545	A Swarbrick			LPPub3136		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874552	Julia Evans			LPPub3142		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874552	Julia Evans			LPPub3139		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874634	Antoinette Meehan			LPPub3062		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874682	Damen Kerby			LPPub3152		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730245	Ms Tina Brock Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3523		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730245	Ms Tina Brock Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3531		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756099	Mr Francis Walsh			LPPub3655		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756760	Mr Roger			LPPub3530		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Turnbull					Housing Needs		SHMA	
827361	Mr Robin Mooney			LPPub3431		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827361	Mr Robin Mooney			LPPub3437		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827932	Julie Mabberley Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			LPPub3575		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827932	Julie Mabberley Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			LPPub3571		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3676		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3677		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829511	MR Stephen Heath			LPPub3456		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829511	MR Stephen Heath			LPPub3458		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829923	Dr Stephen Webb Wantage Constituency Labour Party			LPPub3541		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3673		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831190	Mr Simon Jenkins			LPPub3368		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831190	Mr Simon			LPPub3372		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Jenkins					Housing Needs		SHMA	
831307	Ms Carolyn Francis			LPPub3448		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831307	Ms Carolyn Francis			LPPub3435		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831307	Ms Carolyn Francis			LPPub3433		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872110	Mrs Penny Curtis			LPPub3364		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874110	D Beer			LPPub3160		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874110	D Beer			LPPub3167		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874154	A Anson			LPPub3452		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874158	Antony E Hughes			LPPub3412		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874312	John Power			LPPub3465		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874669	Mrs Jinty Biggs			LPPub3283		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874689	Mrs Sarah Day			LPPub3498		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
722498	mrs Annabelle			LPPub3770		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Housing Target -	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Zinovieff					Housing Needs		SHMA	
759310	Mr Peter Martin Western Vale Villages Consortium of Parish Councils			LPPub3786		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872362	Dr Charles Cottriall			LPPub3690		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874243	Mrs Valerie Krol			LPPub3643		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874243	Mrs Valerie Krol			LPPub3638		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler			LPPub3410		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874316	P Roper			LPPub3508		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3609		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3627		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874430	Mr Craig Dunphy			LPPub3394		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874487	Dr Anthony Webster			LPPub3499		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3574		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874560	Ms Helen Marshall			LPPub3567		Core Policy 4:	No	Housing	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Campaign to Protect Rural England					Meeting Our Housing Needs		Target - SHMA	
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3569		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3555		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874694	Mrs Sue Davies			LPPub3566		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
875814	Mr Roger Green			LPPub3712		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
875857	Mr James Jewell			LPPub3717		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4106		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871706	Cllr Tony de Vere			LPPub3946		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872591	Miss Layla Moran Liberal Democrats, Oxford West and Abingdon			LPPub3966		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874348	Susan Garrett			LPPub3689		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874424	Mr Peter Harbour			LPPub3890		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
875867	Mrs Susan Cobham			LPPub3735		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
875871	Dr & Mrs Rawlings			LPPub3742		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
875942	Cllr Anthony deVere Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub3942		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4298		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4109		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4135		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4120		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4115		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874682	Damen Kerby			LPPub4066		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827386	Dr Christopher Prior			LPPub314		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872735	Mr Timothy Howse			LPPub1104		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872589	Mr Jonathan Armitage			LPPub1466		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872817	Dr A Van Maanen			LPPub1216		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873500	Mr Patrick Burnage			LPPub1347		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1528		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1521		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831631	Marguerite Osbourne			LPPub1805		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874494	Lloyd Czaplewski			LPPub2762		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874559	T Roberts			LPPub2761		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756130	Mr Norman Staples			LPPub1561		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829414	Mr Richard Cave			LPPub654		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872125	Dr Gina Copp			LPPub555		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872445	Mrs Catherine Clayton			LPPub899		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872467	Mrs Claire Tyrell-Williams			LPPub830		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828988	Dr Christopher Bedford			LPPub1161		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831239	Mark Selinger			LPPub1151		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873526	Professor Joe Cartwright			LPPub1362		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873834	Mr			LPPub1592		Core Policy 4:	No	Housing	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Malcolm Posnett					Meeting Our Housing Needs		Target - SHMA	
874272	Mr Geoffrey Smith			LPPub1901		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827341	Phyl Howard			LPPub2103		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
830844	Caroline Ball			LPPub2078		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874566	Claire Inness			LPPub2352		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874579	Shelia Denley			LPPub2263		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874581	Tessa Thomas			LPPub2253		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
785693	Mr Charles Lochrane Compton Beauchamp Parish Meeting			LPPub3207		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
828748	Prof Peter Renton			LPPub3255		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874394	Mrs Alison Draper			LPPub3806		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756743	Neil Fawcett			LPPub1983		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874623	Ms Susan Hamilton			LPPub2563		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
742134	Mr Robert Warne S.P.A.D.E			LPPub3032		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874128	A Smith			LPPub3020		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730237	Mrs Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council			LPPub4048		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley			LPPub116		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub147		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub171		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
749581	Dr Elizabeth Boon			LPPub458		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871601	Mr Fischer			LPPub198		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub318		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub653		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub357		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub884		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
743654	Mr Peter Gore			LPPub627		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874154	A Anson			LPPub2277		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872575	Mr Paul Spencer			LPPub1070		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3679		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3222		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
827361	Mr Robin Mooney			LPPub3439		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871706	Cllr Tony de Vere			LPPub2422		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4703		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873837	Mrs Cecile Deer			LPPub4619		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4704		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
879287	Alison Smith			LPPub4740		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
879287	Alison Smith			LPPub4741		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874665	Ms Felicity Todd			LPPub4752		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730191	Councillor Jim Halliday Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub4754		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831065	Professor Francis Frascina			LPPub4780		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871772	Ms Margaret Killick			LPPub250		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
829611	DR Michael Willis			LPPub603		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1525		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872079	Mr Sean Mannall			LPPub490		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872502	Andrew and Sharon Allen			LPPub867		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871668	Mr Alistoun			LPPub1087		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872900	Mr Andrew Jeffries			LPPub1271		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873884	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1684		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1866		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Western Vale			
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1872		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1530		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872502	Andrew and Sharon Allen			LPPub863		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub735		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874154	A Anson			LPPub3455		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872741	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1690		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub516	1.34	Paragraph	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872719	Ms Tessa Billyeald			LPPub1065		Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872079	Mr Sean Mannall			LPPub487		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871668	Mr Alistoun			LPPub1084		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872900	Mr Andrew Jeffries			LPPub1268		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873884	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1680		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1869		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1522		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub737	1.23	Paragraph	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
756175	Mr Robin Draper			LPPub1069	2	Chapter 2: Key Challenges & Opportunities	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874773	Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub2158		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3237		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
874348	Susan Garrett			LPPub3688		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
820249	Mr Gareth Morgan			LPPub216	1	Chapter 1: Introduction	No	Housing Target - SHMA	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
868665	Mr Stuart Lovegrove			LPPub27		Local Plan 2031 Publication	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
820249	Mr Gareth Morgan			LPPub216	1	Chapter 1: Introduction	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872824	Ms Samantha Bowring			LPPub1225		Foreword	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872775	Strain			LPPub1213		Executive Summary	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872794	Mr Alexander Meredith			LPPub1179		Executive Summary	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872798	Mr Matthew Pryor			LPPub1175		Local Plan 2031 Publication	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
872798	Mr Matthew Pryor			LPPub1173		Local Plan 2031 Publication	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
404457	Mr Ken Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub2122			Yes	Housing Target - SHMA	
871974	Ms Lynda Pasquire Crowley			LPPub388		Local Plan 2031 Publication	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
871772	Ms Margaret Killick			LPPub245		Local Plan 2031 Publication	No	Housing Target - SHMA	
730262	Dr Tian Davidson Hinton Waldrist			LPPub235		Local Plan 2031 Publication	No	Housing Target - SHMA	<p>A number of comments provided support to Core Policy 4. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We support the housing target for at least 20,560 homes to be delivered in the plan period and the inclusion of the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area, in particular the North West Abingdon-on-Thames strategic allocation. Concern that opportunities to increase the numbers on-site may have been overlooked. The Planning Practice Guidance describes an appropriate methodology for the assessment of future housing requirements. Need to build more houses. The current high house prices are an impediment to growth.
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub800		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
874122	Mr Timothy Shepherd			LPPub2001		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target – Support	
749047	Fraser Old			LPPub2502		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
737357	Mr			LPPub2713		Core Policy 4:	No	Housing	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Nathan McLoughlin					Meeting Our Housing Needs		Target – Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In principle we are in favour of more good housing, especially at lower prices We welcome and fully support the Council's proposal to address in full the evidenced housing needs arising in the Vale of White Horse. Furthermore, we support the District Council's pragmatic approach to addressing any unmet needs arising elsewhere in the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area. Support Spatial Strategy and Sub-Area Strategies. Redrow Homes have suggested the inclusion of a signpost to the 'Ring Fence' within the South East Vale Sub-Area which would be helpful in understanding the significant amount of growth planned for this area. We welcome and support the Council's proposal to address in full the evidenced housing needs arising in the Vale of White Horse. We support the proposal to progress with the Local Plan (Part 1) on the basis of meeting the District's own objectively assessed housing needs, whilst working with other Oxfordshire authorities to address any unmet needs in the wider Housing Market Area. In the context provided by the City Deal it is entirely appropriate for the objectively assessed need to be met in full in the Vale of White Horse district. We fully support the Council's proposal to address in full the evidenced housing needs arising in the Vale of White Horse. Furthermore, we support the District Council's pragmatic approach to addressing any unmet needs arising elsewhere in the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area. The full merits of the proposed allocation at North Abingdon are addressed in the covering letter that accompanies this representation. Subject to our comments above regarding the Oxford City housing requirement, we support the housing target for the Vale District providing for the full objectively assessed needs of the Vale as set out in the SHMA. However Redrow Homes suggest modifications are made to Core Policy 4 in order to emphasise that land will be considered for release from the Green Belt where it does not fulfil the purposes at paragraph 80 of the NPPF
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2961		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2854		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
853108	Ian Gillespie			LPPub3430		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3699		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
874676	Greg Shaw			LPPub3586		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target – Support	
874473	Mr Richard Burke Commercial Estates Group (CEG)	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub4023		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
873484	Redrow Homes Ltd	876188	Mr Robert Barber Pegasus Group	LPPub4085		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target – Support	
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3957		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2924		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
783140	Mt Simon Tofts Blue Cedar Homes			LPPub2937		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target – Support	
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	873720	Ms Donna Palmer Boyer Planning Ltd	LPPub2648		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Housing Target – Support	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729199	University of Oxford University of Oxford	873599	Ms Emma Fellowes Barton Willmore LLP	LPPub3234		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Housing Target – Support	
865409	Mr Iain Greig			LPPub3		The Development Plan	Yes	Housing Target – Support	
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3902		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Non-Strategic allocations	A further 1900 dwellings remain to be identified through the Local Plan Part 2, Neighbourhood Development Plans or the Development Management process. The county council will advise on the implications of further housing development as proposals are submitted. Further expansion of village schools is likely to be required.
874773	Mr Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3985		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Non-Strategic allocations General Comment	The county council in principle supports the proposed allocation of smaller nonstrategic sites (0-199 dwellings) through the Local Plan Part 2.
873621	Stockham Properties Ltd Stockham Properties Ltd	872228	mr. Terence Gashe Ferax Planning	LPPub3123		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Policies Map	Seek amendments to the Policies Map for South East Vale Sub Area. CP4 Development Boundary. The defined Development Boundary around Wantage and Grove as drawn is illogical and inconsistent and will lead to anomalies in the future. Saved Policy NE10 Important Open Land - the definition of the boundary has been modified on the Policies Map and this representation seeks a further modification. Land at Stockham south of the canal has now been excluded from this definition and this is supported. However further land which wraps around the western edge of Wantage and links with the excluded area at Stockham should also be excluded. This is indicated on the attached plan.
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub3794		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Policy Wording	We welcome the fact that the housing target figure is expressed as being 'at least'. If a proposal passes the NPPF test of sustainability it should be permitted. Location is only one matter that feeds into an assessment of sustainability. Policy wording should be amended to reflect NPPF phrase relating to development outside the existing built area of settlement; 'special circumstances' and not the phrase 'exceptional circumstances' as set out in CP4. English Heritage suggests wording in order to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of, and clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment required by the NPPF paragraphs 126 and 157.
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2809		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Policy Wording	
830045	Mrs Judy Roberts			LPPub3227		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Reasonable alternatives	An absence of 'reasonable alternatives'. The Plan should be amended to provide: for at least biennial confirmation that expected economic and population growth forecasts

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829511	MR Stephen Heath			LPPub3479		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Reasonable alternatives	are on track and the capability to amend the programme in the light of these. The absence of 'reasonable alternatives' such as those explored in the Local Plan 2029 Part 1. Those alternatives applied before the SHMA was published and now irrelevant. They cannot therefore be described as 'reasonable' and need to be replaced.
874830	Miss Charlotte Goodrum Daniel Watney LLP			LPPub3558		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Settlement Boundary at Harwell Campus	Establishing Harwell Campus with a settlement boundary would result in a more clearly defined settlement, and would ensure growth within the area is sustainable.
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3631		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	<p>A number of comments were received relating to the Spatial Strategy. These include:</p> <p>Objection to the proposed presumption against development outside built up areas of Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Larger Villages in Core Policy which is contrary to the NPPF which is clear that sustainable development should go ahead without delay.</p> <p>Spatial strategy is unsound. The policy is not positively prepared or justified as it does not seek to address unmet housing requirements from neighbouring authorities and is insufficiently flexible to meet the housing target. Allocate additional sites for housing in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The strategy fails to protect the environment, build healthy, sustainable communities, support sustainable transport and accessibility or economic prosperity (apart from developments adjacent to "Science Vale"). Need a strategy like the two previous Local Plans which concluded that locating most development in Abingdon, Botley, Faringdon, Grove and Wantage and limiting it elsewhere was the most sustainable strategy.</p> <p>Four development sites in the Green Belt have been identified to accommodate over 1,500 houses and two sites in the AONB for 1,400 houses. Proposals to develop in the Green Belt and AONB are a threat to the rural character of the Vale and conflict with the NPPF.</p> <p>There is a potential to identify more housing sites in light of the wider housing need within Oxfordshire, and significant amount of surplus employment land available.</p> <p>Lack of any explanation in the Plan as to why the 200 home capacity threshold has been decided upon and why smaller allocations of, say, 100 dwellings might not be considered strategic allocations.</p>
723546	Dr Susan Nodder Watchfield Parish Council			LPPub2714		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3635		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	
875857	Mr James Jewell			LPPub3720		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	
853098	Mr Richard House Gladman Developments Limited			LPPub3293		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	
873845	Mr Christopher Brand			LPPub1588		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	
727675	Mr Henry Venners JPPC			LPPub3714		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	
874656	Mr & Mrs W M Wasborough	830006	Mr Mark Richards	LPPub2498		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	
404457	Mr Ken Dijkman Dijkman Planning	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman	LPPub2583		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	LLP		Planning LLP						
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2345		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy	<p>The text under the third key strand of the Spatial Strategy should include a reference to protecting village character. This amendment would help ensure that the Plan sets out the positive and clear strategy for the conservation, enjoyment and enhancement of the historic environment required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Spatial Strategy Paragraph 4.3 is supported as it recognises the strong linkage of the Abingdon / Oxford Fringe sub area with Oxford. However this is not further recognised or exploited in the actual strategy.</p> <p>As the Vale is concentrating employment opportunities in a few locations it would make more environmental and economic sense to concentrate housing in those areas more than is being done in this version.</p> <p>Concentrate on areas where expansion would be beneficial including where developing infrastructure (transport hubs such as new rail stations) would be welcomed and enhance existing and expanding communities.</p> <p>The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable, sustainable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by NPPF.</p> <p>The Local Plan Part 1 should seek to increase housing supply in the Plan's early years to ensure a continuous 5 year supply of housing land including a 20% buffer and meeting the previous years shortfall in the first five years of the Plan. This should be achieved by including a new policy which allows permission to be granted for smaller sustainable, immediately available sites</p>
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)		Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3924		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Spatial Strategy	
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2186		Paragraph	No	Spatial Strategy	
756175	Mr Robin Draper			LPPub1098		Paragraph	No	Spatial Strategy	
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2807		Figure 4.1:	Yes	Spatial Strategy	
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3945		Figure 4.	Yes	Spatial Strategy	
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2189	Figure 4.2	Map showing the strategic growth across the three Sub-Area's within the Vale of White Horse District.	No	Spatial Strategy	
831397	B Read			LPPub3970	Figure 4.2	Map showing the strategic growth across the three Sub-Area's within the Vale of White Horse District.	No	Spatial Strategy	
831677	Mr John Earwicker			LPPub2053		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Spatial Strategy	
873605	Mr Bill Kler	873604	Ms Gemma Field Barton Willmore	LPPub3298		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – Blewbury	Policies should state how the additional 220 dwellings should be distributed within the remaining South East Vale Sub-Area. This should include provision at the Larger Village of Blewbury
866198	MR DAVID			LPPub12		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Spatial Strategy –	The emphasis on SE Vale does not reflect the role Oxford plays in the County.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	RICHARDS					Housing Needs		Botley and Kennington	Botley and Kennington should be allocated housing sites to balance growth in the South of the County. The Local Plan 2031 should recognise SE Vale villages and rural communities have had a disproportionate amount of development compared with other rural areas and villages that have had no significant growth in the period since the last local plan. This new policy should allocate a proportion of the 6600 houses unallocated at present in The Plan to each of the three Sub Areas.
725173	Policy Unknown Oxford City Council			LPPub2180		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – Distribution	A more sustainable, spatial strategy would focus more strategic development close to Oxford. This would better reflect the evidence on commuting patterns and the economic strategy signed up to by all Oxfordshire authorities that confirms Oxford as one of three main growth areas in the County. Reasonable alternative have not been tested.
730281	Mr George Edmonds-Brown St Helen Without Parish Council			LPPub2111		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Spatial Strategy – Future Provision	Parish councils are concerned about the placement of future housing under the Local Plan Part 2.
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3636		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy - Garden Cities	Take on board Government initiatives such as Garden Cities linked to existing and developing infrastructure
404457	Mr Ken Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP			LPPub4098		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy - Oxford Garden City	Support for Oxford Garden City.
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1136	4.1	Paragraph	Yes	Spatial Strategy – General Comment	The proposed strategic allocations, with one exception, are in sustainable locations, or ones that can be made sustainable, subject to appropriate developer interventions and contributions, including, where necessary, those required to initiate public transport improvements.
769602	Marcham Parish Council Marcham Parish Council			LPPub1201		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – Marcham	Pleased that the site south of the A415 in Marcham, previously in the 2014 Housing Delivery Update, has been removed from the Plan as a site for housing
874832	Ms Rebecca Mitchell Barwood	874520	Mr Ben Holmes Oxalis Planning	LPPub3578		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – site representation	Barwood have interests in land to the East of East Hanney – east of the A338 and south of Steventon Road. Barwood object to the Spatial Strategy which is considered unsound, and would encourage the District Council to review their decision not to allocate land to the east of East Hanney.
758199	John Richards Dandara Ltd,			LPPub2613		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing	No	Spatial Strategy – smaller sites	Concern that the plan is overlooking small and medium scale deliverable housing land, such as at Stockham Farm, which is not of a scale to be a strategic allocation

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729199	University of Oxford University of Oxford	873599	Ms Emma Fellowes Barton Willmore LLP	LPPub3106		Needs Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – smaller sites	and is currently outside out of date settlement boundaries. These sites potentially represent an important supply of sustainable housing land. The University is in broad support of the Plan and keen to work with the Council to ensure that it is found sound. However, as suggested in previous representations, the University is concerned that the role of smaller scale proposals on suitable deliverable sites, such as that at Hazel Road, should be considered within Part 1 of the Plan in order to ensure the Council delivers growth in the short term.
875603	Mr Jeremy Flawn			LPPub3140		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy Smaller Villages	Core Policy 4 fails to recognise the role development at smaller villages and at the lowest order settlements (below the four tiers of the settlement hierarchy) have played in maintaining the supply of housing in the Vale. Limited non-local needs development should be also allowed in smaller villages and villages of the lowest order to help making those villages and rural communities thriving. In terms of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is considered that the presumption applies to all settlements within defined parts of the hierarchy, save for those locations not listed. The Policy's approach to the presumption conflicts with the Framework which has no such limitations on development. There is an overreliance on the Local Plan Part 2 and neighbourhood plans to deliver.
879120	Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4533		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy Smaller Villages	
872752	Mr Peter Smith			LPPub1150		Core Policy 4: Housing Delivery	No	Spatial Strategy Smaller Villages	
875603	Mr Jeremy Flawn			LPPub3179		Figure 4.1:	No	Spatial Strategy Smaller Villages	
873605	Mr Bill Kler	873604	Ms Gemma Field Barton Willmore	LPPub3292		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – Support	Kier Group agrees that providing the majority of the District's new homes within the South East Vale Sub-Area is the most appropriate strategy for the Local Plan. Science Vale is a key growth area within Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan (OSEP) and focus for significant investment. Given extensive existing employment opportunities within the South East Vale Sub-Area, plans for further growth, and the NPPF emphasis on minimising the need for travel, it is appropriate that the emerging Plan allocates 75% of strategic housing growth within South East Vale. The Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Strategies and Settlement Hierarchy which focuses strategic housing growth at the three Market Towns (including Abingdon) is supported and considered to comply with the Government's drive for delivering sustainable development. Given the strong National Policy approach to minimising the need for travel and ensuring sustainable patterns of development, it is considered that the approach for allocating most of the District's strategic housing growth in the South East Vale Sub-Area where most of the District's existing and emerging employment opportunities are located, is
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2843		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – Support	
741313	Radley College	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3371		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Spatial Strategy – Support	
727675	Mr Henry Venners JPPC			LPPub3715		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – Support	
758245	Bloor Homes Bloor Homes	864481	Mr James Stewart-Irvine Savills	LPPub4079		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Spatial Strategy – Support	
874168	J Stewart-Irvine			LPPub4210		Core Policy 4:	Yes	Spatial	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Bloor Homes South Midlands					Meeting Our Housing Needs		Strategy – Support	consistent with national policy and is therefore both sound and legally compliant. Radley College have interest in land off Radley Road, Abingdon-on-Thames ('the Triangular Field') and through these representations review the proposed release of the site within the Green Belt Review and confirm the college's support for the Council's position in this respect. Comprehensive representations pertaining to land at Radley have been submitted under separate cover. The Spatial Strategy sets out how the Vision will be shaped. It is supported. The use of the sub-areas to set specific requirements and deliver the vision for the plan is supported. Bloor supports the distribution of housing under Core Policy 4. However, it should accommodate development in neighbourhood plans should these allocate more housing than set out in the Local Plan and identify an allowance for windfall sites coming forward over the Plan period as additional to Neighbourhood Plan allocations. We support the distribution of growth as set out within the spatial strategy for the Vale of White Horse. The plan provides a robust justification for its approach, which responds and balances the unique characteristics of the district covering the economic opportunities presented by the Science Vale, Oxford, Swindon and Didcot and the environmental characteristics of the district, which are implicit in the overall distribution of housing.
872083	Green & Co		Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub797		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	Yes	Spatial Strategy – Support	
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS		MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3956		Figure 4.1: 'Building on our strengths'- a sustainable strategy for the Vale of White Horse	Yes	Spatial Strategy – Support	
758106	Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4767	4	Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	Yes	Spatial Strategy – Support	
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3955		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Spatial Strategy – Support	More attention needs to be given to connections with other key sites outside the Science Vale, and in particular to transport between those sites.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3302		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – Surrounding area	Oxford City Council state CP4 does not recognise Oxford's unmet need. Alternatives should have been tested. Also a comment that the housing target should take into account Oxford's unmet need and highlight the potential of Challow Park. East Challow, Wantage.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2190		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – unmet Need	
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub3360		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – unmet Need	
872429	Mrs Deidre Davey			LPPub779		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – Villages	The SHMA figures apply to a city development not a village community and would be unsuitable. The emphasis on expanding existing settlements is useful, but hardly applies to villages. Closures of key services such as banks, post offices, pubs, village shops, reduced bus services, makes villages less sustainable. It is unrealistic to think that adding a few houses to a village will reverse this process
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3310		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Spatial Strategy – Villages	
874158	Antony E Hughes			LPPub3423		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing	No	Spatial Strategy, Alternative	By dividing the District into three Sub Areas VOWH has reduced the flexibility of adjusting housing provision to meet evolving needs over the next 15 or more years.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Needs		sites	
726565	Mr J Stevens Home Builders Federation Ltd			LPPub3194		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Windfall Allowance	It is unsound to defer the matter of identifying land for 1,000 (or possibly 1,900) dwellings to the Part 2 Local Plan, Neighbourhood Development Plans, or Development Management process. We note that the Council has included a windfall allowance for the whole plan period. The NPPF only allows a windfall allowance as part of a council's five year housing land supply where justified by compelling evidence. We consider it dubious to assume 900 dwellings will be provided over the first five years of the life of the plan through windfall.

Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring Fence

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874460	Mr James Colgate	874465	Mr Simon Joyce Srutt and Parker	LPPub1962		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	Yes	Clarify basis for assessing housing supply	While the underlying aim of Policy CP5 is supported, it does not make clear whether assessments of housing land supply will be calculated individually for each respective area. This needs to be made clearer within the policy to ensure that it is justified.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub773		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Economic Baseline Option	It is suggested that the plan is unsound because the forecast growth of homes and jobs is considered unrealistic and therefore contrary to Government policy that proposed allocations must have a realistic prospect of being implemented, as set out in paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). There is no reference in the Plan as to how the delivery of 9,000 homes proposed at Didcot within South Oxfordshire and the Vale will be achieved. The South Oxfordshire Core Strategy has a "ring fence" around Didcot. There is no consideration in this Plan for joint working with South Oxfordshire D.C. on monitoring the rate of development at Didcot within a "ring fence." The SODC 2014 Housing Supply Statement shows that in terms of a 5 year land supply 2014-19, there is a 2,500 dwelling shortfall in the delivery of dwellings at Didcot, based a past completions 2012-13 of 200 dwellings p.a. House completions in Didcot are now projected to be developed at 300 dwellings p.a. over 20 years.
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley			LPPub1241			No		
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley			LPPub1241		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Effect of Ring Fence on Commuting	The proposed ring fence provides no certainty that current commuter patterns of the Vale acting as a dormitory area for commuting to Oxford, Reading, Swindon, Newbury, and London will not continue or be increased by the Plan's proposals. Low salaries in scientific research will make new market housing unaffordable to new jobs in scientific research.
869005	Taylor Wimpey Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	853993	Mr Andrew Ross	LPPub1057		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Growth within the Ring-Fence Area	To be effective amend Core Policy 5 to make clear that the 'ring fence' is not a restriction on bringing forward additional suitable and deliverable sites within the 'ring-fence' area, as housing delivery here will support growth in, and the needs and demands of, the wider Housing Market Area.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LPP	LPPub4517		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Housing Target-SHMA	To make Core Policies 4 and 5 sound they must have a housing needs basis that has been more critically examined than the SHMA, and has addressed the criticisms of the CPRE report. Numbers and sites from the 2013 draft Local Plan should replace those in this version. Even if higher numbers are confirmed as the most reliable forecast, there should still be a mechanism for adjusting plans should reality not match up to the forecast, or if infrastructure to support the housing cannot be delivered.
853514	Linden Homes			LPPub2319			No		
756600	Mr Alan Wagner			LPPub1078			No		
871852	Mrs Clare Wagner			LPPub1072			No		
872778	Mr Andrew Fautley			LPPub1144			No		
872589	Mr Jonathan Armitage			LPPub1467			No		
873616	Mrs Margaret Hughes			LPPub1420			No		
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3749		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	Yes	No Comment	The Freeholder has no comment to make in respect of policy CP5.
874830	Miss Charlotte Goodrum Daniel Watney LPP	0		LPPub3551		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Relationship between CP3 and CP5	Core Policy 5 is a positive new addition to the Local Plan and directs growth to the most sustainable locations for development. Clarification is needed as to how sits alongside the housing delivery and strategic allocations within Core Policy 4. For example, Harwell Campus which falls within the ring-fence is described as a Larger Village, within which Core Policy 3 only allows for unallocated development limited to providing for local needs and to support employment, services and facilities within local communities. Conversely, the ring fence policies encourages housing development to support jobs and infrastructure growth; it is unclear how the objectives of the two policies work together to deliver housing and other new development.
756610	Mrs Linda Martin Sutton Courtenay Parish Council			LPPub3126		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Remove Sutton Courtenay from the Science Vale action area	An explanation should be provided as to why Sutton Courtenay village is included in the Science Vale action area and cannot be excluded. Sutton Courtenay as a village should be removed from the Science Vale action area.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley			LPPub100		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Remove the North Wessex Downs AONB from the Science Vale Ring-Fence	The ring fence area comprises Harwell Campus and Chilton Field and extends into greenfield land beyond: both reside within the North Wessex Downs AONB. The ring fence does not comply with the NPPF 115 and 116, the CROW Act 2000 Section 85, Core Policy 44: Landscape and the plan is therefore unsound.
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub144			No		
829387	Mr Keith Russell			LPPub463			No		
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub315			No		Remove the North Wessex Downs AONB from the Science Vale "Ringfence" to protect it from future speculative development should the Science Vale fall behind in delivery of its housing targets.
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub648			No		Housing provision across the Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire to support the Science Vale has not been made clear as housing provision straddling boundaries is often not provided in documented evidence.
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub353			No		
872161	Mr Keith Mintern			LPPub570			No		
831397	B Read			LPPub4081			No		
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley			LPPub101			No		
828996	Mr Richard Benton			LPPub4057			No		
831397	B Read			LPPub4083			No		
872363	Dr James Vincent			LPPub924			No		
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub146			No		
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub168			No		
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub170			No		
472647	Mr Andrew Lord North Wessex Downs AONB			LPPub265			No		
829387	Mr Keith Russell			LPPub466			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group			LPPub281			No		
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub317			No		
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub652			No		
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub355			No		
872051	Mr Ian Page			LPPub437			No		
872051	Mr Ian Page			LPPub440			No		
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub881			No		
872161	Mr Keith Minter			LPPub572			No		
872363	Dr James Vincent			LPPub923			No		
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung			LPPub1718			No		
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews			LPPub1795			No		
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews			LPPub1797			No		
730292	Mrs Julia Evans West Hendred Parish Council			LPPub2171			No		
874461	Paul Turner-Smith			LPPub3066			No		
829923	Dr Stephen Webb Wantage			LPPub3553			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831397	Constituency Labour Party	724828	Mr Roger Smith Savills L and P Ltd	LPPub3984			No		
874643	B Read			LPPub3872			No		
730242	St Johns College			LPPub4442			No		
828246	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4354			No		
828246	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4307			No		
828771	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4110			No		
828996	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4456			No		
829482	Mr Richard Benton			LPPub4432			No		
831003	Mr Paul Beasley			LPPub4406			No		
874124	Steven and Jane Hale			LPPub4161			No		
874609	Mr David Tilbury			LPPub4231			No		
874700	Dr Jonathan Hogg			LPPub4226			No		
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies			LPPub4229			No		
875989	Mrs Wendy Davies			LPPub4092			No		
730242	Mr Derek Tisdall			LPPub4486			No		
	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council								

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872717	Mr Brian Morris			LPPub4369			No		
872790	Mrs Lorraine Elliott			LPPub4350			No		
874629	Mr Mark Taylor			LPPub4274			No		
874629	Mr Mark Taylor			LPPub4277			No		
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley			LPPub4405			No		
874664	Mr Paul Griffiths			LPPub4388			No		
874696	Mr Tom Davies			LPPub4285			No		
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4386			No		
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4410			No		
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4419			No		
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4560			No		
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4628			No		
876244	K Slater			LPPub4664			No		
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater			LPPub4687			No		
730250	Ms Julie Evans East Hendred			LPPub4729			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Parish Council								
827932	Julie Mabberley Wantage and Grove Campaign Group	0		LPPub3577		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Remove Wantage and Grove from the Ring-Fence	Including Wantage and Grove in the Housing Supply Ring-Fence is unsound as the transport and road infrastructure between Wantage and Grove and areas of employment are unfit for purpose.
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2292		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Ring Fence and Delivery	<p>The Ring-fence and implications of failed supply are unclear. In the absence of high-level sub regional justification the housing supply ring fence is contrary to the NPPF requirement that local plans should meet the full objectively assessed need for in the housing market area. There is no evidence that the proposed ring fenced part of the district constitutes a distinct or identifiable housing market area. In this context suitable potential alternative smaller strategic allocations should be identified which are demonstrably deliverable early in the plan period.</p> <p>GDL has concerns whether allocations can realistically be delivered within the timescales envisaged. If these concerns are borne out, the ring fence policy would not enable the Council to have flexibility to achieve a higher rate of housing development elsewhere in the District to compensate. To achieve objectives for housing supply and provide for contingency in the event that large sites in the Science Vale do not come forward, it will be essential to direct further growth to sustainable locations elsewhere in the District.</p> <p>The Council needs to justify the policy better and clarify how it will operate alongside maintaining supply in the rest of the district and what contingency measures might be brought into play if this mechanism fails. We would like a clause stating that if sites within the ring fenced area become undeliverable, sites, especially brownfield sites outside the ring fence would be considered for development.</p> <p>Reliance upon an artificial 'ring fence' related to housing delivery through major allocations, a mechanism considered necessary because their deliverability is in doubt. Modifications are sought to the Allocations under Core Policy 4 to delete sites within the green belt and AONB and to substitute sustainable non AONB and Green Belt sites, including this site at Southmoor.</p>
404457	Mr Ken Dijksman Dijkman Planning LLP	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijksman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub2583			No		
729558	Southern Construction and Surfacing Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijksman Dijkman Planning LPP	LPPub2392			No		
726565	Mr J Stevens Home Builders Federation Ltd			LPPub3196			No		
853098	Mr Richard House Gladman Developments Limited			LPPub3300			No		
858479	Mr Nick Madden			LPPub3244			No		
875857	Mr James Jewell			LPPub3721			No		
729558	Southern Construction and Surfacing Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijksman Dijkman Planning LPP	LPPub2377			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
879102	Greenlight Developments	874720	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub3365		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Ring-Fence and the five-year housing supply	This approach is concerning, if/when the 'ring-fence' area for Science Vale fails to deliver/perform to the required housing trajectories. This would mean the OAHN for the District is not delivered with no mechanism for delivering this housing by alternative means, particularly if the policy approach in the Local Plan is that apportionments are non-transferable between the 'ring-fence' area and the rest of the District. According to our interpretation, CP5 will have its own separate five-year housing land supply calculation. The policy does not say whether or not apportionments are non-transferable between the 'ring-fence' area for Science Vale and the rest of the District. The consequences of apportionments being non-transferable is that the 'ring-fence' area has the potential to become an 'abyss', where the Council can shift its housing need. Any non-delivery there is then sealed, in the sense that the Council can disregard it when applying Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The Council's approach is contrary to National policy. The Vale's housing need should be calculated as one five-year housing land supply, not artificially divided up.
879104	Leslie Wells	874720	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub3804			No		
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub4011			No		
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2279		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Ring-Fence is too tightly drawn	The proposed housing land supply ring fence will threaten the overall delivery of housing and economic growth. The ring fence should be drawn more widely to include the whole South East Vale Sub Area, including East Challow. The delivery of houses in the plan relies upon allocating sites in AONB and Green Belt. This is unjustified when more sustainable alternatives are available. An alternative is the Golf Course site adjacent to the 500 unit allocation at Shrivenham which could be secured through a modification. Rather than protecting against the possible failure of major allocations more deliverable alternatives should be identified. The deliverable site of Shrivenham Golf Course is an obvious solution to ensure delivery.
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2272			No		
853514	Linden Homes	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LPP	LPPub2311			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874158	Antony E Hughes			LPPub3427		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Ring-Fence is unjustified	The purpose of the Ring Fence is unclear. Science Vale Oxford as depicted in Figure 4.3 is the same as the area of South East Vale depicted in Figure 5.4 apart from the extreme south east corner around Blewbury – in which there are no strategic housing proposals. Core Policy 5 should be deleted as the ring fencing of housing numbers is not justified. The Travel to Work Area associated with Vale of White Horse District includes a variety of settlements within and outside the District Council boundaries. Linden understand there are elements of the proposed plan other parties will argue are unsound, such as the plan is ineffective because it does not seek to address Oxfordshire's unmet housing need; proposed housing allocations within Green Belt and AONB are unjustified because there are more sustainable alternatives; and ring fencing (Core Policy 5) is inconsistent with National Planning Policy. Allocations in protected landscapes of the AONB, in greenbelt locations and those detached from established existing communities are unsustainable.
874643	St Johns College	724828	Mr Roger Smith Savills L and P Ltd	LPPub3872			No		
853514	Linden Homes	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijksman Dijksman Planning LPP	LPPub2306			No		
756610	Mrs Linda Martin Sutton Courtenay Parish Council	0		LPPub3125		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Ring-Fence will cause coalescence	The proposed Ring-Fence would lead to the coalescence of villages with Didcot affecting their identity and the setting of heritage and archeological remains. The ring fenced area needs to be redrawn to exclude land adjacent to the village and there should be a policy preventing Didcot from merging with surrounding villages.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	0		LPPub773		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	South Oxon Ring-Fence	There is no reference in the Plan as to how the delivery of 9,000 homes proposed at Didcot within South Oxfordshire and the Vale will be achieved. South Oxfordshire Core Strategy has a "ring fence" around Didcot. There is no consideration in this Plan for joint working with South Oxfordshire D.C. on monitoring the rate of development at Didcot within a "ring fence."
729030	Planning Policy South Oxfordshire District Council			LPPub3833		Housing supply ring-fence	Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council Support CP5	Stagecoach recognises that a large overall annualised quantum risks creating a situation where, short term there may be perverse outcomes should large-scale allocations be delayed. This can to lead to applications as departures from the Local Plan in less sustainable locations, including many which do not benefit from high-quality public transport, nor would such service be achievable. For these reasons, Stagecoach supports this Policy. LIH supports CP5. Ring-fencing housing supply in the Science Vale area will enable the Council and development industry to work together to ensure that provision of employment and housing is integrated and necessary infrastructure is provided. We support the recognition that the ring fence area is the most sustainable area for new residential development.
869005	Taylor Wimpey Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	853993	Mr Andrew Ross	LPPub1057		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Support CP5	
831469	Mr Nick Small	0		LPPub1140		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	Yes	Support CP5	
735386	Lands	724452	Mr Steve	LPPub4071		Core Policy	Yes	Support CP5	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Improvement Holding Ltd		Sensecall Kemp and Kemp			5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence			SODC is pleased to see a ring fence proposed for housing in Science Vale and strongly supports this proposal. Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd support the principle established by Core Policy 5 in respect of a 'ring fence' to housing supply in the Science Vale area.
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3931		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Support CP5	

Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub801		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes	CP6 - Support	There were three comments of support for Core Policy 6. One of these was a more general comment of support for the strategic employment site allocations across the district, while two were more directly supportive of an employment designation on land south of Park Road, Faringdon with one of these comments supporting also the retention of employment alnd in faringdon and the other stating the use of land for employment should remain on the Faringdon side of the A420 and should not be permitted to cross over the A420 into open countryside
872136	Mr Douglas Lines Little Coxwell Parish Council	0		LPPub860		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes	CP6 - Support	
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	326118	Mr David Barnes Star Planning & Development	LPPub4212		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes	CP6 - Support	
865833	Mr Mark Sandels	0		LPPub10		Meeting business and employment needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	Around 62 comments objected to the revised projected employment figure of approximately 23,000 jobs, derived from the Cambridge Econometrics Report, and which subsequently informed the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for Oxfordshire. These comments related to the following; questioned the accuracy of the figure, the lack of a challenge to the evidence by the Council, requested a much lower employment figure for the district as it reflects aspirational employment growth of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) which should not be taken into account. As the Plan is based on unsound figures and if they are not realised, it is irresponsible and premature to allocate unprecedented large strategic sites in the North Wessex Downs AONB. Also other comments related to; no justification of 129 hectares on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty for business development needs, The net 5,400 number for the Harwell Oxford Campus actually represents a job capacity for the site, not the projected number of new jobs and to date the Harwell-Oxford campus has never provided speculative space. Therefore, the statement of “at least 5,400 jobs” being created at the Harwell Oxford Campus is unsound and Clarification is sought on the past take-up of employment land, seek evidence of monitoring to demonstrate what level of jobs increase is being achieved. Economy Topic Paper page 37 describes three options.but these options do not appear to have been compared to past take up rates for employment land. The economic forecasts to inform the SHMA estimated that two thirds of the growth would be in the Finance and Business sector. As Harwell Campus is promoted as a Science Park, it is not an established Finance and Business centre. It is therefore unrealistic for the proposed jobs in Policy 6 to be delivered in the Plan
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley	0		LPPub102	4.24	Paragraph	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub467	4.24	Paragraph	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
872363	Dr James Vincent	0		LPPub925	4.24	Paragraph	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
831397	B Read	0		LPPub4093	4.24	Paragraph	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub279		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub282		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
756760	Mr Roger	0		LPPub784	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting	No	Employment Figure too	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Turnbull					Business and Employment Needs		High; CE Report	Period.
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub876		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley	0		LPPub1242		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
872363	Dr James Vincent	0		LPPub922		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1798		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
871887	Mrs Caroline Liddle	0		LPPub2121		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874098	Mr Hugh Baxter	0		LPPub2261		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874483	A Gilbert	0		LPPub2403		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874483	A Gilbert	0		LPPub2394		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3061		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
756760	Mr Roger	0		LPPub3533		Core Policy 6: Meeting	No	Employment Figure too	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Turnbull					Business and Employment Needs		High; CE Report	
871706	Cllr Tony de Vere	0		LPPub2423		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
871706	Cllr Tony de Vere	0		LPPub2424		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
875789	Mr Ron Barnes	0		LPPub3652		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
875809	Mrs Jennie Cosgrove	0		LPPub3700		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
875857	Mr James Jewell	0		LPPub3716		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
730224	Councillor Tony deVere Vale of White Horse District Council	0		LPPub3911		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
875942	Cllr Anthony deVere Vale of White Horse District Council	0		LPPub3950		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
875942	Cllr Anthony deVere Vale of White Horse District Council	0		LPPub3952		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4355		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
828246	Mr Keith	0		LPPub4349		Core Policy 6: Meeting	No	Employment Figure too	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Robbins					Business and Employment Needs		High; CE Report	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4303		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4309		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
828771	Karen Rhodes	0		LPPub4112		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
828996	Mr Richard Benton	0		LPPub4457		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
828996	Mr Richard Benton	0		LPPub4448		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4434		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4429		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
831003	Steven and Jane Hale	0		LPPub4402		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
831003	Steven and Jane Hale	0		LPPub4407		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
871706	Cllr Tony	0		LPPub4317		Core Policy 6: Meeting	No	Employment Figure too	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	de Vere					Business and Employment Needs		High; CE Report	
871706	Cllr Tony de Vere	0		LPPub4318		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp	0		LPPub4289		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4164		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4148		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4233		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4224		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies	0		LPPub4230		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4353		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
872790	Mrs Lorraine Elliott	0		LPPub4345		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
874640	Mrs Karen	0		LPPub4408		Core Policy 6: Meeting	No	Employment Figure too	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Beasley					Business and Employment Needs		High; CE Report	
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley	0		LPPub4399		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4593		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4629		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4665		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4688		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
730250	Ms Julie Evans East Hendred Parish Council	0		LPPub4724		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4517		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4626		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4662		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4685		Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4562		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
866932	Dr Giles Moran	0		LPPub16		Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
829387	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub880		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
873539	Mr Peter Smith	0		LPPub1176	5.5	Paragraph	No	Employment Figure too High; CE Report	
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region	0		LPPub2811	4.33	Paragraph	Yes	English Heritage Comments on Retail text (p.44)	English Heritage welcomes the recognition of the historically constrained nature of the Vale's market towns in paragraph 4.33, but the historic character should also be seen as a benefit in attracting shoppers.
758014	Frank Mullin	0		LPPub2668		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	General Comments	Mre general comments made to Core Policy 6 which did not specifically object or support the policy. These included; a number of questions and general comments with respect to the policy and locations such as Abingdon and Didcot, is not clear from the wording of the policy what is meant or specifically captured by the term "employment" for the purposes of the LP 2031, if the predicted increase of employment does not materialise and the scale of new houses falls below the level qualifying for infrastructure how would the shortfall in infrastructure be dealt with and questions how the job amounts translate into new homes. Also should we not be embracing these hi-tech inventions, and not everyone works where they live in particular with the growth of working from home.
875809	Mrs Jennie Cosgrove	0		LPPub3698		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	General Comments	
875812	Mrs Eileen Burzynsta	0		LPPub3709		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	General Comments	
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3750		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes	General Comments	
875625	Ms Janet Williams	0		LPPub3190		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	General Comments	
874460	Mr James Colgate	0		LPPub1963		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes	Glossary	It is not clear from the wording of the policy what is meant or specifically captured by the term "employment" for the purposes of the LP 2031. It is also not defined in the LP 2031 Glossary. It is considered necessary for the Plan to define the term to provide certainty for developers and investors.
873665	Minscombe &	0		LPPub2907	0	Core Policy	No	Milton	Land at Milton Interchange south of the A4130 currently

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Mays Properties Ltd Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd					3: Settlement Hierarchy		Interchange; Trunk Road Service Area	allocated as a site for Trunk Road Services. Central Government proposes significant funding for the Botley and Peartree Interchanges. This along with the proposed new “garden city” at Bicester will increase the need to expand roadside services. The location should be considered in relation to its position within Science Vale UK and nearness to Didcot A (site of the former power station).
725173	Policy Unknown Oxford City Council	0		LPPub2197	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; DtoC	One objection was made by Oxford City Council stating that the core policy and supporting text doesn’t place any great emphasis on the importance of the “knowledge spine” of which Bicester, Oxford and Science Vale all form part of.
758106	Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4770	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes	Objection; Harwell Campus	Two comments were received by Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership who are seeking to allocate residential development as an alternative to the strategic development site to the east of the campus. Their proposal includes residential development on land designated with Enterprise Zone status. They seek a reduction in the total amount of employment land identified in Core Policy 6.
758106	Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4775	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes	Objection; Harwell Campus	
756280	Mr Richard Waters	0		LPPub1015	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Monitoring	There were four comments which seek a revision to the monitoring framework of the local plan so that there are more regular checks (every 2 years) to ensure that any downturn in employment rates would trigger a review of the local plan.
756473	Mr Oliver Gardiner	0		LPPub1028	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Monitoring	
872741	Mr Adrian Gainer	0		LPPub1132	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Monitoring	
872817	Dr A Van Maanen	0		LPPub1220	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Monitoring	
874460	Mr James Colgate	0		LPPub1964	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes	Objection; Site/Location Specific	There were around 13 comments which objected to Core Policy 6 on site/location specific matters
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth	0		LPPub752	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	Three comments for Abingdon-on-Thames there is not enough vacant/developable land in Abingdon-on-Thames to accommodate growth and balance housing growth, and allocate the town centre as a strategic employment site and defer the use of Green Belt land North of Abingdon for

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Employment Needs			housing development until employment and housing needs are clearer.
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council	0		LPPub2109	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	Yes	Objection; Site/Location Specific	Three comments for Cumnor objecting to any further employment development at Cumnor Hill due to infrastructural constraints ad sites should be removed form the greenbelt and concentrate on brownfield land.
873089	Mr Andrew Turner	0		LPPub1335	0	Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	Two comments for Sutton Courtenay seeking a policy to discourage warehousing, arising as a result of recent developments in the vicinity of the village and Plan fails to encourage local investment in high tech jobs.
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottrill	0		LPPub2640	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	One comment for Milton Interchange (designated A34 Service Area) seeking its re-allocation as a mixed use site
831994	Mr Charles Cottrill	0		LPPub3101	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	One comment for the strategic site allocation at Monks Farm, Grove, seeking a more flexible approach to the delivery of employment land on this site. Concerns raised over how it can compete with other strategic employment sites at Harwell Campus and Milton Park
872362	Dr Charles Cottrill	0		LPPub3703	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	Three comments for Faringdon and more widely the Western Vale sub area, generally stating that there are no realistic job opportunities here when compared to the envisaged housing growth, Para 4.29 states employment land will be also be provided as part of mixed-use strategic sites at Land South of Park Rd, Faringdon however these are existing sites, and the Plan makes no realistic attempt to provide for employment growth in the immediate Western Vale area to counter the inevitable out-commuting that will result.
873665	Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd	0		LPPub2912	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	
874584	Linda Martin	0		LPPub3112	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	
831900	PJV Rounce	0		LPPub1875	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	
874401	H Sherman	0		LPPub3013	0	Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	
874685	Maggie	0		LPPub3229	0	Core Policy	No	Objection;	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Brown					6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs		Site/Location Specific	
867424	Prof Alan Atkinson	0		LPPub1605	0	Meeting business and employment needs	No	Objection; Site/Location Specific	
730259	Mr Graham Mundy Grove Parish Council	0		LPPub3616	4.37	Paragraph	No	Retail text (p.44)	<p>Additional comments were also received with respect to the supporting retail text on page 44 of the Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One request was for the inclusion of a reference to the existing local shopping centre at Grovelands (Grove) in paragraph 4.37;and A comment seeking clarification with respect to retail provision in Faringdon as well as for the whole district. A comment seeking to retail specialits shops and businesed within centres tather than big stores,
874401	H Sherman	0		LPPub3014	4.32	Paragraph	No	Retail text (p.44)	
749047	Fraser Old	0		LPPub2509		Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs	No	Retail text (p.44)	

Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4489		Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	No	A34	<p>A number of comments are made about the A34, including by members of the “Save Chilton AONB Action Group” to express their concern with regard to the impacts (air, noise and light pollution) the increased traffic on the A34 and other roads in the vicinity like the A417 (as a result of the housing development) will have on to the North Wessex Downs AONB. Following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the essential highway infrastructure does not address the capacity issues surrounding the A34 the A34 is a barrier to growth for the Science Vale. it is very likely that the new residents in the new housing areas at Harwell Oxford Campus will access employment opportunities further afield. This will lead to an increased traffic on the A34 which is already known to be congested and operating over its designed capacity in peak periods. The increased traffic on the A34 poses further threats to the tranquillity and character of the AONB. thus it is argued that it would appear premature to proceed with large strategic housing allocations within the protected landscape of the North Wessex Downs AONB until there is a proven track record of economic growth in the area issues surrounding capacity on the A34 have been addressed and it has been proven that housing must be located in this area with a full analysis as required by the NPPF paragraphs 115 and 116. the allocation of the 1400 houses within the AONB is with regard to their argumentation deemed to be unsustainable and are demanded to be removed from the Plan or reallocated. implementing these steps in full will make the Local Plan compliant with the NPPF paragraphs 115, 116 and the CROW Act 2000. The Highways Agency (HA) is concerned if
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley			LPPub103	4.43		No		
829328	Mrs Ros Page			LPPub4476			No		
829387	Mr Keith Russell			LPPub470			No		
830994	Dr Stephen King			LPPub57	4.43		No		
831397	B Read			LPPub3995			No		
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub655			No		
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub885			No		
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub148			No		
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub172	4.43		No		
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub319			No		
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub320			No		
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub358			No		
872051	Mr Ian Page			LPPub443			No		
872161	Mr Keith Mintern			LPPub574			No		
874461	Paul Turner-Smith			LPPub3072			No		
874629	Mr Mark Taylor			LPPub4291			No		
874664	Mr Paul Griffiths			LPPub4404			No		
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4433			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4564			No		<p>any material increase in traffic were to occur on the A34 (which forms the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in the Vale) as a result of planned growth at in the VoWH without careful consideration of mitigation measures. They emphasise that the Local Plan has to ensure that development cannot progress without the appropriate infrastructure in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any impact on the SRN, caused by development, needs to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible. The HA in general, will support a local authority proposal that considers sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduce the need to travel. Infrastructure improvements on the SRN should only be considered as a last resort. Proposed new growth will need to be considered in the context of the cumulative impact from already proposed development on the A34. It is recognised in the Local Plan that to ensure that planned proposals are viable, improvements to the A34 will be required.
872717	Mr Brian Morris			LPPub4594			No		
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4630			No		
876244	K Slater			LPPub4666			No		
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater			LPPub4689			No		
758407	Patrick Blake Highway Agency			LPPub2522			No		

Chapter 5: Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area

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

General Comments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873469	B C Turner			LPPub1342		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Alternate Strategic Sites	<p>A range of sites are proposed as alternatives to development. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell			LPPub2534		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site Cumnor	
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT	0		LPPub4652		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site Cumnor	
829615	Mrs Rebecca Evans			LPPub3401		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site Dalton Barracks	
875960	Mr W G Carter	874466	Mr Kemp & Kemp Jon Waite	LPPub4010		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site Appleton	
825516	Mr Keith Diment			LPPub4538		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site Appleton	
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub4521		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site Appleton	
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub4537		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site Appleton	
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub4547		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford	No	Alternative Site Appleton	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Fringe			
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub4614		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site East of East Hanney	
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub4556		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site Radley South	
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub4555		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Alternative Site Radley South	
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub4760		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	Yes	Alternative Site Wootton	
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub4762		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Alternative Site Wootton	
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub4761		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	Yes	Alternative Site Wootton	
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2817		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	Yes	English Heritage Comments	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).
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2815	5.6	Paragraph	Yes	English Heritage Comments Historic Nature and Conservation	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.
758407	Patrick Blake Highway Agency	0		LPPub2526		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Highways Agency Comments	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									LP1 should be developed on effective joint working on cross-boundary priorities.
873536	Mrs Christine Belcher	853993	Mr Andrew Ross	LPPub3004		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Objection to Spatial Strategy	<p>A number of responses object to the Abingdon Oxford Fringe Sub-Area Spatial Strategy. Specific comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan fails to efficiently ascertain the districts infrastructure problems and necessary improvements. Not all proposals within the green belt have been sufficiently justified. There will be a loss of character in the areas resulting from development within the Green Belt. There is too much development within AONB's and Greenbelts 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 settlements ranked below the four tiers set out in the settlement hierarchy. Economic growth has been given more material weight than the environment. The quoted housing supply over the life span of the plan do not accord with CP8.
873536	Mrs Christine Belcher			LPPub2997			No		
756175	Mr Robin Draper			LPPub1221			No		
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub526			No		
869005	Taylor Wimepy Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub1058			No		
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1527			No		
729431	Mrs S Kiff			LPPub29			No		
879120	Gow Family			LPPub4536			No		
729199	University of Oxford University of Oxford	873599	Ms Emma Fellowes Barton Willmore LLP	LPPub3206			No		
872205	John Allan			LPPub621			No		
872502	Andrew and Sharon Allen			LPPub869			No		
730198	Cllr Bob Johnston Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub1488			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872900	Mr Andrew Jeffries	0	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub1273		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Objection to Spatial Strategy	
873535	Mr William Laing			LPPub1390			No		
873536	Miss Katherine Laing			LPPub1389			No		
873539	Mr Andrew Laing			LPPub1387			No		
873540	Mrs Anne Laing			LPPub1388			No		
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1547			No		
874131	Mr John Earwicker			LPPub2048			No		
752247	Mrs Anne Feather Kennington Parish Council			LPPub992			No		
728843	Mr James Halliday Foreman Laws LLP			LPPub3127			No		
871772	Ms Margaret Killick			LPPub247			No		
875603	Mr Jeremy Flawn	874264		LPPub3149			No		
874473	Mr Richard Burke Commercial Estates Group (CEG)			LPPub4014			Yes		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873884	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1688		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Objection to Ab/OX Spatial Strategy	
756490	Mr Alistair Buckley			LPPub56			No		
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4116			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott	0		LPPub4753		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Objection to Development at Cumnor	An objection is received to development at Cumnor as there is insufficient infrastructure in the village to accommodate growth.
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub4786		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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.
730198	Cllr Bob Johnston Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub1488			No		
872079	Ms Emma Diffey			LPPub2133			No		
729164	Mr Ian Shepherd			LPPub575		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Objection to proposed growth within 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.
873977	Mrs Valerie Swift			LPPub1783			No		
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3947		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Core Policy 8: it is not clear how the figure of 5,438 homes to be delivered has been calculated.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3930		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Fig 5.6a proposes a link from Culham crossing and link road: the route of such a scheme would be considered in the context of the strategic highway network in Oxfordshire as a whole.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2202		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									delay to meeting the pressing housing needs evident within the wider Housing Market Area (particularly Oxford).
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2200		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Oxford City Council Comments	Sub-Area Strategies Section 5 (Sub Area Strategies) recognises the strong functional links between the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area with the City, and this is welcomed. Data indicates that the level of commuting into the City is 10,800 trips daily (around three times the equivalent number of trips into South Oxfordshire), illustrating the importance of the Oxford economy in providing jobs for the Vale, and the inseparable nature of the respective housing markets. Given the 4% increase in trips from the Vale into Oxford between 2001 and 2031, the indications are that these commuting patterns will continue during the Plan period 1. The City Council considers that the needs from Oxford would be most sustainably met by directing development that cannot be accommodated within the City boundaries, to areas immediately adjoining the urban area. The City Council must conclude that overall, the strategy for the Abingdon/Oxford Fringe is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against alternatives and is therefore not justified.
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3755		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Support for CP8	Support is outlined 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.
874670	Douglas Bond	0		LPPub3506	5	Chapter 5: Sub-Area Strategies	No	Support for Green Belt Release of Land at North Hinksey	Support is received for the release of Green Belt Land at North Hinksey.
873539	Douglas Bond	0		LPPub3521		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	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.

Abingdon Comments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2102	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	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.
874494	Lloyd Czaplewski			LPPub2763	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Developer Contributions	
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2813	5.20	Paragraph	Yes	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.
874034	GC Miller			LPPub1835	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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 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.
874473	Mr Richard Burke Commercial Estates Group (CEG)	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub4040	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	General Comment	
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2076	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	General Comment regarding 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 on 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
753677	Mrs Roberta Nichols Friends of Abingdon Civic Society			LPPub93	5.09	Paragraph	Yes	General Comment – Infrastructure and Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken			LPPub1744		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	General Comment – Infrastructure and Traffic Congestion	
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2075		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	General Comment – Infrastructure and Traffic Congestion	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>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.</p> <p>A pedestrian crossing on Lodge Hill is essential as it is already difficult to cross.</p> <p>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.</p>
874316	P Roper	0		LPPub3514	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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.
874503	Nikolay Nikolaev	0		LPPub2363	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development regarding Infrastructure	<p>There has not been any quantitative assessment on the 4 strategic sites around Abingdon.</p> <p>SO4 is inadequate and misleading in regard to the sites.</p> <p>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) .</p> <p>The Sustainability Assessment under SO4 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?</p> <p>Education and road infrastructure: Building 1500 new homes would require substantial supporting infrastructure for which the Plan makes no provision.</p> <p>Building an extension of Lodge Hill interchange on A34 will only alleviate Abingdon's current serious traffic problems.</p> <p>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 West of A34 with easy access to existing diamond interchanges and sufficient space for infrastructural development.</p>
867883	Ms Paulette Burns	0		LPPub1292	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for	No	Object to development	The Green Belt is meant to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. Proposed plans would

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		and release of Green Belt	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>No piecemeal housing development should be allowed unless carried out hand in hand with development of facilities for residents eg shops, GP surgery.</p>
829318	Mr Toby Wright	0		LPPub638	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Coalescence, Historic Character and Setting	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
829318	Mr Toby Wright	0		LPPub651	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Coalescence, Historic Character and Setting	<p>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.</p>
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop	0		LPPub975	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Coalescence, Historic	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								Character and Setting	
830710	Mr Chris Lane	0		LPPub1330	3	Chapter 3: Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Coalescence, Historic Character and Setting	
874424	Mr Peter Harbour	0		LPPub3891	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	<p>I disagree with the proposal to build on the Green Belt. The Green Belt north of Abingdon should be protected from development.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>National Policy</p> <p>The plan ignores Government advice that “protecting our precious green belt must be paramount” and that boundaries should be altered only in “exceptional circumstances”.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The proposals conflict with the five Green Belt purposes set out in National Policy.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Another purpose of the Green Belt is ‘to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’.</p> <p>Developing these two sites would undoubtedly result in</p>
871668	Mr Alistoun	0		LPPub1090	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	
872578	Dr Garry Staunton	0		LPPub928	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	
872578	Dr Garry Staunton	0		LPPub929	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1735	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	
871676	Mr Ashley Poyton	0		LPPub2445	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	
874417	Mrs Frances Trinder	0		LPPub2412	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford	No	Object to Development North and North West of	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Fringe Sub-Area		Abingdon – Green Belt	significant encroachment on a valuable and prominent site in open countryside.
874494	Lloyd Czaplewski	0		LPPub3096	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area continued from previous page	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	Government advice, October 2014, re-iterates the requirement for councils to prioritise brownfield sites and protect the Green Belt from development. By allocating this site the council has ignored this advice.
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1736	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	Consultation 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.
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1737	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	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.
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3686	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	The public was not warned or given any opportunity to object to the further change of the Green Belt.
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3685	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – 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”.
871676	Mr Ashley Poyton	0		LPPub218	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	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
872038	Mr Peter Clare	0		LPPub456	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	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.
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan	0		LPPub1944	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – 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.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Group								properly assessed. The land makes a significant contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The 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.
874424	Mr Peter Harbour	0		LPPub3895	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	Landscape and Amenity
831316	Mr R Garrett	0		LPPub4177	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	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.
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1733	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	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
827361	Mr Robin Mooney	0		LPPub3442	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	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.
871974	Ms Lynda Pasquire Crowley	0		LPPub1148	0	Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	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.
867148	Mr Michael Kilgour	0		LPPub48	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	Public footpaths and streams passing through the proposed development would be affected.
874311	Mr Kelvin Sykes	0		LPPub2993	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	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.
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3681	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	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.
828746	Mr John	0		LPPub4706	0	Core Policy 37: Design and Local	No	Object to Development	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 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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Ammundsen					Distinctiveness		North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	<p>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.</p> <p>Abingdon is an 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Building such a large development on Green Belt to the north of Abingdon would destroy its character and distinctive sense of place.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The green belt area between Abingdon and Oxford must be protected to retain the historic and cultural nature of both</p>
872880	Mr David Hastings	0		LPPub4708	0	Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	
867148	Mr Michael Kilgour	0		LPPub2435	0	Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	
871991	Mrs Sarah Wimborne	0		LPPub834	0	Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	
872100	Mr Ian Bannerman	0		LPPub1327	0	Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	
871674	Wesson	0		LPPub217	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Green Belt	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>towns.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Traffic and Pollution</p> <p>Large scale development North and North West of Abingdon will generate significant additional traffic and pollution.</p> <p>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 Road. This traffic is noisy and polluting. This would not be a suitable environment to live in or raise children.</p> <p>Existing traffic problems and air pollution will be made worse by the new development especially since major employers are to the south of Abingdon.</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>SHMA</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Green Belt Review</p> <p>A '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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The 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.</p> <p>Location</p> <p>There is an argument for building on land to the West of the Tilsey Park, Abingdon.</p> <p>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</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									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.
871653	Mr Robert Krykant	0		LPPub2249	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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 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.</p>
0		0		LPPub1892	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
874088	SR Roberts	0		LPPub1891	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
829615	Mrs Rebecca Evans	0		LPPub3397	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
874116	Mrs Rachel Jakeman	0		LPPub1998	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
828715	Mr Anthony Downs	0		LPPub1779	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
874699	Dr Antonis Ioannides	0		LPPub3576	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
72368	Mr Christopher Oliver	0		LPPub757	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	<p>However, the local secondary school could not accommodate a further 2000 students.</p> <p>Healthcare Development North of Abingdon and surrounding villages will add to the divide in services, ie doctors, dentists, leisure facilities, that exists between 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, Audlet Drive, Dumnore Farm where planned and built.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>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. Lodgehill interchange needs to be done before this development is approved or started. Planned road changes should be carried out before any developments.</p> <p>Abingdon should be excluded from large housing development until such time as a southern bypass has been built.</p> <p>The 'inner ringroad' should allow for future duelling to allow for the inevitable increased traffic pressure should new houses be built on the 'outside' the inner ringroad. 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.</p> <p>Housing in Abingdon is expensive and may affect</p>
867148	Mr Michael Kilgour	0		LPPub50	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth	0		LPPub740	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
872218	Mrs Barbara Hickford	0		LPPub622	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
829318	Mr Toby Wright	0		LPPub697	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
829722	Mrs Alison Rooke	0		LPPub716	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
872357	Mr Ashley Pick	0		LPPub727	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
870007	Mr Stephen Biggs	0		LPPub524	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	
870007	Mr Stephen Biggs	0		LPPub529	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-	No	Object to Development North and	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	developers' ability to sell. Sort out congestion and infrastructure first.
872661	Mr Mark Atkins	0		LPPub1034	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	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.
831316	Mr R Garrett	0		LPPub4743	0	Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	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.
755871	Oliver and Elizabeth Cornish	0		LPPub4610	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	This should be about long term planning but the Southern Abingdon by pass and new river crossing form no part of this plan. If they did, the distribution of housing might be different and Green Belt North of Abingdon would not be required.
729164	Mr Ian Shepherd	0		LPPub1361	0	Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	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 effect the legacy of the plans.
828993	Mrs Wendy Vezey	0		LPPub4758	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Infrastructure	Public Transport 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 Sturt 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 I note that it is proposed to save policies CF3 and CF4 from the 2011 local plan in order to safeguard land at

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>Faringdon and Wantage for burial sites. I submit that similar safeguarding of land for a burial site needs to take place in Abingdon.</p> <p>Safeguard the land along the route of the former Wilts and Berks canal as per the saved policies : L14 and L15 Consultation</p> <p>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>
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher	0		LPPub1557	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Pollution	<p>Increased local traffic will increase greenhouse emissions and pollution within the area.</p> <p>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 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.</p>
874503	Nikolay Nikolaev	0		LPPub2361	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Pollution	<p>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.</p>
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher	0		LPPub3529	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Pollution	<p>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 a electrical ventilation system in the bedroom.</p>
831316	Mr R Garrett	0		LPPub4195	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Pollution	<p>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</p>
871782	Ms Linda Chillmaid	0		LPPub254	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Pollution	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									provisions of hearing protection devices. Why has 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.
871345	Mr Reece Davidson	0		LPPub130	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group	0		LPPub1316	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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
874494	Lloyd Czaplewski	0		LPPub3057	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
831316	Mr R Garrett	0		LPPub4153	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	The ring road is overcrowded with difficulties for traffic joining it from the current estates but no thought has been given to this.
871653	Mr Robert Krykant	0		LPPub3248	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area continued from previous page	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
874494	Lloyd Czaplewski	0		LPPub3086	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area continued from previous page	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
871352	Ms Caroline Ball	0		LPPub132	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-	No	Object to Development North and	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 1000

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	additional vehicles, traffic along Dunmore Road/Twelve Acre Drive will grind to a permanent halt causing further traffic chaos and pollution.
870055	Dr Glyn Evans	0		LPPub53	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
872355	Mrs Ticia Lever	0		LPPub959	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
872576	Mr Charles Pizzey	0		LPPub947	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group	0		LPPub1315	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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?
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group	0		LPPub1320	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group	0		LPPub1321	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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 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.
873469	B C Turner	0		LPPub1340	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon –	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								Traffic Congestion	<p>parallel, at the top of the hill, to the A34.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 sliproads are needed at the Abingdon North junction on the A34 to relieve unnecessary ring road traffic.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
873519	Mr Michael Knott	0		LPPub1364	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1751	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1752	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1734	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1742	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1743	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1745	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1746	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	<p>An upgrade to the A34 is needed before any more housing is considered. The A34 will require a diamond junction at Lodgehill (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.</p> <p>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 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.</p>
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1747	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub1748	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher	0		LPPub1562	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher	0		LPPub1565	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
873888	Diana Robertson	0		LPPub1687	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
729117	Lesley Legge OCC - Councillor	0		LPPub2131	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
873903	Linda Procter	0		LPPub1773	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for	No	Object to Development	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	<p>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 Wooton Road roundabout, and not likely to be relieved.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It is misleading to state '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.</p> <p>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”.</p>
871653	Mr Robert Krykant	0		LPPub2244	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
871653	Mr Robert Krykant	0		LPPub2248	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874711	MD Austin	0		LPPub2143	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
831980	Ms Carol Moodey	0		LPPub2546	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
827405	Mr Geoff Broughton	0		LPPub3330	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874110	D Beer	0		LPPub3226	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874110	D Beer	0		LPPub3232	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford	No	Object to Development North and North West of	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Fringe Sub-Area		Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	Air Pollution Additional traffic will increase the already high levels of pollution in the town.
874110	D Beer	0		LPPub3220	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
874110	D Beer	0		LPPub3221	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
874110	D Beer	0		LPPub3238	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	The proposed developments will increase greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution, contrary to SO 12.
874311	Mr Kelvin Sykes	0		LPPub2995	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
874545	A Swarbrick	0		LPPub3135	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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).
874110	D Beer	0		LPPub3180	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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 fro 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.
874110	D Beer	0		LPPub3193	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic	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).

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								Congestion	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 boundary.
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3649	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3662	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3666	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3669	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3672	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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.
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3683	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	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
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3675	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874424	Mr	0		LPPub3896	0	Core Policy 8:	No	Object to	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Peter Harbour					Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	<p>before additional houses/traffic are attracted to the town.</p> <p>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.</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, 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>
831316	Mr R Garrett	0		LPPub4140	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
831316	Mr R Garrett	0		LPPub4151	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
831316	Mr R Garrett	0		LPPub4155	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
831316	Mr R Garrett	0		LPPub4167	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
831316	Mr R Garrett	0		LPPub4181	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
876772	Mr Micheal Belcher	0		LPPub4519	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
785816	Councillor Jeanette Halliday	0		LPPub2427	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-	No	Object to Development North and	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Vale of White Horse District Council					Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874545	A Swarbrick	0		LPPub2639	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874316	P Roper	0		LPPub3516	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area continued from previous page	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874685	Maggie Brown	0		LPPub3233	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright	0		LPPub713	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
848989	Anne Davies Clifton Hampden and Burcot Parish Council	0		LPPub3156	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright	0		LPPub692	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872117	Mr David Andrews	0		LPPub548	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon –	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								Traffic Congestion	
871161	Mr Andrew Bell	0		LPPub78	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright	0		LPPub646	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth	0		LPPub741	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872471	Dr Gill Turner	0		LPPub835	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872471	Dr Gill Turner	0		LPPub846	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872577	DR David Forrow	0		LPPub945	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872576	Mr Charles Pizzey	0		LPPub948	5.400000000 0000004	Paragraph	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
870958	Mr David Adams	0		LPPub240	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
869058	Mr Robert Jacobs	0		LPPub38	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
871674	Wesson	0		LPPub217	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
871653	Mr Robert Krykant	0		LPPub2243	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872108	Mr Jonathan Noys	0		LPPub2473	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874110	D Beer	0		LPPub3184	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
874348	Susan Garrett	0		LPPub3641	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
871345	Mr Reece	0		LPPub4714	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for	No	Object to Development	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Davidson					Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group	0		LPPub4654	0	Core Policy 12: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872471	Dr Gill Turner	0		LPPub4716	0	Core Policy 12: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken	0		LPPub4656	0	Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
871352	Ms Caroline Ball	0		LPPub4717	0	Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
872471	Dr Gill Turner	0		LPPub4719	0	Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
827386	Dr Christopher Prior	0		LPPub851	0	Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828703	Mr Tim Pottle	0		LPPub1325	0	Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
871670	Mrs Julie Irving	0		LPPub1753	0	Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
871677	Mr Woodford David	0		LPPub136	0	Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
0		0		LPPub1234	0	Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility	No	Object to Development North and North West of Abingdon – Traffic Congestion	
831624	Mrs RC Fisher	0		LPPub3172	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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.
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group	0		LPPub1916	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North of Abingdon – Green Belt	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.
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group	0		LPPub1953	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to Development North of Abingdon and South of Radley – Green Belt	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>Sunningwell. This site makes a High Contribution to this Green Belt purpose, to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.</p> <p>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 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.</p>
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3867	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments North and North West of Abingdon – Education	<p>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).</p> <p>Expansion of secondary school and SEN school capacity serving Abingdon will also be required.</p> <p>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.</p>
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council	0		LPPub2102	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Parish Boundary	<p>If the sites are approved then there should be a parish boundary review.</p>
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub803	0	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Support for development	<p>The inclusion of sub-areas is supported and in accordance with the NPPF paragraphs 156 & 157.</p> <p>It is appropriate to direct a large proportion of housing allocation to Abingdon, as recognised by the council's sub-areas.</p> <p>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</p> <p>The plan would not be effective if it included housing figures, which it could not deliver.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The allocation at North West of Abingdon-on-Thames comprises two parts in separate ownership promoted through the Plan process by separate agents.</p> <p>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</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									land west of Wootton Road (my clients interest), is able to deliver circa 90 dwellings. Therefore, we consider that the Council should provide flexibility in the numbers they are proposing by stating a minimum of 200 homes.
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council	0		LPPub2057	5.700000000 0000002	Paragraph	Yes	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”.

North of Abingdon-on-Thames Site

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872356	MrsTicia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1937		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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.
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2894		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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.
821371	Dr David Illingworth			LPPub2554		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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 . 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.
873469	B C Turner			LPPub1341		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	General Comment	<p>A number of general comments were received. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The trees planted west of Sunningwell track, will be decimated? Dunmore roundabout needs reviewing Page 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.
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2077			Yes	General Comment	
829424	Mr Clive Manvell	0					Yes	General Comment	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group	0		LPPub1939		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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.</p>
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1943			No	General Comment – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever			LPPub1945			No	General Comment –	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	North Abingdon Local Plan Group							Green Belt	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).
728938	Ms Nicola Blackwood MP (Oxford West and Abingdon Constituency)			LPPub2305		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Infrastructure	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 keep pace with development proposed for Abingdon; an area already operating over capacity.
753677	Mrs Roberta Nichols Friends of Abingdon Civic Society			LPPub92		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	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.
873835	Mrs Karon Gray			LPPub2060			Yes	Infrastructure and Services	
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2980		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Delivery	The land can accommodate more than 800 houses in accordance with local policies. Infrastructure will be in place ready for development. Affordable housing needs to continuously reviewed in line with the masterplan. Development Site Templates (Appendix A to the Local Plan). Flexibility should be incorporated into the Site Development Templates, removing the stipulation that future development should be limited to those parts of the sites identified in the Landscape Capacity Studies. Further LVIA could support development beyond these areas. A number of stipulations are worded as a requirement rather than qualified followed by 'where necessary/required' or wording to that effect. Police presence, evidence does not suggest this is a requirement. Assessments and studies are only necessary when appropriate.
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2881			No	Delivery	
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2886			No	Delivery	
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2872			No	Delivery	
730229	Mr Nigel Warner			LPPub1305		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for	No	Object to development–	Implementation works would disrupt existing residents, whereas one unified development on one site would be less

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Abingdon Town Council Abingdon					Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		Alternative site	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?
874119	T Lever			LPPub3408		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object to development– Air Pollution	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 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.
827405	Mr Geoff			LPPub2898		Core Policy 8: Spatial	No	Object to	Proposed Green Belt housing developments to the North of

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Broughton					Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		development–Air Pollution	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 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 reducet traffic into the centre therefore reduce pollution levels. This measure has failed.
872073	Mrs Elizabeth Davies			LPPub4747			No	Object to development–Air Pollution	
872370	Mrs Anne Parker			LPPub4748			No	Object to development–Air Pollution	
872436	Mr Terry Macmillan			LPPub4749			No	Object to development–Air Pollution	
872446	Mr Bernard Pottle			LPPub4750			No	Object to development–Air Pollution	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1914		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Consultation Process	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. The group is keen to be invited to put their views in person to the Planning Inspector at the Planning Inquiry stage.
827405	Mr Geoff Broughton			LPPub2896			No	Consultation Process	
827405	Mr Geoff Broughton			LPPub3319			No	Consultation Process	
870640	Mr John Smith			LPPub65		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object – Green Belt	<p>A number of objections were received development in the Green Belt to the North of Abingdon. Specific comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
871207	Mrs Dolores Fletcher			LPPub87			No	Object – Green Belt	
871236	Mr Robin Chapman			LPPub91			No	Object – Green Belt	
867148	Mr Michael Kilgour			LPPub51			No	Object – Green Belt	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub738			No	Object – Green Belt	
871745	Mr Patrick Bird			LPPub222			No	Object – Green Belt	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729164	Mr Ian Shepherd			LPPub580			No	Object – Green Belt	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 development of the two sites would be significant encroachment into the countryside. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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). Employment is planned in the south placing housing to the north, will creating further congestion. The A34 is already at full capacity.
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub668			No	Object – Green Belt	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub748			No	Object – Green Belt	
870007	Mr Stephen Biggs			LPPub530			No	Object – Green Belt	
872079	Mr Sean Mannall			LPPub485			No	Object – Green Belt	
872105	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council	872103	MrsJane Dymock Radley Parish Council	LPPub721			No	Object – Green Belt	
872355	Mrs Ticia Lever			LPPub958			No	Object – Green Belt	
872577	DR David Forrow			LPPub944			No	Object – Green Belt	
873469	B C Turner			LPPub1339			No	Object – Green Belt	
873859	Mrs Claire Proudman			LPPub1637			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1926			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1928			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1934			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1938			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1940			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1941			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan			LPPub1942			No	Object – Green Belt	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Group								
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1946			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1948			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1949			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1951			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1952			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1954			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1955			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1956			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1957			No	Object – Green Belt	
728938	Ms Nicola Blackwood MP (Oxford West and Abingdon Constituency)			LPPub2305			No	Object – Green Belt	
827341	Phyl Howard			LPPub2124			No	Object – Green Belt	
730276	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council			LPPub2389			No	Object – Green Belt	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871676	Mr Ashley Poyton			LPPub2443			No	Object – Green Belt	
872038	Mr Peter Clare			LPPub3251			No	Object – Green Belt	
872458	Mr Ian Wilkinson			LPPub3214			No	Object – Green Belt	
872458	Mr Ian Wilkinson			LPPub3205			No	Object – Green Belt	
874110	D Beer			LPPub3177			No	Object – Green Belt	
874110	D Beer			LPPub3183			No	Object – Green Belt	
874119	T Lever			LPPub3375			No	Object – Green Belt	
874119	T Lever			LPPub3383			No	Object – Green Belt	
874119	T Lever			LPPub3391			No	Object – Green Belt	
874119	T Lever			LPPub3398			No	Object – Green Belt	
874119	T Lever			LPPub3404			No	Object – Green Belt	
874312	John Power			LPPub3461			No	Object – Green Belt	
874504	Mrs Dana Pennington			LPPub3277			No	Object – Green Belt	
874348	Susan Garrett			LPPub3687			No	Object – Green Belt	
874348	Susan Garrett			LPPub3684			No	Object – Green Belt	
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4184			No	Object – Green Belt	
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4193			No	Object – Green Belt	
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub527			No	Object – Green Belt	
872084	Mr Chris Henderson			LPPub504			No	Object – Green Belt	
831624	Mrs RC Fisher			LPPub3172			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	MrsTicia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1950			No	Object – Green Belt	
871772	Ms Margaret Killick			LPPub243			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan			LPPub1915			No	Object – Green Belt	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Group								
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1918			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1919			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1920			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1922			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1935			No	Object – Green Belt	
829381	Mrs Gemma Fraser			LPPub2515			No	Object – Green Belt	
872356	MrsTicia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1921			No	Object – Green Belt	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub656			No	Object – Green Belt	
872355	MrsTicia Lever			LPPub955			No	Object – Green Belt	
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub4518			No	Object – Green Belt	
872513	Mr Roy Jones			LPPub877			No	Object – Green Belt	
828992	Mr Peter Vezey			LPPub4586			No	Object – Green Belt	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub696			No	Object – Green Belt	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub747			No	Object – Green Belt	
873859	Mrs Claire Proudman			LPPub1637			No	Object – Green Belt	
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub2250			No	Object – Green Belt	
871653	Mr Robert			LPPub2251			No	Object –	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Krykant							Green Belt	
871676	Mr Ashley Poyton			LPPub2442		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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.</p> <p>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 ringroad or town centre.</p> <p>The proposed housing cannot be sustained by the existing infrastructure and facilities so should not proceed.</p> <p>800 homes is too many. Reduce the number of houses and the infrastructure will cope.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The delivery of south facing slips is not fully funded by the N. Abingdon development and other funding is not guaranteed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There is no bus 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Phasing should firstly focus on the A34</p> <p>Provision of a new primary school is a must.</p> <p>There is little mention to the future developments of a secondary school, in response to the rising population.</p> <p>Youth facilities and groups need to be also considered.</p> <p>IDP funding is not adequate</p> <p>Lack of funding to make the infrastructure changes necessary, make this development unsuitable and unsustainable.</p> <p>Abingdon has no railway</p> <p>A diamond junction or interchange at Lodge Hill must be in</p>
728843	Mr James Halliday Foreman Laws LLP			LPPub3138			No	Infrastructure	
827850	Mrs Linda Cole			LPPub3082			No	Infrastructure	
874303	Mrs Katharina Walls			LPPub2808			No	Infrastructure	
874110	D Beer			LPPub3203			No	Infrastructure	
874110	D Beer			LPPub3187			No	Infrastructure	
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4143			No	Infrastructure	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub744			No	Infrastructure	
872359	Dr Keith Newton			LPPub755			No	Infrastructure	
872917	Mr Mark Wilkinson			LPPub1294			No	Infrastructure	
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher			LPPub1567			No	Infrastructure	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									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.
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub750		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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 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.</p> <p>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 Tilsey 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 Tisley 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.</p>
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub751			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1917			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1923			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1925			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1930			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1931			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1932			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1933			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1947			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland	
827405	Mr Geoff Broughton			LPPub3325			No	Landscape, Biodiversity and Ancient	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								Woodland	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1927		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on- Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object - 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.
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub1227			No		
874034	G C Miller			LPPub1827		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on- Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object - Overdevelopm ent	
871283	Dr A Strange			LPPub96		Abingdon-on- Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area Strategy	No	Object - Traffic Congestion	<p>A number of comments refer to traffic issues and those associated with infrastructure and the site location. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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. 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 . 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. An upgrade to the A34 is needed before any more housing is considered. The A34 will require a diamond junction at Lodgehill (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. Air pollution in Abingdon-on-Thames will increase due to
865539	Mr Gordon Parsons			LPPub162			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
871207	Mrs Dolores Fletcher			LPPub86			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
871345	Mr Reece Davidson			LPPub125			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
871345	MrReece Davidson			LPPub126			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
871352	Ms Caroline Ball			LPPub133			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
729164	Mrlan Shepherd			LPPub579			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub703			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub704			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub706			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub711			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub712			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub714			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub745			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872027	Mr Terence Carter			LPPub427			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872114	Mr Peter Zimmerman			LPPub547			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
873519	Mr Michael Knott			LPPub1360			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann			LPPub1741			No	Object - Traffic	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Aitken							Congestion	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 drive to work, which conflicts with Core Policy 35 which seeks to support sustainable transport measures to promote public transport, cycling and walking..
828725	Mr Andrew Litherland			LPPub1982			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
874442	Mr Jonathon Acres			LPPub1990			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
827405	Mr Geoff Broughton			LPPub3321			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
874110	D Beer			LPPub3158			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
874494	Lloyd Czaplewski			LPPub3052			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher			LPPub3517			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
874312	John Power			LPPub3469			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
874348	Susan Garrett			LPPub3646			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4136			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872582	Mr Paul Murcutt			LPPub951			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872038	Mr Peter Clare			LPPub1852			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub687			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub705			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub700			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub709			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub672			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872598	Drlain Strachan			LPPub980			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken			LPPub1740			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub742			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub842			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub1314			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
828263	MR KEVIN NORTH			LPPub4127			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
873843	Mr Paul Kearns			LPPub1323			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell			ID-3186742-P-2.8	paragraph		No	Object - Traffic Congestion	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	MsGemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub847	3.2		No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub4710			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub4711			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub4707			Yes	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub4519			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
868674	Mr Oliver Cornish			LPPub4617			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
871352	Ms Caroline Ball			LPPub4715			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub127	6.68		No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
873089	Mr Andrew Turner			LPPub134	6.68		No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
874560	Linden Homes	724542	MrKenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub1318	6.68		No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
871682	Mrs Hilary Prior			LPPub849			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
871682	Mrs Hilary Prior			LPPub2333			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829294	Mrs Julie Pottle			LPPub578			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
829942	Mrs Lucille Peel			LPPub49	5.37		No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub746			No	Object - Traffic Congestion	
827405	Mr Geoff Broughton			LPPub3309		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object – Unsustainable location	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.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3788		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Infrastructure	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 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.
874773	Mr Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3998		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Infrastructure funding	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.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3838		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Public Transport	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. There are strong concerns about the impact of the proposed south-facing slips on the very frequent bus service from Abingdon to Oxford. Any

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									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.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3948		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on SEN facilities	North of Abingdon p10: Social and community requirements – this should clarify that contributions would also be required to SEN facilities
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2203		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Oxford City Council comments	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 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.
832269	Penny Silverwood Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			LPPub2966		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Site Template	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.
874473	Mr Richard Burke Commercial Estates Group (CEG)	874264	MsClare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub4044		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Site Template	
872471	Dr Gill Turner		Abingdon LPPub843	LPPub3767		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing	Yes	Support Green Belt boundary	The Freeholder supports the proposed amendments to the Green Belt boundary at North West Radley, the Triangular

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Needs		amendments	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.
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2991		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	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.
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2878			No	Support North Abingdon Site	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.
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2876			No	Support North Abingdon Site	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.
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2849			No	Support North Abingdon Site	We support the allocation of North Abingdon for around 800 dwellings, which accords with national policy and the Council's Spatial Strategy.
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2852			No	Support North Abingdon Site	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.
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2846			No	Support North Abingdon Site	
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services ((Grd Floor East))			LPPub2318		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>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 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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub793		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Appendix A Site Template	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.
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services ((Grd Floor East))	0		LPPub2323		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments	Thames Water do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capabilityat this site. They have concerns regarding Waste Water Services and note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
873859	Mrs Claire Proudman	0		LPPub1640		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object - Infrastructure	Concerned about the impact on the River Sturt. Building next to the Sturt 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
874494	Lloyd Czaplewski	0		LPPub2378			No	Object – Infrastructure	
872356	Mrs Ticia Lever North Abingdon Local Plan Group	0		LPPub1936		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object – Traffic, Infrastructure and Flooding	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 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
871494	Mr Noel Newson	0		LPPub196		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Object – Traffic, Infrastructure and Flooding	
871494	Mr Noel Newson	0		LPPub197		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Object – Traffic, Infrastructure and Flooding	
871740	Yvette and John Earl	0		LPPub220		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object – Traffic, Infrastructure and Flooding	
872188	Councillor Hermann Matheson	0		LPPub596		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object – Traffic, Infrastructure and Flooding	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730263	Mr John Melling Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council	0		LPPub2434		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Object – Traffic, Infrastructure and Flooding	<p>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, eg noise pollution, prior to development.</p> <p>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 businesses. There are no local shops along North Abingdon.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3791		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	<p>North West of Abingdon on Thames (200 dwellings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Additional congestion along Dunmore Road would push traffic back towards the town, and negate its function as a peripheral road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 contributions would be required. • Twelve Acre Drive and Dunmore Road form part of Abingdon relief road, subject to 40mph limit. This road

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									already suffers substantial congestion during peak traffic periods.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3837		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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.

South of East Hanney Site

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873872	Mrs Sheila Wilkinson			LPPub1666		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Objection to allocation/development South of East Hanney	Representations received with respect to the land South of East Hanney object to the allocation. Reasons for these objections include
873874	Mr Iain Gray			LPPub1647			No		
874042	Mrs Gillian Panton			LPPub1855			No		
872285	Mr Philip Moyes			LPPub694			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3492			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3480			No		
832269	Penny Silverwood Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			LPPub2967			No		
868060	Mr Paul Aram			LPPub21			No		
829740	Mrs Isabel Kent			LPPub258			No		
866283	Mrs Nicola Kauert			LPPub276			No		
830111	Mr Steven Moss			LPPub3262			No		
830111	Mr Steven Moss			LPPub3265			No		
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1285			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub1258			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3494			No		
873682	Mrs Lorene Ashby			LPPub1473			No		
873874	Mr Iain Gray			LPPub1651			No		
874013	Mrs Susan Brown			LPPub1826			No		Comments include a number of those made by East Hanney Parish Council

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874042	Mrs Gillian Panton			LPPub1860			No		The vast majority of suggested modifications to make the plan sound seek the removal of the strategic site allocation South of East Hanney
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub3978			No		
873723	Mr Len Firth			LPPub1489			No		
873723	Mr Len Firth			LPPub1487			No		
873835	Mrs Karon Gray			LPPub1606			No		
872285	Mr Philip Moyes			LPPub691			No		
873977	Mrs Valerie Swift			LPPub1788			No		
874042	Mrs Gillian Panton			LPPub1853			No		
874044	Mr Martin Seymour			LPPub1858			No		
756521	Ms Sally Wallington Letcombe Brook Project			LPPub3171			No		
868539	Mrs Jacqueline Price			LPPub3037			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3495			No		
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub3976			No		
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub3977			No		
865961	Mr David Kirk			LPPub1410			No		
874064	Mrs Jean Elizabeth Jones			LPPub1886			No		
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub815			No		
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1287			No		
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1288			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub1259			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873835	Mrs Karon Gray			LPPub1601			No		
871052	Mr Mike Roberts			LPPub193			No		
871052	Mr Mike Roberts			LPPub195			No		
755871	Oliver and Elizabeth Cornish			LPPub1515			No		
873691	Mrs Jean Smith			LPPub1444			No		
873695	Mr Frederick Smith			LPPub1451			No		
868073	Mrs Ann Iles			LPPub1539			No		
873682	Mrs Lorene Ashby			LPPub1472			No		
873874	Mr Iain Gray			LPPub1650			No		
874013	Mrs Susan Brown			LPPub1822			No		
874042	Mrs Gillian Panton			LPPub1859			No		
874044	Mr Martin Seymour			LPPub1848			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1904			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3490			No		
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub3981			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub1253			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub1256			No		
868674	Mr Oliver Cornish			LPPub1296			No		
873835	Mrs Karon Gray			LPPub1604			No		
874042	Mrs Gillian Panton			LPPub1862			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873835	Mrs Karon Gray			LPPub1609			No		
873873	Mr and Mrs Ann and Clive Fewins			LPPub1661			No		
873874	Mr Iain Gray			LPPub1653			No		
868539	Mrs Jacqueline Price			LPPub3046			No		
871052	Mr Mike Roberts			LPPub189			No		
871052	Mr Mike Roberts			LPPub192			No		
871052	Mr Mike Roberts			LPPub194			No		
868073	Mrs Ann Iles			LPPub1534			No		
868212	Mrs Thelma Scott			LPPub1618			No		
873682	Mrs Lorene Ashby			LPPub1479			No		
873846	Mr Robert Hodgson			LPPub1615			No		
873873	Mr and Mrs Ann and Clive Fewins			LPPub1654			No		
873874	Mr Iain Gray			LPPub1646			No		
873887	Mrs Susan Clarke			LPPub1696			No		
874013	Mrs Susan Brown			LPPub1824			No		
874107	Dr Roger Bett			LPPub2767			No		
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub3975			No		
868539	Mrs Jacqueline Price			LPPub3042			No		
873873	Mr and Mrs Ann and Clive Fewins			LPPub1659			No		
871648	Mrs Jennifer Rolfe			LPPub3418			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871648	Mrs Jennifer Rolfe			LPPub3419			No		
871182	Mr William S.D McCall			LPPub404			No		
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell			LPPub825			No		
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1286			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub1260			No		
758117	Mr Eddie Wilkinson West Hanney Parish Council			LPPub2400			No		
868674	Mr Oliver Cornish			LPPub1299			No		
829241	Mr David Price			LPPub3185			No		
871200	Ms Anne Egerton			LPPub85			No		
829621	Dr Thomas Bradshaw			LPPub186			No		
829740	Mrs Isabel Kent			LPPub226			No		
829910	Mr Michael Kent			LPPub227			No		
829910	Mr Michael Kent			LPPub256			No		
870814	Mrs Margaret Hanlon			LPPub201			No		
871660	Catherine Chater			LPPub207			No		
871182	Mr William S.D McCall			LPPub405			No		
871664	Mrs Karen Bradshaw			LPPub906			No		
872208	Mrs Joanne Kent			LPPub618			No		
872211	Mr Chris Kent			LPPub619			No		
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub1772			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
868212	Mrs Thelma Scott			LPPub1616			No		
868212	Mrs Thelma Scott			LPPub1617			No		
873682	Mrs Lorene Ashby			LPPub1476			No		
873763	Mr Mervyn Rolfe			LPPub1502			No		
873766	Mrs Pixie Poller			LPPub1504			No		
873816	Dr Thomas Hockaday			LPPub1572			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1903			No		
874107	Dr Roger Bett			LPPub2764			No		
868708	Mr Alan Miles			LPPub2932			No		
830111	Mr Steven Moss			LPPub3266			No		
868539	Mrs Jacqueline Price			LPPub3025			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub3396			No		
868212	Mrs Thelma Scott			LPPub32			No		
874555	Mr Robert Pritchard			LPPub3315			No		
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub3972			No		
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub3974			No		
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub3980			No		
829953	Dr Paul Birkby			LPPub1169			No		
829953	Dr Paul Birkby			LPPub1142			No		
873841	M Allen			LPPub1593			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
890667	Mrs Deane Swift			LPPub4785			No		
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub813			No		
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub811			No		
829374	Dr JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1280			No		
829374	Dr JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1281			No		
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1289			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub1254			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub1255			No		
829926	Mr David Blomley			LPPub1291			No		
830589	Wanda Oberman			LPPub1462			No		
872911	Professor James Triffitt			LPPub1279			No		
873674	Judith Long			LPPub1431			No		
868655	Mr Richard Emptage			LPPub28			No		
871182	Mr William S.D McCall			LPPub82			No		
871191	Mrs P J McCall			LPPub83			No		
868060	Mr Paul Aram			LPPub37			No		
868780	Mr Ian Smith			LPPub36			No		
870814	Mrs Margaret Hanlon			LPPub200			No		
867893	Mrs Fiona Derrick			LPPub533			No		
872091	Mr Tony Lee			LPPub501			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell			LPPub827			No		
865961	Mr David Kirk			LPPub1463			No		
867894	Mr Max Derrick			LPPub1293			No		
872939	Mr John Graham Steventon Road Nurseries			LPPub1313			No		
873691	Mrs Jean Smith			LPPub1443			No		
873695	Mr Frederick Smith			LPPub1450			No		
868073	Mrs Ann Iles			LPPub1541			No		
868212	Mrs Thelma Scott			LPPub1620			No		
873709	P Allen			LPPub1474			No		
873816	Dr Thomas Hockaday			LPPub1569			No		
873816	Dr Thomas Hockaday			LPPub1570			No		
873872	Mrs Sheila Wilkinson			LPPub1662			No		
873873	Mr and Mrs Ann and Clive Fewins			LPPub1658			No		
874064	Mrs Jean Elizabeth Jones			LPPub1881			No		
874064	Mrs Jean Elizabeth Jones			LPPub1882			No		
874064	Mrs Jean Elizabeth Jones			LPPub1887			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1902			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1909			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1911			No		
874268	Mr & Mrs Clarke			LPPub2194			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874295	Mr Andrew Heron			LPPub2254			No		
758117	Mr Eddie Wilkinson			LPPub2402			No		
874107	West Hanney Parish Council Dr Roger Bett			LPPub2765			No		
828917	Mrs Gillian Parrry			LPPub2883			No		
871648	Mrs Jennifer Rolfe			LPPub3421			No		
865961	Mr David Kirk			LPPub1426			No		
865961	Mr David Kirk			LPPub1404			No		
748003	Ms Stella Brecknell			LPPub562			No		
749659	Mr T Palmer			LPPub496			No		
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell			LPPub823			No		
825516	Mr Keith Diment			LPPub1012			No		
829374	Dr JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1282			No		
829374	Dr JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1283			No		
868674	Mr Oliver Cornish			LPPub1295			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1912			No		
870814	Mrs Margaret Hanlon			LPPub202			No		
872285	Mr Philip Moyes			LPPub688			No		
868073	Mrs Ann Iles			LPPub1536			No		
868212	Mrs Thelma Scott			LPPub1619			No		
873760	Mr William Gunning			LPPub1503			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873827	Mary Rose			LPPub1580			No		
873873	Mr and Mrs Ann and Clive Fewins			LPPub1656			No		
873874	Mr Iain Gray			LPPub1643			No		
873977	Mrs Valerie Swift			LPPub1786			No		
874013	Mrs Susan Brown			LPPub1815			No		
874042	Mrs Gillian Panton			LPPub1846			No		
874044	Mr Martin Seymour			LPPub1861			No		
874064	Mrs Jean Elizabeth Jones			LPPub1885			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1905			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1910			No		
874616	Dr Susan Tyack			LPPub2576			No		
830111	Mr Steven Moss			LPPub3263			No		
867892	Mr Phillip Creme			LPPub3217			No		
867964	mr anthony watson			LPPub3130			No		
868539	Mrs Jacqueline Price			LPPub3034			No		
874531	Mr Meurig Williams			LPPub3017			No		
865961	Mr David Kirk			LPPub1457			No		
873723	Mr Len Firth			LPPub1484			No		
877853	Mrs Susan Moss			LPPub4613			No		
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub817			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829374	DR JENNIFER SCOTT			LPPub1284			No		
867551	Mr Stewart Scott			LPPub1257			No		
873835	Mrs Karon Gray			LPPub1581			No		
873691	Mrs Jean Smith			LPPub1441			No		
873695	Mr Frederick Smith			LPPub1448			No		
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub816			No		
873835	Mrs Karon Gray			LPPub1600			No		
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell			LPPub829			No		
872285	Mr Philip Moyes			LPPub690			No		
755871	Oliver and Elizabeth Cornish			LPPub1512			No		
873691	Mrs Jean Smith			LPPub1442			No		
873695	Mr Frederick Smith			LPPub1449			No		
868073	Mrs Ann Iles			LPPub1540			No		
873682	Mrs Lorene Ashby			LPPub1480			No		
873872	Mrs Sheila Wilkinson			LPPub1665			No		
873874	Mr Iain Gray			LPPub1645			No		
873977	Mrs Valerie Swift			LPPub1787			No		
874013	Mrs Susan Brown			LPPub1818			No		
874042	Mrs Gillian Panton			LPPub1849			No		
874446	Mr Christopher Baker			LPPub2916			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
868539	Mrs Jacqueline Price			LPPub3039			No		
868197	Mr Stephen McKechnie			LPPub3979			No		
873723	Mr Len Firth			LPPub1486			No		
873691	Mrs Jean Smith			LPPub1445			No		
873695	Mr Frederick Smith			LPPub1452			No		
868073	Mrs Ann Iles			LPPub1544			No		
873682	Mrs Lorene Ashby			LPPub1478			No		
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell			LPPub828			No		
755871	Oliver and Elizabeth Cornish			LPPub1508			No		
873691	Mrs Jean Smith			LPPub1440			No		
873695	Mr Frederick Smith			LPPub1446			No		
873977	Mrs Valerie Swift			LPPub1789			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1907			No		
872285	Mr Philip Moyes			LPPub693			No		
868073	Mrs Ann Iles			LPPub1542			No		
873682	Mrs Lorene Ashby			LPPub1477			No		
873872	Mrs Sheila Wilkinson			LPPub1664			No		
873874	Mr Iain Gray			LPPub1648			No		
874013	Mrs Susan Brown			LPPub1820			No		
874042	Mrs Gillian Panton			LPPub1856			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874044	Mr Martin Seymour			LPPub1863			No		
874125	Mr Arthur Taylor			LPPub1906			No		
868539	Mrs Jacqueline Price			LPPub3045			No		
873835	Mrs Karon Gray			LPPub1602			No		
755871	Oliver and Elizabeth Cornish			LPPub1506			No		
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub818			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3481			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3485			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3472			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3486			No		

East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Site

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874643	St Johns College	724828	Mr Roger Smith	LPPub3869		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Alternative Site (Kingston Bagpuize)	It is stated that a strategic allocation on land east of Kingston Bagpuize and Southmoor could accomodate 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 allcoations in the AONB for which the plan currently proposes two allcoations in the AONB which is contary to national policy.
729558	Southern Construction and Surfacing Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub2373					
829895	Mactaggart and Mickel Homes	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4160		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Developme nt at Kingston Bagpuize (Support)	<p>Support is outlined for the allocation of land to the east of Kingston Bagpuize wuth Southmoor at Core Policy 4 and 8 of the Local Plan. Comments include:</p> <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 it's 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'. Newton Europe Limited which is a thriving operational consultancy business based in Kingston Bagpuize supports the site to the East of Kingston Bagpuize, which wil 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>
741327	David Wilson Homes Southern	873720	Ms Donna Palmer Boyer Planning Ltd	LPPub2652					
829895	Mactaggart and Mickel Homes MrAndrewHawes	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4152					
871845	Newton Europe Limited	0		LPPub290					
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region	0		LPPub2788		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	English Heritage Comments	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									Cultural Heritage” requiring development to retain and respect the line of this earthwork.
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England	0		LPPub2230		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Natural England Comments	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.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3873		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3798		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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 cause satisfactory access to this site to be difficult to

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									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.
831469	Mr Nick Small	0		LPPub1146		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	Yes	Public Transport and Support	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.
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services ((Grd Floor East))	0		LPPub2304		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

North West of Radley Site

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3768		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Alternative Site	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>The freeholder is disappointed in the omission of the North Radley site.</p> <p>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.</p>
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3708			Yes		
872577	Dr David Forrow			LPPub946			No		
872577	Dr David Forrow			LPPub941			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873988	Mrs Edda Smith			LPPub682		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	CP 8 - Objection to Development - Radley	<p>A number of comments object to development at Radley. Specific comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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 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 disregarded?</p>
873801	Miss Camille Deer			LPPub2485			No		
830390	Philip Deer			LPPub2462			No		
873686	Mrs Margaret Davies			LPPub2480			No		
873837	Mrs Cecile Deer			LPPub382			No		
873500	Mr Patrick Burnage			LPPub1349			No		
873521	Mrs Susan Burnage			LPPub1357			No		
874272	Mr Geoffrey Smith	741289	Ms Gemma Care Barton Willmore	LPPub3748		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development	<p>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.</p> <p>Another comment stated that the council's current approach is sound, specifically the draft allocation at North West Radley.</p>
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes			LPPub3765			Yes		
872458	Mr Ian Wilkinson			LPPub3209		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Development of Green Belt	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
724877	Mr Martin Small			LPPub2790		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-	Yes	English Heritage Comments	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	English Heritage South East Region					Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area			College” and “Conserve and enhance the semi-rural setting of the historic core of Radley”.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3870		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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 (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.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3795		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3840		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Area			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 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.
827432	Andrew Dumas			LPPub39	5.8	Paragraph	No	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.
828731	Dr Danielle Ashton Chair of Radley Primary School			LPPub1526		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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.
832268	Lynda Pasquire Crowley			LPPub777		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	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.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub2453		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Scale of Development	<p>A number of comments raise concern over the scale of development at Radley. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Insufficient parking facilities Will affect the character of Radley College Mansion.
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2646			No		
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services ((Grd Floor East))	0		LPPub2324		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

South of Kennington Site

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871196	Ms Mary Cavanagh			LPPub84		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Objection	<p>A number of comments object to development at Kennington. Specific comments include:</p> <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 to high. Local services cannot cope.
872159	Mr L Huxtable			LPPub563			No		
829987	Dr Tim Stephens			LPPub965			No		
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop			LPPub973			No		
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop			LPPub977			No		
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop			LPPub1025			No		
872594	Mrs Carolyn Jessop			LPPub1033			No		
828715	Mr Anthony Downs			LPPub1778			No		
831994	Mr Charles Cottrill			LPPub3097			No		
871196	Ms Mary Cavanagh			LPPub84			No		
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3868		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	<p>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 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.</p>
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs			LPPub3792		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council	<p>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</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Oxfordshire County Council					Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		Comments	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.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3839		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874676	Greg Shaw			LPPub3604		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Support	Support is given for the proposed development. Specific comments include:
873484	Redrow Homes Ltd	876188	Mr Robert Barber Pegasus Group	LPPub4086		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No		<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. <p>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.</p>
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services ((Grd Floor East))			LPPub2328		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments	<p>Thames Water do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site. Thames Wayet do however 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. 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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									ensure infrastructure is in place before development commences.

Core Policy 9: Harcourt Hill Campus

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
728951	David Wyatt Harcourt Hill Resident's Association	755836	Mr David Wyatt Harcourt Hill Estate Resident's Association	LPPub1043	5.21	Paragraph	Yes	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.
728927	Unknown Oxford Brookes University	724498	Mr Steven Pickles West Waddy	LPPub2112		Core Policy 9: Harcourt Hill Campus	No	Objection	
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3322		Core Policy 9: Harcourt Hill Campus	No	Objection	
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2818		Core Policy 9: Harcourt Hill Campus	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage welcomes key site issue iv regarding the long distance views of the site from Oxford, although the view is of spires, towers and domes.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3920		Core Policy 9: Harcourt Hill Campus	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council	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.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2204		Core Policy 9: Harcourt Hill Campus	No	Oxford City Council Comments	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 request opportunity for the City Council to participate in the examination hearing that considers this site.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3323 LPPub3324		Core Policy 9: Harcourt Hill Campus	Yes No	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.

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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871310	Mays Properties Ltd	871308	Mr Gareth Roberts G R Planning Consultancy Ltd	LPPub110		Core Policy 10: Abbey Shopping Centre and the Charter, Abingdon-on-Thames	No	CP10	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.
729117	Lesley Legge OCC - Councillor	0		LPPub2132		Core Policy 10: Abbey Shopping Centre and the Charter, Abingdon-on-Thames	No	Land Uses	Phase 2 Redevelopment of the town centre needs to include mixed retail and leisure facilities as much shopping is now carried out online and town centres need to encourage community activities as well as retail
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council	0		LPPub2108		Core Policy 10: Abbey Shopping Centre and the Charter, Abingdon-on-Thames	Yes	Policy Wording	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.”
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region	0		LPPub2822		Core Policy 10: Abbey Shopping Centre and the Charter, Abingdon-on-Thames	Yes	English Heritage Comments	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.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3922		Core Policy 10: Abbey Shopping Centre and the Charter, Abingdon-on-Thames	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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.

Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub1003		Paragraph	No	Objection	There were around 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
827959	Mr James Krol			LPPub2607		Paragraph	No		
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3680		Paragraph	No		
874243	Mrs Valerie Krol			LPPub3651		Paragraph	No		
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3727	5.29	Paragraph	No		
829858	Mrs P Maltby			LPPub1039		Paragraph	No		
829858	Mrs P Maltby			LPPub1044		Paragraph	No		
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub964		Paragraph	No		
872579	Mrs Helen Devenport			LPPub969		Paragraph	No		
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2825		Paragraph	Yes		
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3729		Paragraph	No		
872202	Ms Angela MacKeith			LPPub684		Botley central area	No		
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub962		Botley central area	No		
872579	Mrs Helen Devenport			LPPub970		Botley central area	No		
730195	Councillor Dudley Hoddinott Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub732		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730195	Councillor Dudley Hoddinott Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub733		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		nearby, issues around land ownership and developability, the loss of housing is not justified against economic benefit and poor community involvement.
829858	Mrs P Maltby			LPPub890		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
872202	Ms Angela MacKeith			LPPub681		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
828796	The Revd Graham Sykes			LPPub1094		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
828796	The Revd Graham Sykes			LPPub1103		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829858	Mrs P Maltby			LPPub1035		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub957		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub953		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1147		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
871866	Dr Kathryn Davies			LPPub1180		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
872596	Dr Caroline Potter			LPPub978		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Oxford			LPPub1434		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829495	Preservation Trust Mr. Martin Dowie			LPPub1634		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2205		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
831733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2176		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
831733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2147		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
831733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2153		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
831733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2163		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
831733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2161		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
756208	Cllr Richard Webber			LPPub2580		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
756208	Cllr Richard Webber			LPPub2577		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
828390	David and Norah Charlesworth			LPPub2418		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East			LPPub2826		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873626	Region Mr Peter Bowell			LPPub2539		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
874617	Mrs Julia Hammett			LPPub2573		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
874617	Mrs Julia Hammett			LPPub2551		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2841		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2819		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2814		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
874607	Mr David Mason	724517	Mr Jeremy Flawn Bluestone Planning	LPPub2943		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
874607	Mr David Mason	724517	Mr Jeremy Flawn Bluestone Planning	LPPub2931		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
874607	Mr David Mason	724517	Mr Jeremy Flawn Bluestone Planning	LPPub2945		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3317		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3326		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3328		Core Policy 11: Botley	No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3336		Central Area Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3339		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829471	Mr Gordon Stokes			LPPub3271		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
830045	Mrs Judy Roberts			LPPub3230		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
830782	Rachel and Stephen Pickles			LPPub3257		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
872596	Dr Caroline Potter			LPPub3281		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
872596	Dr Caroline Potter			LPPub3284		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
730245	Ms Tina Brock Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3557		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829511	Mr Stephen Heath			LPPub3466		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
874628	Mid Counties Cooperative	874466	Mr Kemp & Kemp Jon Waite	LPPub3414		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
828771	Karen Rhodes	873599	Ms Emma Fellowes Barton Willmore LLP	LPPub4125		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
729199	University of Oxford			LPPub3633	0	Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No	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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
875916	Doric Properties and Mace	831404	Mr Julian Philcox JP Planning Ltd	LPPub3819		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		amend the proposed settlement and retail hierarchy to differentiate Botley as a District Centre from Grove which is a Local Service Centre.
729199	University of Oxford	873599	Ms Emma Fellowes Barton Willmore LLP	LPPub3219		Core Policy 8:	No		
828796	The Revd Graham Sykes			LPPub1099		Paragraph	No	Other Comments	<p>There were around 17 other comments for the section on Core Policy 11. These included the following matters:</p> <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
828796	The Revd Graham Sykes			LPPub1100		Paragraph	No		
828796	The Revd Graham Sykes			LPPub1102		Paragraph	No		
832011	Ms Joyce Encer			LPPub612		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
827386	Dr Christopher Prior			LPPub787		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
872176	Miss Michelle Sanders			LPPub581		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
828796	The Revd Graham Sykes			LPPub1095		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
828796	The Revd Graham Sykes			LPPub1097		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829858	Mrs P Maltby			LPPub954		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub963		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
874308	John Marriott			LPPub2000		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
756208	Cllr Richard Webber	724517	Mr Jeremy Flawn Bluestone Planning	LPPub2579		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2827		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2812		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
874247	Mr and Mrs Brian and Margery Dent			LPPub2810		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
874607	Mr David Mason			LPPub2936		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		
872596	Dr Caroline Potter			LPPub3282		Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area	No		

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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2828		Core Policy 12	Yes	English Heritage Comments	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.
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub2256		Core Policy 12	No	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.
758407	Patrick Blake Highway Agency			LPPub2523		Core Policy 12	No	Highways Agency Comments	The Highways Agency make a number of points relating to the proposal to upgrade the Lodge Hill A34 Interchange. Their comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4712	5.37	Core Policy 12	No	Infrastructure Delivery	<p>A number of comments relate to infrastructure delivery. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 development commences. • Hopefully funds for the A34 improvements will be made available from central government, rather than CIL or S106 contributions.
872680	Ms Vicky Walker			LPPub2364			No		
874110	D Beer			LPPub3198			No		
874348	Susan Garrett			LPPub3653			No		
874128	A Smith			LPPub3026			No		
753677	Mrs Roberta Nichols Friends of Abingdon Civic Society			LPPub95			Yes		
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub3252		Core Policy 12	No	Lodge Hill Upgrade	<p>A number of points are made relating to the proposed upgrade of the Lodge Hill A34 Interchange. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3909		Core Policy 12	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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.
874773	Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3993		Core Policy 12	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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 Cumnor. No specific sites have been identified yet but the plan linked below shows indicative approximate locations.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3834	5.32	Paragraph	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	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.
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2080		Core Policy 12	Yes	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.
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1149		Core Policy 12	No	Public	Stagecoach supports the Policy. Specific

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								Transport	<p>comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
729030	Planning Policy South Oxfordshire District Council			LPPub3848		Core Policy 12	Yes	Safeguarding of Land within South Oxfordshire	<p>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 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.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
753677	Mrs Roberta Nichols Friends of Abingdon Civic Society	724518	Mr Neville Surtees Barton Willmore	LPPub94	5.34	Paragraph Core Policy 12:	Yes	South Abingdon Bypass	<p>A number of comments are made relating to the safeguarding of land for the South Abingdon Bypass. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 affect 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.
874650	R and N Kennedy			LPPub2429			No		
873603	Mr and Mrs G Wilson			LPPub3303			No		
730112	Mrs LDalby Culham Parish Council			LPPub2308			No		
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2206		Core Policy 12	No	Oxford City Council Comments	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.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4713	5.37	Core Policy 12: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Traffic Congestion	<p>A number of comments refer to existing traffic congestion within the Abingdon and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. Particular comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP12 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 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.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3341			No		
871345	Mr Reece Davidson			LPPub128			No		
871345	Mr Reece Davidson			LPPub129			No		
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub848			No		
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1322			No		
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken			LPPub1750			No		
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4158			No		
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub2252			No		
867148	Mr Michael Kilgour			LPPub49			No		
874110	D Beer			LPPub3210			No		
874110	D Beer			LPPub3236			No		
871352	Ms Caroline Ball			LPPub135			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871179	Ms Jean Carroll			LPPub81		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	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. 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. 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
871345	Mr Reece Davidson			LPPub131			No		
871352	Ms Caroline Ball			LPPub137			No		
828437	Mr Matthew Hall			LPPub531			No		
872084	Mr Chris Henderson			LPPub505			No		
769602	Marcham Parish Council			LPPub1199			No		
829858	Mrs P Maltby			LPPub934			No		
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub1007			No		
872577	DR David Forrow			LPPub935			No		
872661	Mr Mark Atkins			LPPub1046			No		
872777	Mrs Andrea Spencer			LPPub1181			No		
872880	Mr David Hastings			LPPub1230			No		
873089	Mr Andrew Turner			LPPub1326			No		
873662	Mrs Dominique Henderson			LPPub1427			No		
873701	Mrs Catherine Warren			LPPub1465			No		
823367	Professor Hugh Summers			LPPub1754			No		
828715	Mr Anthony Downs			LPPub1777			No		
829495	Mr. Martin Dowie			LPPub1644			No		
852115	Ian Scargill			LPPub1761			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
852115	Ian Scargill			LPPub1762			No		<p>green belt review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan is unsound as it does not adequately take into account environmental and social constraints, particularly through the green belt review. 6 of approx 482 comments on the Green Belt generally support the recommended changes to the Green Belt boundaries.
867424	Prof Alan Atkinson			LPPub1607			No		
871068	Mr Chris Fox			LPPub1698			No		
873806	Dr Diana Tubbs			LPPub1568			No		
873845	Mr Christopher Brand			LPPub1589			No		
873850	Mr Geoffrey Gibbens			LPPub1603			No		
730281	Mr George Edmonds-Brown			LPPub2110			No		
872038	St Helen Without Parish Council Mr Peter Clare			LPPub1854			No		
873888	Diana Robertson			LPPub1679			No		
873898	Mrs Pamela Gee			LPPub1694			No		
873903	J.P Gee & Sons Farmers Linda Procter			LPPub1764			No		
874034	GC Miller			LPPub1825			No		
728938	Ms Nicola Blackwood			LPPub2301			No		
830844	MP Caroline Ball			LPPub2092			No		
874154	A Anson			LPPub2265			No		
874680	Ricky Cunningham			LPPub2018			No		
871779	Mr Brian Thomas			LPPub253			No		
872122	Mr Colin Cooper			LPPub554			No		
872446	Mr Bernard Pottle			LPPub790			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub833			No		
832469	George Lambrick			LPPub3162			No		
829615	Mrs Rebecca Evans			LPPub3388			No		
831190	Mr Simon Jenkins			LPPub3376			No		
874658	Mr Patrick Lonergan			LPPub3249			No		
874665	Ms Felicity Todd			LPPub3299			No		
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub792			No		
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub788			No		
872313	Rob and Andrea Whitehouse			LPPub701			No		
872423	Mrs Susan Posnett			LPPub775			No		
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1511			No		
827959	Mr James Krol			LPPub2608			No		
874348	Susan Garrett			LPPub3678			No		
874358	B Johnson			LPPub3600			No		
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3611			No		
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3625			No		
874566	Claire Inness			LPPub2355			No		
874579	Shelia Denley			LPPub2267			No		
874581	Tessa Thomas			LPPub2257			No		
874711	MD Austin			LPPub2141			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828554	MR Keith Bushnell			LPPub2682			No		
830181	Mr Peter Hamilton			LPPub2630			No		
831358	Clair Chinnery			LPPub2717			No		
831358	Clair Chinnery			LPPub2712			No		
872102	Mr John Platts			LPPub2464			No		
872108	Mr Jonathan Noys			LPPub2469			No		
872415	Ms Clare Smith			LPPub2482			No		
872559	Mrs Susan Holroyd			LPPub2487			No		
872577	DR David Forrow			LPPub2490			No		
872667	Mrs Maria Bushnell			LPPub2597			No		
874103	Mr Peter Lister			LPPub2694			No		
874266	Mr and Mrs Danny Fisher			LPPub2557			No		
874271	Mr and Mrs Adrian and Joanne Samuels			LPPub2525			No		
874282	Mrs Alice Pinkney			LPPub2501			No		
874419	Ken Howard			LPPub2653			No		
874428	Mr JP Osborne			LPPub2688			No		
874617	Mrs Julia Hammett			LPPub2574			No		
874617	Mrs Julia Hammett			LPPub2556			No		
874623	Ms Susan Hamilton			LPPub2564			No		
830088	Dr Jane Impey (Mellanby)			LPPub3073			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874110	D Beer	741289	Ms Care Gemma Barton Willmore	LPPub3174			No		
874128	A Smith			LPPub3022			No		
874311	Mr Kelvin Sykes			LPPub2990			No		
874528	V Johnson			LPPub3071			No		
874584	Linda Martin			LPPub3117			No		
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3347			Yes		
729030	Planning Policy South Oxfordshire District Council			LPPub3842			Yes		
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher			LPPub3507			No		
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes			LPPub3713			Yes		
874243	Mrs Valerie Krol			LPPub3654			No		
874424	Mr Peter Harbour	741289	Ms Care Gemma Barton Willmore	LPPub3885			No		
874424	Mr Peter Harbour			LPPub3893			No		
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3732			No		
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes			LPPub3757			Yes		
872591	Miss Layla Moran Liberal Democrats, Oxford West and Abingdon			LPPub3971			No		
831624	Mrs RC Fisher			LPPub3166			No		
829471	Mr Gordon Stokes			LPPub3272			No		
728843	Mr James Halliday Foreman Laws LLP			LPPub3131			No		
728817	Mrs Elizabeth Bennett			LPPub3030			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
823909	Mr Michael Umbers			LPPub17			No		
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4128			No		
874694	Mrs Sue Davies			LPPub3570			No		
827959	Mr James Krol			LPPub2611			No		
874406	mr Dudley Goodhead			LPPub2603			No		
828768	Mr Christopher Bryan			LPPub2380			No		
869835	Mrs Amanda Morbey			LPPub44			No		
852115	Ian Scargill			LPPub1757			No		
871162	Mr Andrew Andrew Lane			LPPub79			No		
874416	Mr Daniel Essen			LPPub2780			No		
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2654			No		
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2754			No		
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2757			No		
852115	Ian Scargill			LPPub1774			No		
874669	Mrs Jinty Biggs			LPPub3285			No		
872079	Mr Sean Mannall			LPPub491			No		
873626	Mr Peter Bowell			LPPub2540			No		
730245	Ms Tina Brock Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3538			No		
829511	MR Stephen Heath			LPPub3470			No		
872362	Dr Charles Cottrill			LPPub3694			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2622			No		
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2623			No		
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2625			No		
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2627			No		
828390	David and Norah Charlesworth			LPPub2419			No		
742134	Mr Robert Warne S.P.A.D.E			LPPub3035			No		
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3730			No		
872900	Mr Andrew Jeffries			LPPub1272			No		
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1546			No		
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub525			No		
874128	A Smith			LPPub2149			No		
874131	Mr John Earwicker			LPPub2050			No		
831631	Marguerite Osbourne			LPPub1808			No		
874140	Mr David Launchbury			LPPub2033			No		
874298	Dr Robin Rees			LPPub2240			No		
873535	Mr William Laing			LPPub1385			No		
873536	Miss Katherine Laing			LPPub1386			No		
873539	Mr Andrew Laing			LPPub1383			No		
873540	Mrs Anne Laing			LPPub1384			No		
873884	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1686			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873884	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1681			No		
828725	Mr Andrew Litherland			LPPub1974			No		
830844	Caroline Ball			LPPub2091			No		
874391	Mrs Helen Rees			LPPub2047			No		
874706	Deidre Jones			LPPub2013			No		
874708	Mike Davies			LPPub2008			No		
820249	Mr Gareth Morgan			LPPub2436			No		
871676	Mr Ashley Poyton			LPPub2444			No		
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2651			No		
874094	Mr Robert McGurrin			LPPub2670			No		
831595	Clive Ricks			LPPub2908			No		
874487	Dr Anthony Webster			LPPub3503			No		
872186	Alison Shelley			LPPub607			No		
868665	Mr Stuart Lovegrove			LPPub31			No		
867694	Dr Rosamond Hall			LPPub20			No		
829213	Ms Celina Sykes			LPPub229			No		
872445	Mrs Catherine Clayton			LPPub900			No		
872502	Andrew and Sharon Allen			LPPub868			No		
871668	Mr Alistoun			LPPub1088			No		
872926	Mr John Bleasdale			LPPub1308			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828437	Mr Matthew Hall	876188	Mr Barber Robert Pegasus Group	LPPub532	5.41		No		
874560	Ms Helen Marshall			LPPub3728			No		
874676	Campaign to Protect Rural England Greg Shaw			LPPub3618			No		
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4173			No		
873484	Redrow Homes Ltd			LPPub4087			No		
872437	Mr Philip Pullman			LPPub820			No		
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub754			No		
746942	Professor Bernard Fingleton			LPPub2			No		
869829	Dr Isabella Rey			LPPub43			Yes		
829948	Mr Mark Elly	872081	Miss Brighton Alice Planning Potential	LPPub1074	5.4		No		
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub509			No		
871974	Ms Lynda Pasquire Crowley			LPPub386			No		
872083	Green & Co			LPPub804			Yes		
831232	Dr Brian Gasser	873599	Ms Fellowes Emma Barton Willmore LLP	LPPub1582	5.4		No		
729199	University of Oxford			LPPub3224			No		
752247	Mrs Anne Feather Kennington Parish Council			LPPub993			No		
866592	mr bob evans			LPPub15			No		
874670	Douglas Bond			LPPub3525			No		
730195	Councillor Dudley Hoddinott Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub731			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock	872103	Mrs Dymock Jane Radley Parish Council	LPPub2367			No		
756208	Cllr Richard Webber			LPPub2572			No		
756208	Cllr Richard Webber			LPPub2575			No		
872084	Mr Chris Henderson			LPPub499			No		
872102	Mr John Platts			LPPub536			No		
832268	Lynda Pasquire Crowley			LPPub767			No		
872105	Mrs Jane Dymock Radley Parish Council			LPPub718			No		
872415	Ms Clare Smith			LPPub812			No		
872559	Mrs Susan Holroyd			LPPub904			No		
874316	P Roper			LPPub3511			No		
874773	Ms Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3989			No		
785816	Councillor Jeanette Halliday Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub2425			No		
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Oxford Preservation Trust			LPPub1432			No		
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2207			No		
873500	Mr Patrick Burnage			LPPub1351			No		
873521	Mrs Susan Burnage			LPPub1358			No		
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub2446			No		
872877	Mrs Nicola Payne			LPPub1229			No		
873519	Mr Michael Knott			LPPub1359			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874660	Jane Guest	879505	Mr Gardner Geoff	LPPub2760			No		
874500	Mr Alex Money			LPPub3044			No		
725556	Mr Sean Mannall			LPPub493			No		
725556	Mrs Alice Gardiner			LPPub1049			No		
725556	Andrew and Sharon Allen			LPPub871			No		
727437	Mr Alistoun			LPPub1091			No		
728489	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2100			Yes		
728489	Mr Peter Lister			LPPub2693			No		
729558	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1545			No		
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd			LPPub4554			No		
873513	D Barney			LPPub4632			No		
873696	E Butler			LPPub4633			No		
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4705			No		
879287	Alison Smith			LPPub4742			No		
730191	Councillor Jim Halliday Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub4756			No		
730191	Councillor Jim Halliday Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub4757			No		
831065	Professor Francis Frascina			LPPub4781			No		
831065	Professor Francis Frascina			LPPub4783			No		
873843	Mr Paul Kearns			LPPub1585			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829615	Mrs Rebecca Evans	832055	Mr Butt Paul	LPPub3382	5.1		No		
872801	Mr Matthew Green Green and Co c/o Community of St Mary the Virgin, Wantage			LPPub1177			No		
728938	Ms Nicola Blackwood MP	873600	Mr Maniar Ifti West Waddy ADP	LPPub2288			No		
873601	Mr Robin Herd			LPPub3060			No		
872826	Mrs Antonia Keaney			LPPub1218			Yes		
830710	Mr Chris Lane			LPPub1550			No		
872739	Mr Jeremy Slatter			LPPub1096	2		No		
829318	Mr Toby Wright			LPPub634		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	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</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) 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
828086	Mrs Christine Wootton			LPPub63			No		
729471	Mrs June Bruce			LPPub1080			No		
872205	John Allan			LPPub620			No		
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher			LPPub1311			No		
873648	Marylyn Garraway			LPPub1428			No		
823367	Professor Hugh Summers			LPPub1755			No		
826675	Mrs Ann Aitken			LPPub1731			No		
872819	Mr Gordon Garraway			LPPub1767			No		
872038	Mr Peter Clare			LPPub1851			No		
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub2255			No		
874442	Mr Jonathon Acres			LPPub1993			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874494	Lloyd Czaplewski	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2371			No		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. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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.
724889	Didcot Chamber of Commerce			LPPub2558			No		
827850	Mrs Linda Cole			LPPub3079			No		
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub3246			No		
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub3250			No		
872458	Mr Ian Wilkinson			LPPub3201			No		
876772	Mr Micheal Belcher			LPPub4518			No		
872089	Ms Maureen Allison			LPPub500			No		
872807	ms annabel eyres			LPPub2151			No		
874503	Nikolay Nikolaev			LPPub2366			No		
741313	Radley College			LPPub2851			No		
828086	Mrs Christine Wootton			LPPub61	5.4		No		
828086	Mrs Christine Wootton			LPPub62	5.4		No		
828086	Mrs Christine Wootton			LPPub219	No				
828086	Mrs Christine Wootton			LPPub41	No				
743654	Mr Peter Gore			LPPub629	No				
755926	Mr Derek Charles Moores			LPPub756	No				
827918	Mr John Huddleston			LPPub1251	No				
828453	Mrs Joyce Huddleston			LPPub1264	No				
873922	Mrs Vivienne Summers			LPPub1704	No				

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
741313	Radley College	741289	Ms Care Gemma Barton Willmore	LPPub3390			Yes		
829615	Mrs Rebecca Evans			LPPub3400			No		
874311	Mr Kelvin Sykes			LPPub2990			No		
874614	Miss Katerina Johnson			LPPub3105			No		
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher			LPPub3507			No		
871806	Mr Martin Hatton			LPPub283			No		
730195	Councillor Dudley Hoddinott			LPPub734			No		
729117	Vale of White Horse District Council Lesley Legge OCC - Councillor			LPPub2130			No		
872680	Ms Vicky Walker			LPPub2362			No		
873648	Marylyn Garraway			LPPub1425			No		
827405	Mr Geoff Broughton			LPPub3313			No		
728489	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2100			Yes		
872218	Mrs Barbara Hickford			LPPub4655			No		
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4705			No		
871653	Mr Robert Krykant			LPPub3254			No		
869005	Taylor Wimpey Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	853993	Mr Ross Andrew	LPPub1063			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730231	Mrs Susan Blomerus Appleton with Eaton Parish Council			LPPub257		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	Appleton Green Belt Comments	<p>21 of around 540 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to some or all of the green belt boundary changes around Appleton village</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) Objections predominantly relate to the two areas recommended in the green belt review for removal. For land #25, access to the site is difficult and currently a bridleway; health and safety issues in relation to the playground, important views from the bridleway across the Thames Valley, and there are potential flooding issues. For land # 7, the area is too large and any development on this land would not be in keeping with the existing character/grain of the built up environment A lot of comments made reference that some minor/small scale development could be acceptable in the village. The majority of the recommended modifications seek to remove any changes to the green belt in Appleton village.
871980	Mr and Mrs Biltcliffe			LPPub397			No		
871982	Leon and Sophie Willis			LPPub399			No		
871983	Mr Roger Gilkes			LPPub400			No		
871986	Mr Liam Clogger			LPPub402			No		
872016	Chris and Paul Snelling			LPPub419			No		
872260	Graeme Campbell			LPPub676			No		
872266	Ms Deborah White			LPPub678			No		
873538	Dr T. M. Jack			LPPub1372			No		
871983	Mr Roger Gilkes			LPPub1697			No		
873775	Mrs & Mr Diana & Patrick O' Meara			LPPub1516			No		
873788	Mary Carey			LPPub1537			No		
873793	D Pearl			LPPub1552			No		
874321	Ms Kimberley Rennie			LPPub2185			No		
728938	Ms Nicola Blackwood MP			LPPub2321			No		
829642	Mr Richard Tyack			LPPub2805			No		
873936	Mr Richard Dick			LPPub3275			No		
874678	Mrs Sandra Baker			LPPub3451			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873936	Mr Richard Dick			LPPub1732			No		
831994	Mr Charles Cottriall			LPPub138			No		
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4129			No		
869005	Taylor Wimepy Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	853993	Mr Ross Andrew	LPPub1059		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	Botley Green Belt Comments	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 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.
874690	JD Carver			LPPub2006			No		
728927	Oxford Brookes University	724498	Mr Pickles Steven West Waddy	LPPub2135			No		
728938	Ms Nicola Blackwood MP			LPPub2316			No		
873847	Mr David Nowakowski			LPPub1598		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	Cumnor/ Botley Green Belt Comments	Around 172 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 <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
828263	Mr Kevin North			LPPub1613			No		
873988	Mrs Edda Smith			LPPub1819			No		
873988	Mrs Edda Smith			LPPub1803			No		
873989	Mrs Edda Smith			LPPub1813			No		
830181	Mr Peter Hamilton			LPPub2635			No		
830182	Mr Peter Hamilton			LPPub2628			No		
874623	Ms Susan Hamilton			LPPub2567			No		
827386	Dr Christopher Prior			LPPub313			No		
828703	Mr Tim Pottle			LPPub534			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871670	Mrs Julie Irving			LPPub214			No		<p>development as a result of these changes will have a significant adverse impact on the local infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of the recommended modifications seek to remove any changes to the green belt in Cumnor parish. 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.
871677	Mr Woodford David			LPPub896			No		
871682	Mrs Hilary Prior			LPPub339			No		
871682	Mrs Hilary Prior			LPPub342			No		
0	Anonymous			LPPub699			No		
829294	mrs Julie Pottle			LPPub726			No		
829942	Mrs Lucille Peel			LPPub538			No		
871991	Mrs Sarah Wimborne			LPPub412			No		
872100	Mr Ian Bannerman			LPPub522			No		
872073	Mrs Elizabeth Davies			LPPub695			No		
872370	Mrs Anne Parker			LPPub760			No		
872436	Mr Terry Macmillan			LPPub783			No		
872446	Mr Bernard Pottle			LPPub789			No		
828992	Mr Peter Vezey			LPPub1496			No		
828993	Mrs Wendy Vezey			LPPub1499			No		
830390	Philip Deer			LPPub1595			No		
873686	Mrs Margaret Davies			LPPub1447			No		
873801	Miss Camille Deer			LPPub1576			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873837	Mrs Cecile Deer	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub1584			No		
874272	Mr Geoffrey Smith			LPPub1895			No		
828972	Mr/Mrs Nic/Rose Hallam			LPPub2449			No		
828972	Mr/Mrs Nic/Rose Hallam			LPPub2451			No		
871677	Mr Woodford David			LPPub2483			No		
831994	Mr Charles Cottrill			LPPub3100			No		
873989	Mrs Edda Smith			LPPub1832			No		
874384	Oxford Diocese Board of Finance			LPPub2520			No		
831878	Keith and Margaret Eddey			LPPub680			No		
872067	Mr Kingsmill Bond			LPPub453			No		
831232	Dr Brian Gasser			LPPub1579			No		
831391	Mrs Joyce M Robinson			LPPub1571			No		
874682	Damen Kerby			LPPub4067			No		
827386	Dr Christopher Prior			LPPub321			No		
828703	Mr Tim Pottle			LPPub540			No		
828972	Mr/Mrs Nic/Rose Hallam			LPPub519			No		
829929	Mr Richard Peel			LPPub204			No		
867694	Dr Rosamond Hall			LPPub45			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
867694	Dr Rosamond Hall			LPPub209			No		
871669	Mr Russell Irving			LPPub211			No		
871670	Mrs Julie Irving			LPPub215			No		
827407	Mr John Ross			LPPub671			No		
829011	Mr Rogan Meadows			LPPub637			No		
829294	mrs Julie Pottle			LPPub724			No		
829457	Mr Robin Wimborne			LPPub398			No		
867694	Dr Rosamond Hall			LPPub508			No		
871682	Mrs Hilary Prior			LPPub378			No		
871991	Mrs Sarah Wimborne			LPPub413			No		
872064	Ms Sarah Redston			LPPub449			No		
872100	Mr Ian Bannerman			LPPub521			No		
872125	Dr Gina Copp			LPPub556			No		
872133	Mr Michael John Hodder			LPPub558			No		
872153	Mr Tim Rhodes			LPPub561			No		
871677	Mr Woodford David			LPPub897			No		
872073	Mrs Elizabeth Davies			LPPub689			No		
872241	Mrs Patricia Meadows			LPPub643			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872370	Mrs Anne Parker			LPPub759			No		
872383	Mr Stephen Harvey			LPPub762			No		
872423	Mrs Susan Posnett			LPPub776			No		
872429	Mrs Deidre Davey			LPPub778			No		
872429	Mrs Deidre Davey			LPPub780			No		
872436	Mr Terry Macmillan			LPPub785			No		
872450	Mrs Delia Weston			LPPub807			No		
872467	Mrs Claire Tyrell-Williams			LPPub831			No		
829371	Mrs Fiona Newton			LPPub1053			No		
830773	Dr Margaret Selinger			LPPub1119			No		
831239	Mark Selinger			LPPub1155			No		
872575	Mr Paul Spencer			LPPub1108			No		
872579	Mrs Helen Devenport			LPPub968			No		
872691	Mrs J Thakker			LPPub1041			No		
0	Anonymous			LPPub1453			No		
0	Anonymous			LPPub1586			No		
828741	Mr Martin Townsend			LPPub1597			No		
828992	Mr Peter Vezey			LPPub1497			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828993	Mrs Wendy Vezey			LPPub1498			No		
830390	Philip Deer			LPPub1596			No		
873526	Professor Joe Cartwright			LPPub1365			No		
873700	Mr Peter Sissons			LPPub1458			No		
873700	Mr Peter Sissons			LPPub1461			No		
873705	Mrs Deborah Baird			LPPub1470			No		
829402	Ms Janet Pottle			LPPub1749			No		
873724	Mrs Colette Selwood			LPPub1485			No		
873801	Miss Camille Deer			LPPub1577			No		
873802	Harry Powell			LPPub1555			No		
873834	Mr Malcolm Posnett			LPPub1591			No		
873853	J Kenwright			LPPub1614			No		
873885	Mr Christopher Ing			LPPub1673			No		
873886	Mr Simon Warren			LPPub1685			No		
873988	Mrs Edda Smith			LPPub1776			No		
874272	Mr Geoffrey Smith			LPPub1896			No		
874272	Mr Geoffrey Smith			LPPub1897			No		
874272	Mr Geoffrey Smith			LPPub1898			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874272	Mr Geoffrey Smith			LPPub1900			No		
728938	Ms Nicola Blackwood MP			LPPub2310			No		
831961	John Grimshaw			LPPub1986			No		
873419	Mr and Mrs Jones			LPPub2029			No		
874120	Mr Bob Boyles			LPPub1999			No		
874648	Mrs Jan Deakin			LPPub2045			No		
828437	Mr Matthew Hall			LPPub2456			No		
828437	Mr Matthew Hall			LPPub2460			No		
872098	Dr Edward Impey			LPPub2404			No		
874408	Dr Elizabeth Matthews			LPPub2407			No		
828554	MR Keith Bushnell			LPPub2685			No		
828863	mrs catherine Mott			LPPub2687			No		
828966	Mr John Conder			LPPub2552			No		
832024	Mr and Mrs Roger and Sheila Clarkson Webb			LPPub2592			No		
872667	Mrs Maria Bushnell			LPPub2599			No		
874307	Mr Edward Mott			LPPub2681			No		
874412	A Gaydon			LPPub2701			No		
874412	A Gaydon			LPPub2702			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874489	Mrs Sandra Gee			LPPub2740			No		
874489	Mrs Sandra Gee			LPPub2741			No		
728657	Mr Ben Willis			LPPub3053			No		
829960	Dr Robert Amess			LPPub2985			No		
829960	Dr Robert Amess			LPPub2978			No		
874441	Mr Gerard Ledger			LPPub2958			No		
829655	Mrs Natalie Kerby			LPPub3259			No		
831994	Mr Charles Cottriall			LPPub3094			No		
874634	Antoinette Meehan			LPPub3065			No		
874682	Damen Kerby			LPPub3155			No		
829968	Dr Yuka Kobayashi			LPPub3580			No		
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3731			No		
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3620			No		
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3614			No		
874367	F Frascina			LPPub3615			No		
831994	Mr Charles Cottriall			LPPub138			No		
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4129			No		
828748	Prof Peter Renton			LPPub3253			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831583	Dr Derwent Swaine	724322	Mr Lyzba Nick John Phillips Planning Consultancy	LPPub1573			No		
830050	Mr Peter Snow			LPPub1635			No		
830050	Mr Peter Snow			LPPub1633			No		
830050	Mr Peter Snow			LPPub1638			No		
830050	Mr Peter Snow			LPPub1639			No		
873729	Mr and Mrs John & Shelley Szull			LPPub1491			No		
873732	J Sissons			LPPub1493			No		
873988	Mrs Edda Smith			LPPub1831			No		
830045	Mrs Judy Roberts			LPPub3212			No		
831981	Ms Linda Hill			LPPub2379			No		
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2645			No		
874118	Mr John Boyles			LPPub2677			No		
874237	Mr and Mrs John and Tricia Venables			LPPub2665			No		
872542	Mr Graham Deacon			LPPub2484			No		
831779	Landowners land at South Cumnor			LPPub3882			No		
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2754			No		
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2757			No		
873626	Mr Peter Bowell			LPPub2540			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730245	Ms Tina Brock Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3538			No		
829511	MR Stephen Heath			LPPub3470			No		
872362	Dr Charles Cottriall			LPPub3694			No		
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2622			No		
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2623			No		
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2625			No		
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2627			No		
828390	David and Norah Charlesworth			LPPub2419			No		
831595	Clive Ricks			LPPub2908			No		
832011	Ms Joyce Encer			LPPub615			No		
874634	Antoinette Meehan			LPPub3068			No		
874154	A Anson			LPPub3444			No		
825498	Dr Guy Matthews			LPPub772			No		
869896	Mr Robin Noble			LPPub54	5.4		No		
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub2760			No		
873837	Mrs Cecile Deer			LPPub4620			No		
873696	E Butler			LPPub4634			No		
831065	Professor Francis Frascina			LPPub4783			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872807	ms annabel eyres			LPPub2151		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	Kennington Green Belt Comments	<p>8 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)</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) 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)
874503	Nikolay Nikolaev			LPPub2366			No		
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2645			No		
829615	Mrs Rebecca Evans			LPPub3386			No		
871160	Mr Benjamin Dean			LPPub77			No		
730195	Councillor Dudley Hoddinott Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub734			No		
872144	Colin Charlett			LPPub559			No		
872680	Ms Vicky Walker			LPPub2362			No		
874670	Douglas Bond			LPPub3534		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	North Hinksey Green Belt Comments	<p>One comment on the Green Belt specifically object to the green belt boundary changes around North Hinksey village (this excludes references to Botley above)</p> <p>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 stand alone village.</p>
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub1202		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	Other Green Belt Comments	<p>Affordable Housing 1 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. 1 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.</p>
866170	Ms Anne Gow			LPPub1192			Yes		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872807	ms annabel eyres	741289	Ms Care Gemma Barton Willmore	LPPub2151	5.4	Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	Radley Green Belt Comments	<p>16 comments on the Green Belt specifically object to the green belt boundary changes around Radley village (this excludes references to Botley above)</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) 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. 1 comment 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)
874503	Nikolay Nikolaev			LPPub2366			No		
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2645			No		
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes			LPPub3757			Yes		
871156	Mr Andrew Krajewski			LPPub76			No		
873733	S Collison			LPPub1518			No		
871806	Mr Martin Hatton			LPPub283			No		
832011	Ms Joyce Encer			LPPub615			No		
874154	A Anson			LPPub3444			No		
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub528			No		
871160	Mr Benjamin Dean			LPPub77			No		
730195	Councillor Dudley Hoddinott Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub734			No		
872144	Colin Charlett			LPPub559			No		
872680	Ms Vicky Walker	879505	Mr Gardner Geoff	LPPub2362			No		
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd			LPPub4554			No		
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes			LPPub3740			Yes		
873611	Radley College & Kibswell Homes	741289	Ms Care Gemma Barton Willmore	LPPub3744			Yes		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
758213	The Manor Preparatory School The Manor Preparatory School	874466	Mr Jon Waite Kemp & Kemp	LPPub3425		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	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.
872089	Ms Maureen Allison	874611	Mr Mitchell Greg Framptons Town Planning	LPPub500		Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt	No	Wootton Green Belt Comments	93 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. <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) 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 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.
871984	Mr John Perry			LPPub401			No		
874612	Mr Grant Stevenson Catesby			LPPub2600			Yes		
874621	Mrs Denise Fletcher			LPPub2570			No		
742134	Mr Robert Warne S.P.A.D.E			LPPub3035			No		
828879	Mrs T Woods			LPPub241			No		
829367	Prof John Simons			LPPub234			No		
871425	Mr Stephen Studds			LPPub187			No		
871753	Mr Tim Rayne			LPPub233			No		
871767	Ms Jenny Bigg			LPPub238			No		
825523	mrs anne garner			LPPub630			No		
829933	mr anthony white			LPPub421			No		
871979	Mr John Woods			LPPub395			No		
871987	M Field			LPPub403			No		
872086	Mr Mark Garner			LPPub497			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872088	Mr Gordon Allison			LPPub498			No		
872092	Mr Mark Harrington			LPPub502			No		
872197	Mrs Christine Peel			LPPub610			No		
872219	Peter & Marie Turner			LPPub624			No		
829373	Gunderson			LPPub1017			No		
871922	Mrs Suzanne Thornton			LPPub1206			No		
872644	Mr Jon Woods			LPPub995			No		
872709	John and Angela Hudson			LPPub1051			No		
872821	Mr and Mrs Harrison			LPPub1210			No		
872883	J A Perkins			LPPub1235			No		
872886	Ms Sylvia Huggins			LPPub1236			No		
872887	Cecil Selby			LPPub1238			No		
872908	Ms Jill Selby			LPPub1277			No		
872923	Ms Sarah Cook PPD			LPPub1300			No		
872934	Mr Andy Cook			LPPub1310			No		
873503	M Shevchenko			LPPub1343			No		
873506	V Shevchenko			LPPub1344			No		
873507	S Barney			LPPub1345			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873534	J Weston			LPPub1367			No		
873542	K Weston			LPPub1368			No		
873546	S Thornton			LPPub1369			No		
873547	K Thornton			LPPub1370			No		
873548	P Harrison			LPPub1371			No		
873552	J Harrison			LPPub1373			No		
873557	N Harrison			LPPub1374			No		
873560	S Harrison			LPPub1375			No		
873561	Steve Harrison			LPPub1376			No		
873562	R Nichols			LPPub1377			No		
873563	J Nichols			LPPub1378			No		
873613	Leonard Lyford			LPPub1409			No		
873619	J K LYFORD			LPPub1411			No		
873628	J Wacławek			LPPub1417			No		
873630	D A Wacławek			LPPub1418			No		
873634	J Alswatt			LPPub1419			No		
873637	R Mackay			LPPub1421			No		
873643	S Mackay			LPPub1422			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828769	Mr Stuart Henderson			LPPub1970			No		
874136	Mr & Mrs Arnold			LPPub2042			No		
874138	Mr & Mrs Arnold			LPPub2043			No		
874145	Dr Ziyah Mehta			LPPub2026			No		
874150	Freya Mehta			LPPub2027			No		
874151	Mrs Maggie Shepley			LPPub2028			No		
874451	Mrs Jane Weston			LPPub1984			No		
828305	Mrs Alison Kirtland			LPPub2356			No		
874546	Mr Tom Alabaster			LPPub2351			No		
874662	Mr & Mrs G & M McDonough			LPPub2410			No		
729384	Mr Wilfred Laycock			LPPub2595			No		
825538	Mr Robert Kirtland			LPPub2675			No		
871425	Mr Stephen Studds			LPPub2571			No		
873507	S Barney			LPPub2493			No		
874099	Mr Tim Friers			LPPub2673			No		
874112	Mrs J Harrington			LPPub2674			No		
874396	Mrs Jenny Iles			LPPub2590			No		
874398	Mr Richard Chaundy			LPPub2582			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874402	Mrs Liz Corder	875597	Mr Brown Philip Savills	LPPub2589			No		
874409	Mr Adrian Cantwell			LPPub2602			No		
874411	Mrs Joanna Corder			LPPub2601			No		
874451	Mrs Jane Weston			LPPub2585			No		
874618	Dr Philippa Henry			LPPub2549			No		
874633	Ms Eileen Studds			LPPub2535			No		
828967	miss amanda whatley			LPPub2801			No		
874670	Douglas Bond			LPPub3150			No		
875595	Farrar, Manning and Henry Families			LPPub3115			Yes		
874304	John Fathers			LPPub3335			No		
874678	Mrs Sandra Baker			LPPub3453			No		
874327	Gareth Williams			LPPub3565			No		
874332	S Williams			LPPub3583			No		
874334	B Parsons			LPPub3591			No		
874339	Pek Ng			LPPub3593			No		
874342	Peter Bennett			LPPub3595			No		
730294	Mr George Edmonds-Brown Wootton Parish Council			LPPub2695			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829948	Mr Mark Elly			LPPub1074	5.41		No		
874154	A Anson			LPPub3444			No		
829948	Mr Mark Elly			LPPub1076	5.4		No		
872515	Ms Christine Haylett			LPPub882			No		
829948	Mr Mark Elly			LPPub1073	5.42		No		
830156	Mrs Carol Trower			LPPub2357			No		
826844	Mr David Stanford			LPPub2751			No		
873513	D Barney			LPPub4632			No		
879157	Mr K and Mrs D K and Denise Fletcher			LPPub4732			No		

Core Policy 14: Upper Thames Reservoir

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2832		Core Policy 14: Upper Thames Reservoir	No	English Heritage Comments	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2690	5.45	Core Policy 14: Upper Thames Reservoir	No	Objection to Proposal	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub749			No		
874584	Linda Martin			LPPub3124			No		
404457	Mr Ken Dijksman Dijkman Planning LLP			LPPub4100			No		
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4130			No		
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub2583			No		
829424	Mr Clive Manvell			LPPub2290			No		
874773	Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3991		Core Policy 14: Upper Thames Reservoir	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments - 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 Vale's policy on a combined housing and reservoir site on the safeguarded land.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2208		Core Policy 14: Upper Thames Reservoir	Yes	Oxford City Council Comments	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.
874630	Mr Philip Smith Swindon Borough Council			LPPub2545		Core Policy 14: Upper Thames Reservoir	Yes	Swindon Borough Council Comments Support	The safeguarding of land for the Upper Thames Reservoir is supported so not to prejudice the long-term growth of Swindon.
874791	Mr Mark Mathews	874790	Mr David Wilson Savills	LPPub2286		Core Policy 14: Upper Thames Reservoir	No	Thames Water Comments 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.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									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.
874791	Mr Mark Mathews Thames Water	874790	Mr David Wilson Savills	LPPub2280		Core Policy 14: Upper Thames Reservoir	No	Thames Water Comments	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. 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.

Summary of Representations: Chapter 5 South East Vale Sub Area

Core Policy 15 Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub Area

General Comments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729077	M Carlisle The Hendred Estate	770888	Mr Henry Venners JPPC	LPPub2925	0	Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Allocation for Larger and Smaller Villages	<p>We are of the view that East Hendred may present an opportunity for significant development, which would have the potential to 'take' all of the Part 2 allocation of 56 dwellings</p> <p>There is understood to be demand for housing more widely across the district including in existing sustainable locations like East Hendred</p> <p>The countryside setting of East Hendred and its Conservation Area would be affected by large scale development between Harwell and East Hendred. It would increase pressure for continuous development between Didcot and East Hendred.</p> <p>Raising the number of homes to be allocated in Part 2 would spread development pressure across the district and reduce risk of market saturation in any one area. Relying only on very large allocations for the South East Vale could be said to be putting all one's eggs in one basket.</p> <p>Allocating in Part 1 for more housing to be provided in Part 2 for the larger and smaller villages will allow communities to avoid stagnation.</p> <p>Allocating only say 5 dwellings 1 for East Hendred will not account for grow that all given the 20 year period of the plan and likely diminished household sizes over that time.</p> <p>Sustainable villages such as East Hendred are well placed to contribute to meeting housing need for the area, and would be enhanced through development. However the tightly planned form of East Hendred and the other villages means there are limited opportunities for infill development (as currently defined</p> <p>Well located to take advantage of the Local Plan's vision of sustainable economic development that is identified by Science Vale and significant employment potential of Harwell Campus and Milton Park</p> <p>People living here would not need to own a car to access vital day to day services, including employment, schools and shops and others.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873605	Mr Bill Kler	873604	Ms Gemma Field Barton Willmore	LPPub3297		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Allocation for Open Countryside	<p>A number of comments relate to allocations in open countryside. Specific points raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of acknowledgement within the Policies that would help support the future housing needs of the Larger Village of Blewbury Blewbury is one of two Larger Villages located within the South East Vale Sub-Area which does not have a strategic housing allocation It is considered that Blewbury should be required to accommodate some of this additional housing need through the Local Plan Part Two. This approach will help promote the village as a thriving community and ensure that the vitality and sustainability of its local services will be supported. Core Policy 15 fails to recognise the important role that development at the lowest order settlements (those ranked below the current four tiers of the settlement hierarchy) have played in the past in maintaining the supply of housing in the Vale.
875603	Mr Jeremy Flawn			LPPub3157			No		
873605	Mr Bill Kler	873604	Ms Gemma Field Barton Willmore	LPPub3289		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Alternative Site - Blewbury	<p>Land West of Woodway Road, Blewbury (Location Plan enclosed) for residential development. Blewbury offers a range of services and facilities to its residents and regular bus services provide access to Didcot and its higher order services and facilities, as well as Didcot Parkway. Didcot Parkway provides access to a range of locations including London. Sustainable settlement, where new residential development can be accommodated to meet local housing needs and help maintain its vitality and the sustainability of its local services. The Site at Woodway Road is located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Blewbury and within walking distance of its local facilities and public transport offer. The Site is therefore considered to offer potential to accommodate sustainable development in accordance with both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the emerging Local Plan.</p>
729558	Southern Construction and Surfacing Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning	LPPub2393		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Alternative Site - East Challow	Allocate land on unprotected landscapes, including 200 dwellings on this land at East Challow. Making the plan sound insofar as this new allocation would be both justified and consistent with national policy.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub3545		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Alternative Site - Rowstock	Rowstock does not have the facilities of a village suitable for large scale development and should be deleted from the list of Small Villages.
873601	Mr Robin Herd	873600	Mr Ifti Maniar West Waddy ADP	LPPub2624		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Alternative Site - Steventon	The Land at Milton Heights to the East of Steventon House Hotel is approximately 5.8 hectares in size and has the potential to deliver circa 200 dwellings.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3739	5.57	Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Coalescence with Villages	<p>The village and parish of Harwell have been particularly affected by existing Vale of White Horse and SODC plans for the expansion of Didcot. If the Plan goes ahead, 45% of Parish land that is currently farmland or open countryside will be built over. About 80% of the Parish boundary will have buildings on one or both sides, compared with 20% now. Much of the farmland in question is best and most versatile agricultural land. Appleford and Sutton Courtenay have similar problems. We are also concerned at the potential coalescence or near coalescence and loss of the green gap between Great Coxwell and Faringdon as a result of the housing development proposed in the Plan. The loss or erosion of this green gap would not only damage the open countryside, but the independent existence of an ancient Small Village with a Conservation Area, listed buildings and the nationally important Great Barn. The proposals map should be extended to provide protection to Harwell Village and Great Coxwell. Site Template for Valley Park should be strengthened to prevent the coalescence of Didcot with its surrounding villages, and extended to provide a rural gap alongside the B4493 between Didcot and Harwell. The Plan has no effective mechanisms to deliver the aim stated in 5.57. This aim is ignored in paras 5.81-5.84 which discuss the proximity of Harwell (and other villages) to Didcot Nor does the Plan have an effective mechanism to deliver CP 44. The saved proposals map shows the whole area of Valley Park, and a buffer area west of the A34 and east of the village. In need of revision because it indicates that no development should take place on the land now allocated to Valley Park. There is nothing specific anywhere in the Plan which defines unambiguously what constitutes 'maintenance of distinctive character/separate identity for Harwell village' To make Section 5.57 and Core Policy 44 of the Local Plan sound, the Plan must identify a rural gap right around Harwell Village where development will not be permitted. This particularly applies to the approach to Harwell from the east, but is not confined to this direction. All of this area to the east of the A34 is now earmarked for development in the Plan to 2031, becoming what will be known as Valley Park. This threatens the retention of Harwell Village's separate identity. The proposals map does not reflect the impact of this impending speculative development on open land surrounding the village and does not adequately protect Harwell Village's rural character and separate identity from further erosion in all directions.</p>
756473	Mr Oliver Gardiner			LPPub1026			No		
756280	Mr Richard Waters			LPPub1008			No		
829007	Mr Don Smith			LPPub2137			No		
728489	Mr David Marsh Harwell Parish Council			LPPub3118			No		
874158	Antony E Hughes			LPPub3416			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
850975	Karen Dodd			LPPub2820		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	CP 15 - General	Objects to the proposed large scale residential developments near Didcot.
874514	Mr Ian Jackson			LPPub4722		Core Policy 7:	No	CP15 - Air Quality	There is the potential of car pollutants from the A34 impacting on the health of residents of the new development at Valley Park and other sites near the A34.
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3928		Core Policy 4	No	CP15 - Alternative Site Crown Packaging	We support the allocation of strategic sites and contend that Crown's site has suitable credentials to be put forward for a strategic residential allocation able to deliver at least 250 homes, and this will also help VWHC meet its housing needs
404457	Mr Ken Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP			LPPub4099		Core Policy 2	No	CP15 - Alternative Sites - Oxford Garden City	There has been a lack of serious consideration of the Oxford Garden City proposal.
831832	John Richards Dandara Ltd,			LPPub2553		Core Policy 15	No	CP15 - Alternative Sites - Stockham Farm	Dandara Ltd demands from the VoWH to undertake a review of the Local Plan settlement boundaries.
872801	Mr Matthew Green Green and Co c/o Community of St Mary the Virgin, Wantage	832055	Mr Paul Butt	LPPub1177		Core Policy 4	No	CP15 - Alternative Sites Challow	A modification is sought to CP4 to include two sites owned by the Community St Mary the Virgin (the CSMV) north and south of Challow Road, Wantage. CP13/Green Belt See Summary for LPPub2288
869005	Taylor Wimpey Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	853993	Mr Andrew Ross	LPPub1063		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	CP15 _ Alternative Site North West Grove	The proposed saving of the previous Grove Airfield allocation (Local Plan policy H5) is essential to ensure that the policy position in respect of the Grove Airfield development is preserved, whilst the development is brought forward. The Council's strategy relies on the completion of this development and its policy status (as a commitment) should be unambiguous within the Plan.
404457	Mr Ken Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning	LPPub2583		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	CP15 -Alternative Sites Garden City	1 Failure to consider unmet Need 2 Allocations in Green Belt and AONB when alternatives are available 3 Artificial Ring Fence preventing Garden City proposal coming forward
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub717		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Distribution of Growth within South East Vale Sub Area	Proposals in Fig 4.2 have not been justified and are not consistent with National Planning Policy Site 9 Milton Heights, Sites 12 & 13 North and East of Harwell, and other sites which would not be required if the Inspector accepted that the Council had not chosen the most appropriate strategy
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group			LPPub280		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Distribution of Growth within South East Vale Sub Area and Working with	Total housing provision for the Science Vale, across South Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse, may be as high as 18,150 + 3,540 = 21,690 homes. Science Vale ambitiously speculating to create up to 16,000 jobs, then it would appear that with up to more

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								Neighbouring Authorities	than 20,000 houses being built in the general area, that there is more than an adequate provision of housing to support the predicted economic growth. Option they are considering is to allocate 60% of the new additional housing target to the Didcot area Seem reasonable to remove 1,000 of the 1,400 houses allocated to the North Wessex Downs AONB and relocate them elsewhere, without it being detrimental to the economic growth plans of the Science Vale. Wider distribution of growth (and spending power) could be more beneficial in supporting the rural areas more Wot been made clear as housing provision straddling boundaries is often not provided in documented evidence.
874661	Mrs Amanda Russen			LPPub3287		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Growth in Didcot	What are the limits of the expansion to our town? Are we just to go on sprawling and sprawling? Core Policy be added to the local plan of VOWH defining these limits at least in their area; but if possible also in conjunction - and transparently - with South Oxfordshire.
758407	Patrick Blake Highway Agency			LPPub2530		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Highways Agency - Transport Infrastructure	It is recognised that a large proportion of Local Plan growth (both housing and jobs) will be located with the Science Vale Area (Core Policy 13 – Spatial Strategy South East Vale Sub-Area). Proposals will be supported by a delivery focused Area Action Plan (AAP) prepared jointly with South Oxfordshire District Council and Oxfordshire County Council. The HA look forward to involvement with development of the AAP. An assessment of the potential impact of proposals on improvements already identified at the Milton Interchange and Chilton junction needs to be undertaken to ensure growth can be accommodated without impacting on the continued safe and efficient operation of the A34. The deliverability of an identified transport package on the A34 will need to be fully assessed to ensure the AAP is sound. The Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study (November 2014) highlights a number of challenges to delivery of this growth, we welcome early discussions. Although at this stage it is unclear how proposals will be delivered, it is understood this will be set out in the Science Vale AAP and supporting detailed transport package.
831397	B Read			LPPub4032		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Housing Delivery and Trajectory	Proposed pre-allocation of housing numbers to fund infrastructure plans contradicts paragraph 5.60 Will not match employment growth as delivery will be at the mercy of the housing market. Since there is no accurate and clear year by year job forecast available, it is premature to allocate It is clear that the housing allocation within the North Wessex Downs AONB is NOT linked to the growth of

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									employment at the Harwell Oxford Campus as stated,.
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4118		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Housing Target for South East Vale Sub Area	Requirement of 12,450 houses to be built during the full plan leaves no houses with development sites needed to be allocated in the near future. However CP15 states that a further 200 houses still need to be identified.
829328	Mrs Ros Page			LPPub4473		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Local development Orders	Question the proposed use of Local Development Orders (LDOs) to speed up delivery on sites, including potentially the Harwell Oxford Campus within the AONB and the effect this will have on the setting.
873605	Mr Bill Kler	873604	Ms Gemma Field Barton Willmore	LPPub3295		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Local Plan Part 2 Allocations	It is considered that Core Policy 15 should be reviewed to be more explicit in identifying broad locations for the additional 220 dwellings to be allocated within the Local Plan Part Two.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3830		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	References to SVUK (Science Vale UK) are included in the Appendix E and elsewhere in the documents. The UK part has now been dropped and the documents should reflect that. • Figure 5.6b (the cycling map) on page 78 of the Local Plan must come with a caveat: "Subject to consultation by OCC as part of LTP4 (early 2015)". • The Didcot-Harwell Public Transport Study is out of date and needs updating. Please state in our response that it is out of date and it will be re-submitted to them.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2201	5.5	Paragraph	No	Oxford City Comments	Paragraph 5.50 refers to the Strategic Economic Plan and Oxford City Deal; recognition of these is welcomed. However in order to be effective this paragraph should also recognise Oxford as a key economic driver for Science Vale and Oxfordshire as a whole. The City Council objects on this basis.
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2282		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	South East Sub Area Boundary	Mr and Mrs Comley object to this policy on the basis that East Challow has been omitted from the South East Vale sub area. As a consequence Core Policy 15 is unjustified. Representations to this effect have been set out in more detail in relation to Core Policy 3.
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2294		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	South East Sub Area Boundary	
729552	Mr Terry Gashe Ferax Planning			LPPub3083		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	General Comment	Representation has been made by White Horse Harries Athletics Club. The club does not have a dedicated training facility. With proper facilities the club could even further enhance its community presence and reputation, especially with the opportunity from the increase in the local population. The Local Plan fails to recognise various recreational facilities that are essential within the community. The LP should identify appropriate sites and additional funding for the scheme.
871329	Mrs Heather			LPPub2869		Local Plan 2031 Publication	No	Spatial Strategy	An alternative site was suggested between Drayton, Steventon and Hanney, which was dismissed on the

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Moseley					Version			ground of flood issues. It is possible the land could be drained and used for residential use. 361 signatures were collated to object to the development, however this was only recorded as one objection.
873665	Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd	0		LPPub2905	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Milton Services	Representations made on behalf Minscombe Properties and May Properties Ltd. Will take interest in the Science Vale Area Action Plan.
729552	Mr Terry Gashe Ferax Planning	0		LPPub2952	0	Map showing the strategic growth planned across the Vale of White Horse District	No	Development Boundary Wantage and Grove	The development boundary around Wantage and Grove is illogical, inconsistent and will lead to numerous anomalies in the future which will be misleading and confusing. The boundaries are drawn as two separate entities yet meet at one point, while also excluding both technology parks and areas with no allocation at all. It would be preferable to create one boundary.
829895	Mactaggart and Mickel Homes	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4150	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	Yes	CP15 - Support for Kingston Bagpuize	Support the allocation for site East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor with the site available for development immediately, helping to reduce the pressure from the LP allocated housing targets.
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3904	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	CP15 - Crown Packaging	CBRE have been instructed by the Crown (world leaders in metal packaging technology) to submit representations to VOWHDC with respect to their Downsview Rd, Wantage site. The Crown welcome the opportunity to engage with VOWHDC.
758065	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	864481	Mr James Stewart-Irvine Savills	LPPub2900	0		No	North Grove	Many urban design principles are unnecessary or replicate advice that is given in the Residential Design Guide. It would be cohesive to have only one reference to need for proposals to consider this guidance, rather than replicating parts to individual sites. Planning Applications should determine if buildings in excess of 2.5 storeys would be a detriment to the surrounding area. Too simplistic to remove 'odour buffers' and areas subject to noise from the provision of recreational space without first defining precisely what these impacts are.
472647	Mr Andrew Lord North Wessex Downs AONB	0		LPPub268	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	CP15 - Harwell	Remove Appendix A in reference to East and North-West Harwell should be removed.
874657	Mrs Gwendoline Marsh Milton Manor Farms	0		LPPub3290	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	CP15 - Milton Heights	There are no CP's on the Rights of Way. Milton Heights map marking Footpath 10 will become totally unusable if the A4130 is doubled in width. Therefore an underpass is needed for the safe travel of pedestrians and cyclists. A CP is needed for the 'Safeguarding Agricultural Land'

Harwell Campus Sites

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
727675	Mr Henry Venners JPPC			LPPub3582		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Alternative Site Harwell Campus	<p>Alternative Site Harwell Campus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site presents an obvious opportunity for strategic development. The site would cause least harm to the AONB and offer excellent connectivity and sustainable development credentials. On balance, the benefits of developing this site outweigh disadvantages People living here would not need to own a car to access many services. In future further services will be added. The site is well positioned to be considered sustainable in future transport terms, given the promotion of Science Vale. Developing this area would help provide balanced communities who would benefit from local employment opportunities. There is a programme of infrastructure improvement this site could utilise, including a full junction at Chilton on the A34. There would be minimal impact on the landscape compared with alternative sites close to the Campus. Including Hendred Estate land within the allocated area would make it possible to achieve peripheral enhancement. This could add to the existing woodland belts in a way that would take longer to achieve on the land East of Harwell Campus. An ecology report on the land owned by Hendred Estate, by Ecoconsult (attached) concludes that there is no known feature of ecological or other such important environmental importance that would preclude development of the site. Woodland and trees near habitats would be largely unaffected but could be enhanced by new planting and other measures.
727675	Mr Henry Venners JPPC			LPPub3584		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Alternative Site Harwell Campus	
832154	landowner Hendred Estate	770888	Mr Henry Venners JPPC	LPPub4142		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Alternative Site Harwell Campus	
832154	landowner Hendred Estate			LPPub4124		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Alternative Site Harwell Campus	
873605	Mr Bill Kler	873604	Ms Gemma Field Barton Willmore	LPPub3294		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Alternative Site_Role of Blewbury	<p>Alternative Site Role of Blewbury</p> <p>Land West of Woodway Road, Blewbury should be considered as a suitable site for up to 149 dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Plan fails to assist in addressing the imbalance in the economically inactive population of Blewbury. The Plan should address the population imbalance of Blewbury, and vitality of its services by acknowledging the need for its sustainable growth. Without this, Blewbury's local services may decline as comparable settlements grow and Blewbury is left

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>behind.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Plan acknowledges the AONB is a constraint, but does not preclude development within the AONB which should therefore not be used as a reason for not considering Blewbury. Core Policy 4 should be more explicit regarding where the additional 220 dwellings should be allocated A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) concludes the site would not compromise the special qualities of the AONB as described in the NW Downs AONB Management Plan. The site is within the settlement fringe and neither remote nor tranquil. Development would not cause any changes to the scarp or impact on the sense of openness or tranquillity.
873665	Mr Norman Staples			LPPub1559		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Coalescence	The Plan does not offer protection to the ancient village of Harwell from coalescence with Didcot. There is no clear boundary map within which building will not be permitted. Although there are words, these cannot offer clear interpretation. A map should be provided.
827350	Mr Brian Spear			LPPub4653		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Coalescence	
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2781 LPPub2782 LPPub2783		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes Yes Yes	Harwell Campus Heritage Assets	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the principle to “Retain the historic field pattern within the site.....”.
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4492		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Appendix A	References to the allocations to the East of Harwell Campus and North West of Harwell Campus should be removed.
758106	Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4773 LPPub4774		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes Yes	Harwell Campus - Development Template	Amend the North of Harwell Development Template (Appendix A). Respondent requests various specific amendments including different housing figures. Delete the East of Harwell Development Template at Appendix A.
472647	Mr Andrew Lord North Wessex Downs AONB			LPPub259 LPPub266		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No No	Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB• The Plan proposes “major development” within the nationally protected North Wessex Downs AONB. This would harm the recognised special qualities of the AONB. The scale of housing allocations and the implications of the Housing Supply Ring Fence Area are unprecedented within the family of protected landscapes including AONBs and National Parks. The conservation

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>and enhancement of the AONB is in the national public interest. The Plan does not comply with national guidance and law that specifically seeks the conservation and enhancement of nationally protected landscapes. The exceptional circumstances tests of the NPPF paragraph 116 are not met.</p> <p>The Landscape Study does not consider the options for AONB avoidance.</p> <p>There are alternatives which avoid the need for allocations within the AONB. Options to meet strategic housing need exist elsewhere, including accommodating some housing within the existing Harwell Campus boundary without the need for substantial loss of greenfield.</p> <p>As there is no existing settlement at Harwell Campus there is no need to provide space for a settlement to grow.</p> <p>Comments previously made in our April 2014 response remain valid.</p> <p>Should the Plan proceed to submission, the AONB Unit will make detailed submissions to the Hearings process objecting to the proposed level of housing in this AONB.</p>
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3879		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	<p>School planning in this area needs to be based on a broader survey of both housing development and school growth potential, across the surrounding area, including Harwell Campus and Chilton.</p>
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3877		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	<p>The Local Plan proposal could exceed the existing village school's capacity.</p> <p>Contributions would be required towards the cost of expanding primary school provision serving the area, and towards new secondary and SEN provision in Didcot.</p> <p>Contributions towards the cost of secondary school capacity would be required at the rate of £3,699 per home. The rate applies to extension of existing schools.</p> <p>As new schools are to be built the appropriate new school building rate of cost should be applied.</p> <p>East Harwell (850) & NW Harwell (550)</p> <p>A new 2 form entry primary school will be required.</p> <p>The school site would need to be 2.22ha and meet OCC's requirements.</p> <p>Contributions would be required towards the cost of new secondary and SEN provision in Didcot.</p> <p>The cost of a 2 form entry school is currently assessed as £8,334,000. Contributions towards the cost of secondary school capacity would be required at the rate of £3,699 per home. The rate applies to extension of existing schools; as new schools are to be built the appropriate new school building rate of cost should be applied.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	0		LPPub2721	Figure 5.4	South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Figure 5.4	Figure 5.4 Update figure 5.4 to reflect the fact that Harwell Campus will become a Local Service Centre, not a Larger Village The map shows Chilton far removed from the East Harwell Campus site. This is misleading and unsound.
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1781		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Figure 5.4	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1794		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Figure 5.4	
725115	Mr Jack Moeran Environment Agency	0		LPPub2994		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Flooding	No development should take place within Flood Zone 3 or 2 - In accordance objectives of the SFRA and Sequential and Exceptions Test
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3805		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Highway Infrastructure	Highway Infrastructure Eharwell (850) • The development can be expected to generate 5100 veh trips per day, 500+ trips in peak hour. • Access(es) could be taken from A4185 Newbury Road. • Strategic access to A34 south would be via Chilton Interchange • As a result of the development, pressure would be created at Rowstock and along the A4185. • Contributions would be expected towards the Science Vale strategic transport infrastructure package • Public Transport contributions would be required. NHarwell (550) : • As above • The development can be expected to generate 3300 veh trips per day, 330 trips in peak hour. • A Public Bridleway (BW) and a Road Used as Public Footpath (RUPP) run along the south and west boundaries of the site and could be affected.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3803		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Highway Infrastructure	
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England	0		LPPub2241		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Natural England Comments Impact on AONB	Natural England's principal concerns are the likely impact on the landscape character, special qualities and natural/scenic beauty of the North Wessex Downs (NWD) Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and people using The Ridgeway National Trail (NT) and surrounding public rights of way network. Natural England advises that the allocation of housing sites 12 and 13 at the Harwell Campus site (totalling 1,400 dwellings) will adversely affect the special qualities of the AONB, given the proposed development sites can be viewed from numerous locations along the Ridgeway National Trail. Policies relating to these sites are
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England	0		LPPub2242		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Natural England Comments Impact on AONB	
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England	0		LPPub2218		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Natural England Comments Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England	0		LPPub2225		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Natural England Comments Impact on AONB	<p>unsound in that they are not justified as being the most suitable locations for development when considered against reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2014 – 2019 describes this area as characterised by some of the most emblematic features of the North Wessex Downs. The key issues for the Plan period will be ensuring that development beyond the boundary does not visually damage these critical scarp landscapes; management of users of the Ridgeway to maximise enjoyment and minimise conflicts; and maintenance and, where possible, extension of the chalk grassland habitats. The allocations, with the existing Harwell Research facility, would bring the urban influence of Didcot to the foot of the down. This, combined with the new development planned for the south of Didcot, would form a new feature in the existing landscape of a scale to change landscape character in a way contrary to the purpose of the AONB designation. The scale of the allocation site and repeated sighting of the development would adversely affect and limit enjoyment of the recreational opportunity offered by the National Trail and extensive network of public rights of way which pass through the site and surrounding landscape. Mitigation of the landscape and visual impacts will be unable to reduce the impact of the allocations to acceptable levels due to the prominent sloping nature of the site, scale of development proposed leading to unacceptable landscape and visual impacts as seen from key viewpoints e.g. 1, 4, 5 and 6 in the Harwell Campus Landscape Study and the Ridgeway NT.</p> <p>The landscape and visual appraisal (para 1.1.1) (also described as a landscape and visual impact assessment report and landscape study), considered the visual impact of the allocations, not landscape impact. We disagree with the Landscape Study conclusion that while there would be a change of character this would not constitute significant harm to the wider AONB landscape, and do not see how such changes would be compatible with the AONB management Plan 2014 – 2019. No attempt has been made to consider how the allocation sites would affect the special qualities of the NWD AONB in part of the designation.</p> <p>Harwell Campus is an employment site, not an existing community. Should these allocations be adopted, we are concerned that their presence will result in consequential development in future plan periods.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Council to discuss our concerns and look for areas of</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									common ground prior to the examination of the plan.
868466	Mr Duncan Cox	0		LPPub25	5.54	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<p>Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB</p> <p>Around 470 respondents object to development of the Harwell sites. Key issues raised are summarised below.</p> <p>Heritage considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would harm the landscape and historic environment in relation to important views, natural features, tranquillity, noise and light pollution. • This area is characterised by some of the most emblematic features of the North Wessex Downs: the Ridgeway, the oldest road in England, runs along the top of the scarp; Uffington White Horse; Avebury on the open Downs Plain, part of Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site. The historic & nationally important Ridgeway National Path lies to the south. • Chilton has been in existence since before the Domesday survey. • There is a Listed building along the boundary of the site. • Open landscape with views to far horizons are a key component of character are reflected in the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. • The Ridgeway will be directly affected by the visual impact of the development. <p>Landscape, AONB & Green Belt considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocations in the Green Belt and AONB will undermine the rural character of the Vale. • The Plan does not comply with the European Landscape Convention, placing too much weight on economic growth at the expense of potential damage to the landscape. • The sites falls entirely within the AONB and the proposals do not comply with the Local Plan CP34 and paragraph 5.108. • Little regard has been given to the environmental impact of proposed developments within NWD AONB with respect to light, noise, pollution and change of character through urbanisation. • Allocating 1,400 houses in NWD AONB when there are viable alternatives is unsound and conflicts with the NPPF, CROW Act 2000 Section 85, and Core policy 44. There has been a failure to consider reasonable
831397	B Read	0		LPPub4141	5.54	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
830994	Dr Stephen King	0		LPPub58	5.59	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley	0		LPPub105	5.59	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub476	5.59	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub663	5.59	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871874	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub329	5.59	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub365	5.59	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872051	Mr Ian Page	0		LPPub447	5.59	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Mintern	0		LPPub587	5.59	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831397	B Read	0		LPPub4145	5.59	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub473	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<p>alternatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CRoW Act 2000 requires Vale of White Horse DC to "conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty". The proposals fail to protect this sensitive landscape. • The NPPF places AONBs in the highest category of landscape protection. Vale officers appear unaware of the status of AONBs. AONB boundaries cannot be adjusted by Local Authorities. • There is a lack of justification for an unprecedented level of housing within the AONB - the largest housing allocation on any greenfield site in any AONB or National Park in the UK. • Unmet housing need does not outweigh harm to the green belt and AONB or constitute 'very special circumstances' for removing land from the Green Belt and AONB given that there are sustainable alternatives. This approach conflicts with the NPPF and PPG. • Allocating sites in AONB does not comply with the NPPF p116 which states that permission should be refused. • Developing the site would irreversibly destroy a protected, irreplaceable landscape. This is unjustified, especially when no accurate job forecast is available. • The presence of Harwell Campus should not be used to justify development outside its boundaries since the campus pre-dates the setting up of the AONB. • It is premature to allocate unprecedented levels of housing to greenfield sites within the AONB. • It is premature to proceed with strategic housing allocations within North Wessex Downs AONB until (a) there is a proven track record of economic growth in the area (b) issues surrounding capacity on the A34 have been addressed and (c) it has been proven that housing must be located here with a full analysis as required by the NPPF paragraphs 115-116. • There is potential for major development to intrude onto open downland, including masts, pylons, major wind turbine developments, mineral extraction and waste management, threatening the sense of remoteness and tranquillity. • Light spillage from development in and around the AONB is of concern. • The proposals would adversely affect views from public vantage points.
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub287	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub659	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871874	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub325	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub362	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub888	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Mintern	0		LPPub583	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4361	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4314	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4438	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skyline impact is a serious constraint. • Impacts – landscape, noise, visual, pollution – cannot be mitigated satisfactorily. • The proposals are incompatible with the AONB Management Plan. • Development at Harwell Campus was discounted previously because of its AONB sensitivity. • Development would set a precedent leading to further building in the AONB. • The housing allocation within AONB is NOT linked to employment growth at Harwell Campus • No houses should be built in the open fields. • Developing EHarwell will have significant, irreversible negative landscape Impacts. • SA 8: Sites chosen are not the least harmful development options. • There will be an impact on the dark night skies within the North Wessex Downs. • The characteristics of The Icknield Way will change from open landscape to urban. • Sites proposed for development have a distinct character forming a transition between the high downs and the clay lowlands of the Vale. • NH site forms open landscape between the Harwell Campus, Harwell village and Didcot. • AONB is a sparsely populated landscape with a population density of 72 people p sqkm. • It is hard to assess the true extent of urban sprawl into the AONB. • The proposals will result in unsympathetic incremental expansion of settlements detracting from the surrounding countryside. • The resulting “settlement” would potentially have one of the largest populations of any settlement within the AONB and place Harwell Campus with the third largest population in the AONB. The planned Campus housing would be the largest urbanised area within the AONB. • Building on site 13 will increase pressure for further development and lead to Chiltern, Rowstock, Milton Heights, Milton Village and Sutton Courtenay, Appleton, the Heybournes and Upton being subsumed in a greater Didcot. • The Downland villages have a recognised style which will be changed for ever. • Development of E.Harwell will be out of scale with developments in the surrounding villages. • The Plan does not define how the distinctive character and separate identity of places will be objectively assessed and maintained.
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4257	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies	0		LPPub4248	5.6	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub474	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub288	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871874	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub326	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub661	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub363	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub889	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Mintern	0		LPPub584	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vale has given greater consideration to preserving the Green Belt than the AONB. • Sites and houses have been reduced for the Green Belt but not AONB. • Vale has incorrectly stated that Green Belt has greater weight than AONB. • Request that the Inspector removes Local Plan site allocations in the Green Belt and AONB. • Developing this site would result in the loss of Best, Most Versatile Land. • The site is a Greenfield site which contains 140ha of Grade 2 Agricultural Land. • Grade 2 land is the best quality in the borough and should be given the greatest protection from development. • The future use of redundant brownfield sites within the AONB ie airfields and military sites. • 2000 houses allocated into the AONB (74% of West Berks is in the AONB) most have already been delivered into existing settlements, brownfield etc. • The landscape focus for site selection is too narrow, given that all 8 land parcels analysed score medium to high on AONB sensitivity, and leads to a disjointed pattern of development in conflict with other objectives of national guidance. • The landscape of the Harwell South site is compromised by its neighbour, the Campus to the north and this provides an opportunity to provide a form of development, where the layout and relationship with the Campus is one critical aspect of development and with the Ridgeway and elevated parts of the AONB is a second critical aspect. Chilton • Chilton has already expanded with no development of infrastructure. • Use of out-of-date maps and aerial photos and omission of Chilton Fields site is unacceptable. • 425 of 850 houses proposed for East Harwell Campus would be in Chilton parish. There has been no assessment of cumulative impacts of the proposed developments and coalescence with Chilton. The Chilton Field Development (2014) increased the size of Chilton by 80% with the completion of 275 new houses and an additional 200 being built at Harwell with outline permission for 125 north of the Hcampus. These allocations are not shown on the Local Plan maps of Chilton and Harwell Oxford Campus. • The diagrammatic map shows Chilton far removed from the East Harwell Campus site.
831397	B Read	0		LPPub4045	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4316	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4440	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4172	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4261	5.61	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828840	Mrs Penny Kinloch	0		LPPub1204	5.62	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley	0		LPPub104	5.63	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub475	5.63	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871874	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub328	5.63	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub662	5.63	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for Chilton and HCampus are in conflict with Core Policy 42. There has been a lack of consultation with village residents and Harwell Campus. The plan to expand Chilton Village within the North Wessex Downs AONB, does not comply with Paragraph 4.7, making the plan unsound. Harwell Campus Harwell Campus needs supporting physical infrastructure. Harwell Campus is an employment site, not an existing community. There are two centres at the Campus: the employment and the school. There are few shops, services or associated facilities around the HC site. Harwell Campus will become a Local Service Centre not a Larger Village. The number of projected new jobs at Harwell Campus is over-estimated The Harwell office employs circa 100 most of whom already work on the Campus. Less than 10% of responding households have anyone working on the Harwell Campus. The number of projected new jobs at Harwell Campus is overestimated. Job growth figures are unclear. According to the SQW/ Cambridge Econometrics report 3,500 net new jobs have the potential to be created at Harwell Oxford Campus up to 2031 whereas the Plan states that at least 5,400 net new jobs will be created. 95% of employees at the Campus do not live in Harwell or Chilton villages. The Plan presupposes HC employees will occupy the new homes. This may not happen. Evidence suggests that the majority of future employees at Harwell Oxford Campus will commute rather than live on the doorstep. Housing within the AONB is more expensive than like-for-like housing elsewhere. The argument that new houses in the AONB are sustainable because everyone who will live in them will work at the new Harwell Business Campus and walk to work, is unrealistic. I am in the minority of people who work on the campus and live locally. There is a serious mismatch in the availability of jobs at the campus and nearby housing. Developing on the edge of Harwell Oxford Campus will not address the needs of Campus employees. Due to high the cost of housing, many will be unable to afford to
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub364	5.63	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872051	Mr Ian Page	0		LPPub446	5.63	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Minter	0		LPPub586	5.63	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831397	B Read	0		LPPub4159	5.63	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4347	5.63	Paragraph	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
868466	Mr Duncan Cox	0		LPPub22		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
868466	Mr Duncan Cox	0		LPPub23		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
868665	Mr Stuart Lovegrove	0		LPPub33		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
742305	The Garden Centre Group	724648	Jo Male Gregory Gray Associates	LPPub70		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
827535	Mrs Nicola Livingstone	0		LPPub88		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	live there. Employees will commute from Swindon, Newbury, Reading and Oxford.
827535	Mrs Nicola Livingstone	0		LPPub89		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry out an assessment of housing affordability for future employees for each proposed site. • Either campus employers take a substantial financial stake in the new homes or developers need to agree covenants restricting sales to Campus employees or offer homes at a substantial discount to Campus employees.
870787	Professor Clive Holes	0		LPPub66		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those working at Harwell Campus often have transient employment placements given the international nature of the work. Short term employees are more likely to rent than buy.
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley	0		LPPub114		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only people who can link housing provision is the Harwell Oxford Campus. There has been a lack of consultation with the Campus on housing requirements or evidence that this has been done.
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley	0		LPPub115		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Campus is of international importance and national economic significance as a world-class centre for science. Enclosing the UK's premier science and technology campus within housing estates will not create a world class impression of British science. The European Space Agency headquarters are in Paris, not Harwell.
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley	0		LPPub117		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinguish between the total number of jobs and net number of new jobs. • Job numbers in the Plan are inconsistent and should not be used to phase housing delivery. • The strategy for the Campus has not been published.
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley	0		LPPub118		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Vale Strategy is not yet complete. • To date Harwell-Oxford campus has never provided speculative space.
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley	0		LPPub119		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative Sites • Has consideration been given to the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area? • There are viable alternative sites close to the Harwell Oxford Campus, outside the AONB. Allocating 1400 houses in AONB without considering four alternative sites conflicts with the NPPF.
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley	0		LPPub120		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 77 % of the Vale of White Horse is NOT within the North Wessex Downs AONB. • If they are necessary, new houses should be tacked on to other existing developments. • A wider distribution of growth could be more beneficial in supporting the rural areas.
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub150		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thames Reservoir may not be needed beyond 2019. • Build on the former Area South Drivesite adjacent to Chilton school, between Chiltern and the A34, and between Chiltern and the dismantled railway. This would

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								AONB	help make village services viable.
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub151		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valley Park, Didcot A Power Station, North West Grove, and Rowstock have no significant constraints. There is ample scope for development at Valley Park and Didcot A which can take the 1,400 figure. Land for the North Harwell Campus development, as specified in the above document, is far smaller than the final site proposed for development on page 36. 32 acres shown on the attached drawing is a potential allocation as an alternative.
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub152		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the site South of NW Harwell would be beneficial alongside the proposed allocation. Rowstock is considered unsuitable due “issues of coalescence” yet there are no neighbouring villages.
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub153		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed allocation boundaries: Hendred Estate would be able to make additional land available for landscape mitigation to ensure a high quality, low impact development.
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub154		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drayton, Steventon and EHanney examined three small areas with for at most 165 houses. An alternative site is suggested between Drayton , Steventon and Hanney.
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub155		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ‘Oxford Garden City’ would site 12,000 – 15,000 houses between East Hanney and Steventon.
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub156		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 32 acres as an urban extension to Wantage would be justified. Identify Blewbury as a location for additional housing. The Plan does not address the imbalance in Blewbury's economically inactive population. As a consequence, local services may decline as other settlements grow. The LVIA concludes that Blewbury does not comprise the special qualities as a site situated within settlement fringe, as it is neither remote nor tranquil.
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub157		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options in Pewsey and Marlborough can be accommodated mostly on brownfield sites. This site has added benefit of assisting in the delivery of the desirable western relief road.
827535	Mrs Nicola Livingstone	0		LPPub236		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A principle embraced by Vale in the past, eg Crab Hill to facilitate Eastern relief road. The provision of a Western relief road to Wantage would be beneficial to the road network
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub472		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Oxfordshire is allocating a further 3,540 houses to the Didcot area to support the “Science Vale” Land parcel 2 for site 19 is different from the land allocated by Vale for development.
									Road Network
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is adjacent to the A34 which is already congested. Development and employment growth at the Campus would increase traffic, air, noise and light

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub174		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<p>pollution, and amenity effects for residents near the road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The traffic management scheme is insufficiently robust to deal with anticipated congestion. No explicit mechanism has been given for the delivery of infrastructure. • Residents are concerned about exiting the village at peak times. • The A34 has been identified as a barrier to growth for the Science Vale. • Concentrating housing alongside the A34 makes significant problems inevitable. • Strategic access to A34 south would be via Chilton Interchange which may require upgrade. • New road building, new road signage and new street lighting will be required. • Two new slip roads onto the A34 will add two new roundabouts to the one existing. • Satisfactory site access(es) could be taken from A4185 Newbury Road. • The only access Chilton residents have to their village is from access roads adjoining the A4185 at the Chilton Interchange. • A Public Bridleway (BW) and a Road Used as Public Footpath (RUPP) could be affected. • The developer must contribute to the cost of funding any additional vehicle requirement. • East Harwell Campus could be expected to generate 5100 vehicle trips per day, 500+ trips in peak hour. • Development of the site should contribute towards the Science Vale strategic transport infrastructure package. • NHCampus could be expected to generate 3300 vehicle trips per day, 330 trips in peak hour. • There is pressure for new developments at the junctions of the M4 and A34. <p>Water, Drainage, Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage and Water Supply Infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity. • A water supply strategy would be required from the developer. • It may take up to 3 years required to deliver the infrastructure, alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. • No development should take place within Flood Zone 3 or 2 to comply with the SFRA, Sequential and Exceptions Test. • There are concerns regarding Waste Water sewage treatment. It will be necessary to undertake investigations into the impact of the development. This takes 12 weeks to complete.
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub175		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub176		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub177		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub178		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub179		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub180		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub181		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub271		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie	0		LPPub284		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Save Chilton AONB Action Group					Vale Sub-Area		and Impact on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade to our assets will be required and need to allow up to three years lead in time for this. • In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund measures/studies. • The developer would be required to provide a drainage strategy. Public Amenities • The proposal could exceed the existing village school capacity. • Contributions towards the cost of Secondary school capacity would be required: £ 3,699 p/home. • Primary education contributions (via S106) need to be re-calculated. • E Harwell allocation is shown as paying the same contribution as NW Harwell, yet E Harwell is providing a new school. • Land can be made available for informal open space and on-site school provision to serve the development. • Chilton will treble in size by 2020: one shop, one bank and one school is inadequate. • The proposal does not include associated infrastructure of schools, shops, doctors etc. • Public and travel planning contributions would be required. • NHCampus will benefit from existing and proposed bus services serving Harwell Campus. • The developer of this site should contribute to some form of bus-way to link with the South VP. <p>Other Impacts and Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased levels of pollution have a significant impact on public health. There are potential noise and air impacts locally. Development will result in a loss of tranquillity. • EIA Directive requires consideration of interactions between potential environmental impacts. Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England & Wales) Regulations 2011 requires a description of the likely significant effects of a development including cumulative effects. EC Directive 85/337/EEC, as amended by Directive 97/11/EC, requires consideration of direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative impacts. • The Inspector is requested to enable a modification to plan to identify the land for 200 dwellings. • No strategic housing allocations are identified in Smaller Villages within the South East Vale. • New large free-standing houses as replacement dwellings in open countryside and insensitive farm
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub292		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub293		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub294		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub286		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871874	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub331		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871874	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub332		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871874	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub324		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub477		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub478		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	<div>diversification activities and associated signage.</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I attended this meeting and was appalled by the absence of democracy. • Conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all areas. • LVIA has several errors, mainly resulting from the use of out-of-date maps. • Impact on Visual Receptors (Users) of the Ridgeway National Trail is considered very high sensitivity. • Public rights of way which pass through the site will be affected. • Additional 220 dwellings identified within the SE Vale through the Local Plan Part2. • The conclusion of the Hankinson Duckett Associates report is misleading and inaccurate. • Acceptance of the SHMA figures as targets has led to the inappropriate allocation of sites. Request lower housing figures be used in the Local Plan. • Hankinson Duckett Associates Report on NHCampus is significantly smaller than the land allocated for development in the Local Plan 2031 • Why is it not possible to provide employment development elsewhere as facilities exist? • Reports refer to whether the associated parcels also have an impact on the skyline. • The proposed pre-allocation of housing numbers to fund infrastructure plans contradicts paragraph 5.60 of the Local Plan and will not match employment growth as delivery will be at the mercy of the housing market. • The Plan will not deliver the infrastructure making it unsound. • Housing should be allocated in towns or adjacent to towns with existing infrastructure to be sustainable rather than in rural areas without infrastructure. • Rowstock does not have the facilities of a village suitable for large scale development. • The plan recognises that proposed development is in an AONB and that this should be protected yet states that employment and housing in this area should grow. The two strategies are in conflict.
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub664		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub665		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub658		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley	0		LPPub393		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub296		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub295		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub360		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub367		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub368		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872051	Mr Ian Page	0		LPPub445		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872119	Mr Matt West	0		LPPub551		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
805299	Mr Frank Dumbleton	0		LPPub956		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
832268	Lynda Pasquire Crowley	0		LPPub771		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub887		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub864		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Mintern	0		LPPub577		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Mintern	0		LPPub588		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Mintern	0		LPPub589		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872363	Dr James Vincent	0		LPPub910		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection against Development at Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872375	Nicholas Tubbs	0		LPPub761		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley	0		LPPub1246		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley	0		LPPub1247		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub996		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub1000		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub991		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub981		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub994		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872363	Dr James Vincent	0		LPPub932		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872363	Dr James Vincent	0		LPPub930		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872363	Dr James Vincent	0		LPPub931		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872363	Dr James Vincent	0		LPPub921		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872363	Dr James Vincent	0		LPPub927		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872684	Miss Rebecca Barnett	0		LPPub1045		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
832474	Norman Goodall	0		LPPub1423		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871875	Mrs Judith Goodall	0		LPPub1414		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871875	Mrs Judith Goodall	0		LPPub1415		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873770	Mrs Jane Woods	0		LPPub1517		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873779	Mr Keith Woods	0		LPPub1520		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873786	Mr Stuart Davis	0		LPPub1533		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873787	Mrs Paula Davis	0		LPPub1535		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873789	Miss Lucy Woods	0		LPPub1538		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873811	Terence Garrett	0		LPPub1574		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873852	Mrs Susan Vaughan	0		LPPub1611		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873856	Mrs Audrey Hayes	0		LPPub1621		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873856	Mrs Audrey Hayes	0		LPPub1622		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873856	Mrs Audrey Hayes	0		LPPub1623		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873860	Mr Thomas Vaughan	0		LPPub1629		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873862	Mr David Vaughan	0		LPPub1630		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873865	Mr John Vaughan	0		LPPub1631		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1729		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1730		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1710		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1711		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1713		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1717		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1720		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1724		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1727		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub1702		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873946	Mrs Grace Garrett	0		LPPub1766		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1791		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1840		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1841		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1842		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1844		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1845		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1836		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1837		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1838		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1833		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1804		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1799		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1802		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1814		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1816		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1821		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1823		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1828		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874088	SR Roberts	0		LPPub1890		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730292	Mrs Julia Evans West Hendred Parish Council	0		LPPub2168		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
830844	Caroline Ball	0		LPPub2093		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871887	Mrs Caroline Liddle	0		LPPub2117		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871887	Mrs Caroline Liddle	0		LPPub2120		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871887	Mrs Caroline Liddle	0		LPPub2113		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874680	Ricky Cunningham	0		LPPub2019		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874706	Deidre Jones	0		LPPub2014		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874708	Mike Davies	0		LPPub2009		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874483	A Gilbert	0		LPPub2401		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874566	Claire Inness	0		LPPub2358		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874579	Shelia Denley	0		LPPub2268		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874581	Tessa Thomas	0		LPPub2258		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
832467	Hazel Oliver	0		LPPub2655		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874103	Mr Peter Lister	0		LPPub2696		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874266	Mr and Mrs Danny Fisher	0		LPPub2559		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874282	Mrs Alice Pinkney	0		LPPub2508		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874416	Mr Daniel Essen	0		LPPub2784		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874419	Ken Howard	0		LPPub2657		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874623	Ms Susan Hamilton	0		LPPub2565		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	0		LPPub2726		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	0		LPPub2739		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829332	Mr Nicholas F Astley-Cooper	0		LPPub3041		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829471	Mr Gordon Stokes	0		LPPub3273		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
830045	Mrs Judy Roberts	0		LPPub3208		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831624	Mrs RC Fisher	0		LPPub3176		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872110	Mrs Penny Curtis	0		LPPub3354		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3048		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3076		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3085		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3080		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3087		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3088		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3089		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3090		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874528	V Johnson	0		LPPub3075		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730245	Ms Tina Brock Cumnor Parish Council	0		LPPub3548		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	0		LPPub3544		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829923	Dr Stephen Webb Wantage Constituency Labour Party	0		LPPub3543		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831190	Mr Simon Jenkins	0		LPPub3378		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873601	Mr Robin Herd	873600	Mr Ifti Maniar West Waddy ADP	LPPub3502		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874158	Antony E Hughes	0		LPPub3429		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874487	Dr Anthony Webster	0		LPPub3509		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828996	Mr Richard Benton	0		LPPub4062		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874643	St Johns College	724828	Mr Roger Smith Savills L and P Ltd, Director	LPPub3866		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
875989	Mr Derek Tisdall	0		LPPub4051		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
875989	Mr Derek Tisdall	0		LPPub4061		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4352		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4357		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4359		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4324		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4325		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4319		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4322		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4327		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4296		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4304		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4306		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4311		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4313		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828996	Mr Richard Benton	0		LPPub4444		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828996	Mr Richard Benton	0		LPPub4450		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829258	Miss Josephine Cormier	0		LPPub4259		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829258	Miss Josephine Cormier	0		LPPub4262		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829258	Miss Josephine Cormier	0		LPPub4267		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829258	Miss Josephine Cormier	0		LPPub4270		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829328	Mrs Ros Page	0		LPPub4477		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4461		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4463		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4464		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4465		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4466		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4431		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4435		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4437		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4423		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829482	Mr Paul Beasley	0		LPPub4426		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831003	Steven and Jane Hale	0		LPPub4390		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831003	Steven and Jane Hale	0		LPPub4395		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831003	Steven and Jane Hale	0		LPPub4403		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831003	Steven and Jane Hale	0		LPPub4409		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831003	Steven and Jane Hale	0		LPPub4412		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831003	Steven and Jane Hale	0		LPPub4414		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp	0		LPPub4315		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp	0		LPPub4310		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp	0		LPPub4260		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp	0		LPPub4294		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp	0		LPPub4204		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4166		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4170		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4171		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4175		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4185		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4182		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4183		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4180		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4111		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4139		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874124	Mr David Tilbury	0		LPPub4157		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4216		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4255		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4138		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4228		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4238		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies	0		LPPub4244		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies	0		LPPub4227		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies	0		LPPub4222		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies	0		LPPub4232		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874700	Mrs Wendy Davies	0		LPPub4217		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
875989	Mr Derek Tisdall	0		LPPub4063		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
875989	Mr Derek Tisdall	0		LPPub4064		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
875989	Mr Derek Tisdall	0		LPPub4065		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
875989	Mr Derek Tisdall	0		LPPub4104		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876219	Mrs Dina Tisdall	0		LPPub4107		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876219	Mrs Dina Tisdall	0		LPPub4113		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876219	Mrs Dina Tisdall	0		LPPub4117		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876219	Mrs Dina Tisdall	0		LPPub4133		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876219	Mrs Dina Tisdall	0		LPPub4137		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4178		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4176		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4198		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4200		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4499		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4500		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4494		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4495		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4496		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4497		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829328	Mrs Ros Page	0		LPPub4498		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829328	Mrs Ros Page	0		LPPub4484		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829328	Mrs Ros Page	0		LPPub4488		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872702	Mrs Autumn Tull	0		LPPub4365		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4367		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4293		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4300		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872790	Mrs Lorraine Elliott	0		LPPub4368		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872790	Mrs Lorraine Elliott	0		LPPub4362		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4264		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4268		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4269		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4266		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg	0		LPPub4271		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874622	Mr Kenneth Slater	0		LPPub4342		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874622	Mr Kenneth Slater	0		LPPub4339		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874625	Mr Kevin Lewis	0		LPPub4272		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874629	Mr Mark Taylor	0		LPPub4334		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874629	Mr Mark Taylor	0		LPPub4348		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874629	Mr Mark Taylor	0		LPPub4363		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874629	Mr Mark Taylor	0		LPPub4364		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874629	Mr Mark Taylor	0		LPPub4360		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874629	Mr Mark Taylor	0		LPPub4366		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley	0		LPPub4385		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley	0		LPPub4387		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley	0		LPPub4392		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley	0		LPPub4416		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley	0		LPPub4417		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley	0		LPPub4411		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874664	Mr Paul Griffiths	0		LPPub4451		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874664	Mr Paul Griffiths	0		LPPub4441		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874664	Mr Paul Griffiths	0		LPPub4430		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874698	Mrs Tina Cook	0		LPPub4372		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876331	Mr Andrew Hayes	0		LPPub4371		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4462		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4479		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4460		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4455		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4485		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4483		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4480		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4481		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831397	B Read	0		LPPub4050	5.73	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1784	5.77	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873540	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group	0		LPPub263		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873540	Mrs Alexandra Kapp	0		LPPub852		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873621	Dr James Vincent	0		LPPub907		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873665	Mr Andrew Jeffries	0		LPPub1274		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873767	Mr Piers von Simson	0		LPPub1303		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873767	Mr William Laing	0		LPPub1394		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873767	Miss Katherine Laing	0		LPPub1393		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873767	Mr Andrew Laing	0		LPPub1391		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873852	Mrs Anne Laing	0		LPPub1392		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873860	Mr Raymond Howes	0		LPPub1690		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873862	Mrs Valerie Andrews	0		LPPub1796		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873884	Southern Construction and Surfacing Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijksman Dijksman Planning	LPPub2391		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873884	Southern Construction and Surfacing Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijksman Dijksman Planning	LPPub2375		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873884	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3054		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung	0		LPPub4515		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4621	1.25	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730250	Ms Julie Evans East Hendred Parish Council	0		LPPub4725		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4513		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4557		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4623		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4627		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4659		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4663		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4680		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4682		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4686		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730250	Ms Julie Evans East Hendred Parish Council	0		LPPub4726		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730250	Ms Julie Evans East Hendred Parish Council	0		LPPub4727		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829328	Mrs Ros Page	0		LPPub4498		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4570		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish	0		LPPub4571		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Council								
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4575		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4577		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4578		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4579		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4580		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4596		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4597		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4598		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4599		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4600		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4602		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872717	Mr Brian Morris	0		LPPub4603		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4635		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4636		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4637		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4638		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4639		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4641		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4642		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4647		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4668		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4669		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4670		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4672		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4674		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876244	K Slater	0		LPPub4675		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4691		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4692		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4693		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4694		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4695		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4696		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4697		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater	0		LPPub4698		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4576		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872741	Southern Construction and Surfacing Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijksman Dijksman Planning	LPPub2391		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Dr Stephen King	0		LPPub60	5.108	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873924	Dr Patrick Moseley	0		LPPub106	5.108	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873946	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub333	5.108	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub479	5.108	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
873984	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub666	5.108	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874103	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub369	5.108	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874122	Mr Ian Page	0		LPPub448	5.108	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874131	Mr Keith Mintern	0		LPPub590	5.108	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874383	B Read	0		LPPub4054	5.108	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872752	Southern Construction and Surfacing Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijksman Dijksman Planning	LPPub2375		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley	0		LPPub97		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
826255	Dr Patrick	0		LPPub98		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Moseley					Housing Needs		Impact on AONB	
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley	0		LPPub111		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley	0		LPPub112		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub139		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub145		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub163		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub165		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths	0		LPPub169		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
472647	Mr Andrew Lord North Wessex Downs AONB	0		LPPub264		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub460		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub464		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871358	Mr Brian Payne	0		LPPub141		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871874	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub302		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871874	Ms Judith Russell	0		LPPub316		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829387	Mr Keith Russell	0		LPPub457		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub639		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub642		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831832	Joel Dothie	0		LPPub650		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub348		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub354		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
871947	Mr David Scott	0		LPPub350		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872051	Mr Ian Page	0		LPPub433		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872051	Mr Ian Page	0		LPPub435		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872051	Mr Ian Page	0		LPPub439		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Minter	0		LPPub564		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
827535	Mrs Nicola Livingstone	0		LPPub883		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Minter	0		LPPub571		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872161	Mr Keith Minter	0		LPPub566		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
866198	MR DAVID RICHARDS	0		LPPub1554		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874461	Paul Turner-Smith	0		LPPub3064		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831397	B Read	0		LPPub3881		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4323		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
828246	Mr Keith Robbins	0		LPPub4290		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829328	Mrs Ros Page	0		LPPub4471		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829328	Mrs Ros Page	0		LPPub4474		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829328	Mrs Ros Page	0		LPPub4475		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874696	Mr Tom Davies	0		LPPub4250		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4513		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4482		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub4493		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874629	Mr Mark Taylor	0		LPPub4283		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874664	Mr Paul Griffiths	0		LPPub4391		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4380		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler	0		LPPub4401		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874154	A Anson	0		LPPub3449		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
868466	Mr Duncan Cox	0		LPPub24	4	Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
872807	ms annabel eyres	0		LPPub2154		Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
874696	Mr Tom Davies	0		LPPub4287		Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831397	Mrs Judith Goodall	0		LPPub1412		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
829923	Dr Stephen Webb Wantage Constituency Labour Party	0		LPPub3549		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council	0		LPPub1068	1.25	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
730292	Mrs Julia Evans West Hendred Parish Council	0		LPPub2165		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley	0		LPPub107	6.69	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
831397	B Read	0		LPPub4056	6.69	Paragraph	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	
724877	Steven and Jane Hale	0		LPPub2354		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection - Harwell Campus and Impact on AONB	Public Transport N Harwell and E Harwell sites • Considerable thought must be given to the spatial layout of the site. • Roads served by bus routes should be designed to an adequate standard.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3855		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Public Transport	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3853		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developer should contribute to the cost of some form of bus-way to link with the southern end of the Valley Park site, ensuring that a direct, efficient, attractive bus service can be provided to Didcot. • The developer must contribute to the cost of funding any additional vehicle requirement needed to serve the residential site, along with service enhancements required.
856306	Mr Craig Neilson Ptarmigan Land	873607	Mr Robin Shepherd	LPPub3007		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	Support for Development at Harwell Campus -14 respondents supported development of the Harwell sites. Their comments are summarised below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The situation will need to be kept under review as the site progresses and cost estimates and values are refined. We therefore welcome the flexibility afforded in draft Core Policies 7 and 24. • Primary education contributions (via S106) need re-calculating. East Harwell allocation is shown as paying the same financial contribution as North West of Harwell Campus, yet East Harwell is also providing land for the new school. The 'gifting' of the land needs to be factored into the financial contribution sought from the East Harwell scheme (and the sums in the IDP re-calculated). • In terms of development capacity we are confident the site can accommodate at least 850 dwellings without conflicting with the Site Development Templates, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, proposed draft Core Policy 38 (Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites) or the draft Housing Density Policy (Core Policy 23). • Owners Mr and Mrs C F Lay and Mr and Mrs N G Lay) of a majority of the land at East Harwell support development of 850 homes and will be in a position to confirm preferred their developer partner shortly. • We consider the Spatial Strategy and Sub-Area Strategy to be a sustainable development option that can deliver integrated housing growth and economic development. • We recognise the importance of landscape masterplanning and urban design in this location and support the Council's aspirations. • We are committed to ensuring development positively contributes to the wider objectives of Science Vale and look forward to working with the Council and other stakeholders to deliver an exceptional scheme. • We support the Council's proposal to allocate land at East Harwell for about 850 dwellings – based upon the Landscape Study evidence. • Proposed development could be accommodated on the least sensitive land around Harwell Campus (with scope
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2874		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2880		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2888		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2885		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2853		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2864		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2871		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2868		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire	0		LPPub3926		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	County Council								<p>to deliver appropriate landscape mitigation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land can be made available for informal open space and on-site school provision to serve the development, in accordance with the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The County Council considers the exceptional circumstance - the need to support employment growth at Harwell Campus, an internationally renowned centre for science and technology • Ptarmigan Land supports the principle of development on land East of Harwell Campus and the allocation of 850 homes on this site. Client seeks an expanded development opportunity by way of an amended policy within the draft Local Plan, requiring a future masterplan. <p>We believe that this spatial strategy does not make adequate provision to support the level of planned employment growth in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recognise the importance of landscape masterplanning and urban design in this location and support the Council's aspirations to deliver exemplary modern design with a unique design response. • Land North and North West of Harwell is suitable for housing development as it is mainly brownfield within the existing campus, with capacity for additional housing without compromising the Campus' primary focus on employment-generating development. It will cause less harm to the AONB than development on adjacent greenfield land east of the A4185. The Partnership confirms the site is available immediately. • Recognition of the economic potential of the Harwell Campus and the need to support economic growth through increasing housing delivery is welcomed by the Partnership. Planning for housing growth should also be driven by a recognition of the Campus's role in relation to national objectives for science investment. Locating housing growth alongside the employment centre will add to the attractiveness of the Campus as a place to work. • The type of housing is important if it is to optimise its contribution to the Science Vale labour requirements. Work being carried out by the Partnership will establish the types of housing that will best support the science investment.
856306	Mr Craig Neilson Ptarmigan Land	873607	Mr Robin Shepherd	LPPub3787		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
758106	Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4766		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
758106	Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4771		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	0		LPPub2724	5.113	Paragraph	No	Support for Development at Harwell Campus	
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services ((Grd Floor East))	0		LPPub2322		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments	<p>We have concerns regarding Water Supply Capability and Waste Water Services in relation to this site. Water supply infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development.</p> <p>A water supply strategy would be required from the</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<p>developer to determine the exact impact on our infrastructure and the significance of the infrastructure to support the development.</p> <p>In the likely event of an upgrade to our assets being required, it could take up to 3 years to deliver the infrastructure, alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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."</p> <p>Drainage Infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity ahead of the development. In the first instance a drainage strategy would be required from the developer to determine the impact on our infrastructure and the significance of the infrastructure to support the development.</p> <p>Should an upgrade to our assets be required, up to three years lead in time may be necessary, alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner.</p> <p>We are likely to request a Grampian planning condition to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation of the development.</p>

Milton Heights and West of Harwell Sites

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829677	Mrs Susan Gaskell			LPPub550		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Coalescence of Villages	A number of comments refer to the coalescence of development with villages. Specific comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is nothing specific in the plan that defines the 'maintenance of the distinctive character' of the separate identity for Harwell village and encroachment. The plan does not include an effective mechanism to deliver CP 44 in relation to Harwell Village.
873884	Mr Raymond Howes			LPPub1672			No		
874101	Mr Tom Gowers			LPPub2299			No		
874364	Mrs Vivienne Smith			LPPub2139			No		
832368	Kathryn Nisbet			LPPub2360			No		
874364	Mrs Vivienne Smith			LPPub2140			No		
874551	Mr Colin Goodall			LPPub2346			No		
874667	Mr Robert Lucksford			LPPub2408			No		
874514	Mr Ian Jackson			LPPub2973			No		
872110	Mrs Penny Curtis			LPPub3361			No		
874430	Mr Craig Dunphy			LPPub3329			No		
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1505			No		
727675	Mr Henry Venners JPPC			LPPub3714		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Development at Milton Heights - Support	Response on behalf of majority owners proposed allocation known as land in Milton Parish west of the A34, Milton Heights. General support for vision. Explain why the model advocated for 1400 homes will be better than others due to the special nature of the model
830195	Mrs Lucy Dalby Milton Parish Council			LPPub2035		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Infrastructure Delivery	Milton Parish Council note the reduction in proposed houses at Milton Heights but continue to be concerned about the lack of local infrastructure to support these dwellings especially the need for the expansion of the village school and relief of the A34 interchange. Other comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision should be made for a shop within the plan.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently a lack of burial space • The road system will not cope whilst the proposed building is taking place
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3875		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Education Provision Milton Heights	<p>Milton Heights: 400 homes St Blaise Primary School is currently smaller than 0.5 form entry. 400 new homes would require the school to expand to 1 form entry, which would benefit the efficient delivery of education. 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 400 homes is shown in the IDP (page 3) as £1,297,200. The initial school site expansion analysis estimates that £1.4-1.65m 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 school on this scale of housing. Expansion of secondary school and SEN school capacity serving the area will also be required. Page 23 of the Local Plan Appendix A and page 39 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan support this requirement for educational provision. In both cases Didcot is specified in the context of secondary education. Milton currently feeds to Abingdon secondary schools; however it will be closer to the new secondary school due to open in Great Western Park, Didcot, and can more appropriately be considered under Didcot secondary school growth.</p>
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3949		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Education Provision Milton Heights	<p>Milton Heights Appendix A p24: there appears to be an error in the requirements for contributions to strategic infrastructure improvements for Abingdon rather than for Didcot. Contributions would also be required to SEN facilities</p>
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3800		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Highway Infrastructure Mitlon Heights	<p>Milton Heights, west of A34 (400 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 2400 veh trips per day, 240 trips in peak hour. • Satisfactory site access could be taken from A4130 Milton Hill but improvements to Milton Hill between the access point and Milton Interchange and to the Milton Interchange junction would be required. • Strategic access to A34 south and Harwell could be taken from Milton Interchange but traffic may seek to use A4130, through Rowstock and to Chilton Interchange. Strategic access to Wantage would also be via A4130 to Rowstock and A417. Hence substantial pressure would be created at Rowstock and along A4130. Local mitigation (e.g. footways, crossing points, junction improvements, traffic management, etc.)</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									may be required • Development would result in increased traffic flows into and from Abingdon and Didcot. Contributions should be secured towards future strategic infrastructure improvement for Science Vale Infrastructure package and Abingdon. PT contributions would be required.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3801		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Highway Infrastructure West of Harwell	West of Harwell (Site for up to 200 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 1000 veh trips per day, 100 trips in peak hour. • Satisfactory site access could be taken from Grove Road. Grove Road has a width restriction and, together with its junction with A4130, would need to be improved. • Strategic access to A34 north would be via A4185 to Milton Interchange. • Strategic access to A34 south and Harwell would be via Rowstock and A4185 to Chilton Interchange. Strategic access to Wantage would also be via Rowstock, and A417. Hence substantial pressure would be created at Rowstock and along A4185. • Local mitigation (e.g. footways, crossing points, junction improvements, traffic management, etc.) would be required. PT contributions would be required
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3845		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Public Transport Milton Heights	Milton Heights It will be very difficult to serve this site by effective public transport, as the quantum of housing will be too small to support a commercially viable bus service. The walking distance to the nearest bus stops on the A4130 will be further than national guidelines for most of the new residents, and this may well lead to complaints and campaigns for a financially-supported bus service. Apart from the school, there are almost no local amenities at Milton Heights so the new residents will require access to the bus to access retail and other amenities in other centres. Nevertheless, the Council will not provide ongoing financial support for a bus service terminating in the Milton Heights development. The developer will be required to contribute to the development of bus routes serving the Milton Heights bus stops on the A4130, along with the best possible walking routes to these stops.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3852		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Public Transport West of Harwell	West of Harwell This site is located about 400 metres from the High Street bus stops in the centre of Harwell village. However, the walking route along Grove Road does not have a footpath currently, and the developer would be required to provide a safe walking route to the bus stops. The developer would contribute to improved frequency and hours of service on the strategic bus route between Wantage, Harwell and Didcot
874773	Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3997		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Oxfordshire County Council Scale of Development	Site Specific Comments 27.Milton Heights - The county council objected to the previous allocation of 1400 dwellings at this site. Due to the insistence that some housing would be allocated here, an allocation of 400 was deemed acceptable in principle as it will allow the primary

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								at Milton Heights	school to expand to 1 Form of Entry. However, the county council is yet to be convinced that the transport impacts of 400 dwellings can be mitigated.
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1130		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Public Transport	Stagecoach objects against development at Milton Heights. Milton Heights is fundamentally unsustainable as it is not served by public transport and will not be in the future as it will then be still to small to be profitable.
826359	Mrs Susan Greatbanks			LPPub2146		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Scale of Development at Harwell Village	<p>A number of comments related to development proposals at Harwell Village. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although all villages need to grow and develop, we are in danger of losing our identity completely. 20 or more houses can be coped with, but when these developments reach the hundreds the whole structure of the village is compromised. Harwell's population of some 2300 people in 1000 dwellings, is set to quadruple with the extensive plans outlined in the Local Plan. Villages and rural communities are being swamped and are in imminent danger of losing their village character, while the countryside, far from being safeguarded is under threat Living as we do on the border of VWHDC and South Oxfordshire means that we are surrounded by these huge building projects; Proposed dev in LP of 200 houses + Taylor Wimpey estate (66 houses) + Blenheim Hill (Bloor Homes 80+) + Reading Road (45 houses) + Great Western Estate (2000+ houses) + several thousand more at Valley Park. I am opposed to any development which impacts the rural nature, outlook and surroundings of the village and fully support the views of the Keep Harwell Rural campaign. Scale of development relative the scale of existing buildings and its limited services is unsustainable development, which will adversely have an urbanising effect on open countryside.
874101	Mr Tom Gowers			LPPub2296			No		
874613	Mr Alastair Greatbanks			LPPub2332			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley			LPPub1245		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Scale of Development at Milton Heights	<p>A number of comments related to development proposals at Milton Heights. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milton Heights is close to the geographic centre of this area and therefore in our view is suitable for further expansion, and expansion of the scale envisaged • Indeed Milton Heights does not have any landscape or other special nationally recognised landscape designation. There are no particular heritage features such as listed buildings or Conservation Areas which might be affected by large scale development. • The benefits of developing this particular site would clearly outweigh any possible disadvantages, give n the pressing need for additional housing to meet assessed needs. • We support the policy but these comments should not be taken as undermining another suggestion that there should be 1,400 homes on this site. • An area with many established jobs and where new jobs could quickly be grown to complement what exists at present to drive a sustainable local community. • It is notable that the draft allocation is double that typically being proposed for much larger and more sustainable villages • The scale of development is tantamount to a new settlement in view of the relationship with the existing settlement, • Cumulative impacts of traffic from this proposed development and others like it, elsewhere in the County and beyond we regard this as entirely unacceptable • It is far from clear that local bus service could be efficiently diverted to serve the area
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub3542			No		
727675	Mr Henry Venners JPPC			LPPub3711			No		
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1154			No		
737058	Mr Andy Cattermole Taylor Wimpey	860277	Mr Steven Neal Vail Williams LLP	LPPub4169		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for Development at Harwell Village	<p>Supporting the inclusion of this site because of its suitability for residential development which will contribute towards the Vale's housing land supply. The site at the West of Harwell is free of any insurmountable technical constraints Realistically developable within the early years of the plan. Acknowledges the need for highway improvement works and has appointed transport consultants who are liaising directly with Oxfordshire County Council in this regard Taylor Wimpey have informed us that they are willing to undertake the necessary highways works along Grove Road</p> <p>A hydrology strategy will be produced in support of any application</p> <p>The allocation is in conformity with 'a presumption in favour of sustainable development.'</p> <p>Sustainable location: edge of existing settlement,</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									minimising need for vehicles as Harwell has many community facilities and services.
872110	Mrs Penny Curtis			LPPub3351		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Traffic Congestion	<p>A number of comments relate to traffic congestion. Specific points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harwell site unsound due to infrastructure restrictions • Grove Road will not be able to cope with the level of traffic. • Narrow with sections where 2 vehicles cannot pass side by side. • access to this school can no way support any more traffic than it does at present. • access to this school needs urgently reviewing • Buses also regularly mount the pavement causing damage and endangering people • Proper survey over time not wandering up there in the middle of the day. • Should be 20mph speed limit • Co-ordination is needed at Milton Interchange traffic lights and the mini-junction and pedestrian crossing inside the park, to relieve congestion off the A34. • An A34 south-bound slip is needed coming across the old Milton Village Football Club field into a new mini-roundabout at that Milton Village junction (see map) • This will alleviate the amount of traffic trying to converge from the two lanes, from the A34 and Milton Interchange, while reducing the amount of the A34 build up. • Several park and rides hubs could also be introduced around Grove, Harwell Campus, Milton Park and Culham. With a regular bus service at reasonable cost, more people would use the service. • Mine and a lot of locals are concerned with many businesses going out of business, loss of jobs due to not getting to work on time, unhappy customers and delivery schedules not met.
874114	Mr Barry Wilkes			LPPub1994			No		
875625	Ms Janet Williams			LPPub4472			No		

East of Sutton Courtenay Site

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
735808	Pippa Cheetham O&H Properties	849350	Ms Dawn Brodie	LPPub3021		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Alternative Site - North of Appleford Road Sutton Courtenay	Support is outlined for CP3 and 4, identifying Sutton Courtenay as a Larger Village, and the councils approach to splitting the district into three sub-areas.
735808	Pippa Cheetham O&H Properties	849350	MsDawn Brodie	LPPub3019		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Alternative Site - North of Appleford Road Sutton Courtenay	There are discrepancies in the plan and its categorisation of Sutton Courtenay (Within CP4 as part of South East Vale Sub-Area/ CP8 as part of Abingdon and Oxford Sub-Area) . It is suggested that the village sits more with the Abingdon/ Oxford Sub-Area. An alternative site is available to the north of Appleford Road in Sutton Courtenay. It is suggested that the Planning Inspector should be satisfied that all alternatives have been considered and the allocation of Green Belt and AONB sites is justified, when other sustainable sites are available.
874519	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2785		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	English Heritage Comments Conservation Area	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the principle to “sensitively design development to minimise any impact on the setting of the Sutton Courtenay Conservation Area.....”.
872573	Dr Heather Sanders			LPPub905		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection to Development at Sutton Courtenay	An objection to development at Sutton Courtenay outlines a number of issues, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan has failed to fully comprehend the negative impact that the traffic, drainage and character loss of the village • Site will be accessed by a very small road, Frilsham Street and Hobby Horse Lane. This road is reduced to one lane in places and cannot be widened. The extra traffic on this road will dramatically reduce road safety within the village. • The increase in house numbers and destruction of valuable green space in the village will be detrimental to character of the village. • It is questioned whether building extra houses will actually provide more affordable housing. It is suggested that the houses built in the villages are still going to be sold at premium market rates. • The council should exhaust all brown field and redevelopment opportunities.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3871		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	East Sutton Courtenay: 220 homes Sutton Courtenay Primary School will need to expand to 1 form entry to meet the needs of already permitted development. The Local Plan proposal could exceed the school's capacity at 1 form entry, without making viable further expansion. However, school planning in this area needs to take into account nearby schools and villages, as much of the existing village of Milton is closer to Sutton Courtenay School than its current designated school, St Blaise, and some of the

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									development planned for Sutton Courtenay is easily accessible to Culham Primary School. Primary education provision for this proposed housing would therefore be based on a broader survey of both housing development and school growth potential, including any new schools resulting from larger scale developments, across the surrounding area. Initial school site expansion analysis indicates that the current school site area is below that recommended for a 1.5 form entry or larger school, which compromises the ability of the school to expand. Acquisition of additional site area for the school would facilitate its expansion, should that be required. Expansion of secondary school and SEN school capacity serving the area will also be required. Page 22 of the Local Plan Appendix A and page 36 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan support this requirement for educational provision. In both cases Didcot is specified in the context of secondary education; Sutton Courtenay is currently part of the Abingdon partnership of schools. Some children attend secondary schools in Didcot, and the provision of new schools in Didcot may mean more children from the village choose schools in Didcot. As such, expansion of secondary education provision to serve this development site may be delivered in either Abingdon or Didcot.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3796		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	East Sutton Courtenay (220 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 1300 veh trips per day, 130 trips in peak hour. • Site access would be taken from Hobbyhorse Lane. The Lane is a farm access standard only and leads westwards to the nPower site at Didcot, but with no strategic access available to Didcot. Eastwards towards the village, Hobbyhorse Lane leads via Frilsham Street to High Street. Frilsham Street is narrow and would not be suitable to cater for the increased volume of traffic. The site, therefore, has no apparent means of satisfactory access. • Strategic access to Abingdon and A34 north would be through Abingdon via A415 or B4017. Both of these routes are heavily congested during peak times. • Contributions should be secured towards future strategic infrastructure improvement for Abingdon. PT contributions would be required.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3844		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	East Sutton Courtenay This site is located over 400 metres from bus stops at High Street garage on the x1 bus route from Harwell and Didcot to Abingdon and Oxford. To reduce this distance, the developer should fund the relocation of these bus stops closer to the junction of the High Street with Frilsham Street, along with improved infrastructure such as shelters. Improved footways would also be required along Frilsham Street and Hobbyhorse Lane. The developer would also contribute to the cost of

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									an enhanced frequency of bus service between Didcot and Abingdon via Sutton Courtenay
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3958		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Support for Development at Sutton Courtenay	Support is outlined for the proposed allocation at Sutton Courtenay. The allocation can be delivered within the context of Appendix A, subject to minor modifications, the site is considered to be deliverable & is not overly reliant on provision of infrastructure. Support is outlined for the Council seeking to protect villages from unallocated development.
874394	Mrs Alison Draper			LPPub3815		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Flooding	The site flood on a regularly basis.
756175	Mr Robin Draper			LPPub2578		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Objection	<p>A number of comments object to development at Sutton Courtenay. Specific comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development borders an active landfill site which regularly floods. The development would be an overburden for the local infrastructure. Development is in close proximity of a major sewerage site, which the EA proved unable to control in regard to foul odours. The absence of a specific proposal to increase public transport services for Sutton Courtenay, despite there being proposed housing sites in the village demonstrates the lack of sustainability and inappropriateness of further village development. Sutton Courtenay appears to have been included in the Science Vale area, yet the village receives no benefit from this. Why is this? As a village, Sutton Courtenay should be removed from the Science Vale Action area.
874584	Linda Martin			LPPub3116			No		
874584	Linda Martin			LPPub3126			No		
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services	0		LPPub2307		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments	<p>Sewage treatment capacity will be unable to support the demand of the development.</p> <p>12 week investigation in needed.</p> <p>3 years lead time for an upgrade.</p> <p>The development plan must ensure developers will guarantee there is enough waste water capacity to serve both the existing and new customers.</p> <p>Drainage strategy will be required by the developer before development can commence.</p> <p>A Grampian planning condition will be requested to ensure infrastructure is in place before development commences.</p>

Valley Park Site

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3847		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Public Transport North West Valley Park	This site will require a high-quality public bus service, probably through routeing a Milton Park – Valley Park – Didcot town centre service through the development along a Spine Road which is suitable for bus operation and which is supplied with bus stops linking with walking routes to the residential areas.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3846		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Public Transport Valley Park	This site will require new high-quality bus services to Didcot station/town centre and to the major employment sites at Milton Park and Harwell, to be funded by the developer, until such time as these services can be operated on a fully-commercial basis. It is essential that the spatial layout of the site provides good penetration by the bus, so this mode of transport can operate efficiently on direct routes, with stops linked to concentrations of population. A higher density of population is desirable near these stops, to generate demand for bus services. The provision of the eventual frequent commercially viable services will be heavily influenced by the provision of bus-friendly infrastructure. The physical shape of the site will lead to some challenges and compromises. The east-west 'width' of the site towards the northern boundary will create some difficulty in serving this area with a single north-south corridor. It may also be difficult to serve the southern end of the site south of the B4493 with the full level of bus service proposed for the northern part of the site. A connecting spine road should be provided to the North West of Valley Park development site, to facilitate through bus operation for a Milton Park to Didcot service passing through the North West of Valley Park site, Valley Park and the Wantage Road B4493 into Didcot.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
850975	Karen Dodd			LPPub2831		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Coalescence with nearby villages	<p>A number of proposals raise concern over the potential for coalescence with nearby villages. Specific points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These proposals will cause coalescence between Didcot and Harwell Village, and Milton Heights and Didcot. The Proposed safeguarding of land off the Harwell Link Road for the Southern Didcot Perimeter Road (Appendix E) would lead to coalescence between Didcot and both East and West Hagbourne. This future coalescence leads to a loss of social identity which would follow a rapid urban extension to an urban extension to Didcot Town. The Valley Parks are neither Harwell, nor Didcot, but isolated and lacking focus. However some of the land designated as protected by NE10 has been allocated to the Valley Park site (2550 homes planned). The proposed plan effectively leads to coalescence of Harwell village with Valley Park/Great Western Park/Didcot destroying the village character. It also does great damage to the important concepts noted in the NPPF section 80 (first 4 bullets) for the residents of our 1000 year old Harwell Village. The Plan should identify a rural gap around Harwell Village where no development will be permitted and commitment to a green corridor along the B4493 between the A34 and Zulu Farm.
872360	Mr Peter Hobin			LPPub2950			No		
830121	Mrs Gillianella Godwin			LPPub765			No		
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3876		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Valley Park and North West Valley Park	<p>2550 homes and North West of Valley Park: 800 homes</p> <p>Given the scale of this development area, school provision requirements would need to be confirmed following full assessment based on actual planned housing mix and build timescales. However, based on the pupil generation rates used above, this scale of development generates primary pupils broadly equivalent to approximately 4.5 forms of entry. This scale of provision could be delivered through two new schools, one 2 form entry and one 2.5-3 form entry. However, to minimise travel to school distances, it may be preferable to plan for three schools, two 2 form entry and one 1 form entry, to provide a better spatial distribution of provision. Should housing numbers in this development area increase, three school sites would provide for more flexibility and future-proofing. Pages 28 and 31 of the Local Plan Appendix A states that two new 2 form entry primary schools will be required for Valley Park and North-West Valley Park, one of which may need to be 3 form entry at least during peak years. Page 39 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that two new schools will be needed, one 2 form entry and one 2.5 form entry. The provision of two new primary schools, one of which will be 2.5-3 form entry at peak, is in line with the pupil generation expected as a result of the Local Plan housing numbers.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									However, if higher housing numbers are approved, this level of provision would not be sufficient, and three primary school sites would be required, one of which should be within North West Valley Park. A new secondary school is already planned to open in Didcot in 2017 to meet the needs of the Great Western Park and Valley Park developments. It will be collocated with a University Technical College, which will serve a wider area. A site for another new secondary school is included in masterplanning for the North East Didcot development, pending confirmation of total housing planned numbers in this area. The scale of additional housing proposed by VOWH would confirm the need for another new secondary school in the area. Page 40 of the IDP states that contributions towards the cost of secondary school capacity would be required at the rate of £3,699 per home. This rate applies to extension of existing schools; as new schools are to be built the appropriate new school building rate of cost should be applied. Due to the scale of development and consequent population growth in and around Didcot, a new Special Education Needs school is planned, to be located on Valley Park. Pages 28 and 31 of the Local Plan Appendix A and page 40 of the IDP support this provision.
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler			LPPub3280		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Development at Valley Park	A response from the owner of the North West Valley Park site identifies the opportunity for the development to be highly sustainable, linked with excellent public transport connections and so to provide opportunities for a car free environment.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3799		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Highways North West Valley Park	This site is located on and would be directly accessed from A4130 which is a good quality link road between Didcot and A34 Trunk Road. The LP includes proposals for the improvement of this link road to dual carriageway standard. Access for this site should therefore be satisfactorily achievable. However, capacity problems could be created at Milton Interchange and on the close approaches to Didcot and mitigation measures would be required. • It is assumed that linkage would be provided between this site and the main Valley Park site and the Great Western Park site. The cumulative impact of this site together with the other development utilising the A4130 link would be substantial. • It is likely that this large site would have impacts on public rights of way. PT contributions would be required. SV UK contributions would be required. This review relates to the extensions of the site to the northwest and south for an additional 400 dwellings. • Northwest - Access should be possible onto A4130 or through Valley Park. PROW may be affected. • South - Access should be secured via proposed Harwell Link Road

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									Section 1 (B4493 – A417). • This is now a further increase of 400 dwellings, but their location is not known. However, the increase does not fundamentally change comments made previously.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3802		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Highways North West Valley Park	Valley Park, adjoining Didcot (2550 dwellings) The previous site for Valley Park (2150 dwellings) has been previously commented upon. This review relates to the extensions of the site to the northwest and south for an additional 400 dwellings. • Northwest - Access should be possible onto A4130 or through Valley Park. PROW may be affected. South - Access should be secured via proposed Harwell Link Road Section 1 (B4493 – A417). This is now a further increase of 400 dwellings, but their location is not known. However, the increase does not fundamentally change comments made previously.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3827		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Highways Valley Park	Transport Strategy Strategic Sites and Policies Appendices Valley Park – Should match advice given via Position Statement • Appendix A P27 – States “Provide the proposed Harwell Link Road (Core Policy 17).” –A developer may be giving the land but Oxfordshire County Council is delivering and has secured money for it. The text implies they are doing more than in reality and this should this be made clearer. The Harwell Link Road has a strategic function, as identified in the evidence base, which is why it is included in the SV scheme package. It is not merely an internal/adjacent local access road to serve Valley Park (having been identified as necessary before) but is required to make the site deliverable, with the need for strategic access points along it (exact wording needs consideration...) Appendix A P27 column 2 – update ref to read A4130 capacity enhancements, instead of duelling (which may be required)
830012	Mr Robert Thomas			LPPub1209	5.48	Paragraph	No	Scale of Growth at Didcot	The proposed 'Valley Park' and 'North West Valley Park' developments to the west of Didcot are excessive when existing and recent local developments are taken into account. Didcot has expanded immensely over recent years, with new housing built to the west at 'Great Western Park', the North with the 'Ladygrove Estate', and possibly also with the proposed development of 'North East Didcot' (in South Oxfordshire District).

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
757670	Hallam Land Management (Didcot)	724475	Mr Nick Laister RPS Planning	LPPub2617 LPPub2609 LPPub2615 LPPub2614		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No No No No	Scale of Valley Park Allocation	The housing supply table should state the following number of dwellings for Valley Park, within the South East Vale Sub-Area: "At least 2,550" There should be an acknowledgement that significantly more than 2,550 dwellings can be achieved on this site. The scale of growth on the Valley Park site as set out in the plan is challenged. It is suggested that the site can deliver more than 2,550 dwellings and that this should be reflected in the plan.
874773	Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub4000		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Scale of Valley Park Allocation	Valley Park – The scale of growth potentially coming forward through applications at Valley Park needs to be fully considered. The Plan allocates 2,550 dwellings; however, developers are working on a scheme for 4,450 dwellings. The Vale will need to be able to demonstrate that the site can absorb higher levels of housing and further work needs to be done to understand if it can be mitigated with appropriate infrastructure and services being provided. The Plan will also need to consider if allocating higher numbers here would necessitate lower numbers elsewhere in the Plan. If it is demonstrated a higher number can be delivered within the Plan period then the county council would strongly suggest less sustainable sites are removed from the plan
872161	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services			LPPub2325		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments	Sewage treatment capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support this development necessary to undertake investigations and completion of this takes 12 weeks. upgrade to assets could take up to three paragraph is included in the Development Plan."Developers will be required ..." Drainage Infrastructure is likely to be required drainage strategy would be required from the developer developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. request a Grampian planning condition
866485	Mr Paul Wyman			LPPub14		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Traffic Congestion	A number of issues are raised concerning highway infrastructure associated with the Valley Park site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road to the station from the A34 needs dualling ALL the way A34 needs an extra lane both sides from Chilton to the Oxford Ring Road south A34 needs an extra lane both sides from Chilton to the Oxford Ring Road south The station car waiting area needs doubling

Crab Hill, Grove Airfield and Monks Farm Sites

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3912		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Alternative Site - Crown Packaging Site	<p>The potential of the Crown Packaging site for re-development for residential use is outlined. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sites consists of 7.2 ha, situated to the northwest of Wantage, and south of Grove along Downsview Road. • The sites are split between two separate parcels • The sites are surrounded by consented residential development • The sites are located close to Grove Technology Park • In accordance with the settlement hierarchy, further residential development in Wantage would be appropriate to recognise its Market Town status in the settlement hierarchy • The continued identification of the Crown Downsview Road sites as strategic employment sites are not consistent with national policy, effective or justified • The sites could serve to maintain the settlement hierarchy as the smaller villages have significantly more new development attributed to them than the main towns • The sites provides an excellent opportunity for a residential allocation which can deliver at least 250 homes. • The sites consist of brownfield land in a sustainable location • Crown Packaging have an urgent need to relocate to a smaller more efficient facility within the local area which will enable them to retain their highly skilled jobs within the Vale • There is a surplus of employment land within the District and market signals indicate the sites are highly unlikely to be re-let or sold for employment use • It is critical the strategic employment designation is removed
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3934			No		
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3943			No		
874656	Mr & Mrs W M Wasborough	830006	Mr Mark Richards	LPPub2500		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Alternative Site - South of Downsview Road	<p>An alternative site is put forward at land south of Downsview Road as available, deliverable and a sustainable location for development. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not Green Belt or AONB • There are no ecological constraints. • Development could help fund restoration of Wilts and Berks Canal (between East Challow and Wantage) • The separation of E Challow and Wantage would be maintained. • The land is well related to existing areas of employment.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wantage: wide range of services and facilities – no reliance upon private vehicles • SEVale sub: Significant centres of employment. Accessible via a range of transport modes. • This site could potentially deliver up to 645 new homes. • It is not anticipated that the entire site should come forward for development as it is important that a physical gap remains between East Challow and Wantage. • Remainder of the land area can be secured as green infrastructure to retain an appropriate sense of separation
756521	Ms Sally Wallington Letcombe Brook Project			LPPub3181		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Biodiversity	<p>The biological value of the Letcombe Brook is outlined, which is in proximity of proposed development at Monks Farm. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chalk streams are globally rare habitats and cannot be recreated or offset elsewhere • Ecological assets should not be subject to unacceptable levels of disturbance from people and their pets. • Associated protected species such as water vole and otter cannot be supported elsewhere as they are reliant on water. • The Government have made a commitment to halt the loss of biodiversity and deliver net gains where possible. • (NPPF) aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible should be respected.
749581	Dr Elizabeth Boon			LPPub465		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub	No	Crab Hill National Policy	Allocating large areas for housing development without significant employment growth in Wantage and Grove is contrary to this Government Policy.
749581	Dr Elizabeth Boon			LPPub465			No		
729744	Mr Jonathan Waite			LPPub4069		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub	Yes	Crab Hill Support	There is some slippage in the proposed timescale for land at Crab Hill, north east of Wantage and south east of Grove. However, the allocation is still expected to be delivered during the life-time of the Plan.
729744	Mr Jonathan Waite			LPPub4070			Yes		The likelihood is that the start date for land at Crab Hill will slip to 2016. However, this still means that allocation of 1,500 homes will be completed during the life-time of the Plan.
729744	Mr Jonathan Waite			LPPub4073		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Crab Hill Development Template	<p>Lands Improvement Holdings Limited (LIH) supports the general principle set out in the Crab Hill, Wantage Site Development Template (Local Plan Appendix A).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dev density should be lower towards.... approach might

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Vale Sub-Area			be appropriate in certain parts of the site but to require lower densities around the outer limits of the whole site is too prescriptive. • requirement to “remediate any contamination...” no such requirements in the draft conditions issued by the Council (P13/V01764/0)
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2779		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	English Heritage Comments Crab Hill	English Heritage make no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but the identified site would complete the envelopment of Wantage Charlton Conservation Area, which has its roots as a rural hamlet, in modern housing. The area still retains the character of a village centre when viewed from within. An additional requirement should therefore be added to the Site Development Template that the scale and extent of development around the historic centre should be limited.
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2778		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	English Heritage Comments Monks Farm	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the requirement for a Heritage Statement to be submitted to show how the listed buildings at Monks Farm and Grove Wick Farm have been sensitively considered. Monks Farm is a good rural group with a farmhouse, barn and cottages, and surrounding this group with housing and a link road can only, in our view, seriously harm the setting of these buildings. It is critical therefore that, if this allocation is taken forward, the impact on setting is mitigated as much as possible through limiting the scale of the surrounding development and sensitive design. The route way (Cow Lane) which runs through the allocated site, is at least post-medieval in date, appearing on Rocque’s map of Berkshire in 1761. This historic feature should be retained and respected within any development scheme. An additional requirement should be added to the Site Development Template requiring the retention of and respect for this historic route.
874632	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2836		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	English Heritage Comments Supporting Text	English Heritage welcomes the statement in the vision for the South East Vale Sub-Area that the town centre in Wantage will have been protected and enhanced, although we would prefer “conserved and enhanced” as terminology more consistent with the NPPF. We also welcome the statement that “The countryside and villages will have retained their distinctive character”.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
758065	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	864481	Mr James Stewart-Irvine Savills	LPPub2895		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Housing Growth at Monks Farm	The site promoters for the Monks Farm site state that they are pleased that the District Council is now at such an advanced stage of production of the Local Plan Part 1. It accords with the principles of the NPPF in that it will boost significantly the supply of housing in the District. Other comments include: Request that the Council considers increasing the housing numbers in the allocation to 825 new dwellings. With regard to providing a new primary school. The expansion of land adjacent to the existing school (Grove Church of England Primary School) site is possible. Discussions have taken place with Oxfordshire County Council who confirm that this approach would be suitable. Therefore, a new primary school will no longer be required within the main development area, and additional land is therefore available within the allocation for a further 75 houses approximately. Bringing forward this site will significantly boost the supply of housing in the District. The allocation could be increased to 825 units together with 6ha of employment. Gallagher-Gleeson intends to consult widely on their intention of submitting an outline planning application by the Summer of 2015. Gallagher Estates welcomes the continued support of land to the north of Grove. The consented schemes representing early phases of the north Grove allocation (listed above) have already secured access that enables further phases to come forward. The junction has been designed in such a way that it can be upgraded to serve the wider north Grove allocation and the Grove airfield site, and the first part of the Grove North Link Road (GNLR) has been designed to the standards required by the Highways Authority for the completed strategic road. Williams supports the identification and inclusion of that land at Monks Farm (North Grove) as a strategic allocation for at least 750 new homes. However, it is submitted that its capacity may well be greater once a detailed assessment has been undertaken. We would encourage the LPA not to resist any increase in delivery. There are relatively few environmental and/or technical constraints on the delivery of Monks Farm (North Grove). It is submitted the land could be brought forward early in the identified Plan period. The site could reasonably be built out within 10 years from adoption of the LP 2031. Williams supports in principle Core Policy 15 (Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area) subject to there being recognition within the policy that non Class B uses would be capable of delivering new job and economic growth opportunities on the Monks Farm (North Grove) allocation.
758065	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	864481	Mr James Stewart-Irvine Savills	LPPub2901			No		
874460	Mr James Colgate			LPPub1961			Yes		
874460	Mr James Colgate			LPPub1965			Yes		
758065	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	864481	Mr James Stewart-Irvine Savills	LPPub2893			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874644	Eoin Garland			LPPub2433		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Housing Growth in Wantage and Grove	<p>A number of issues are raised with the operation of the NPPF, that it is not preventing unsustainable development, and that their is insufficient protection to England's town centres.</p> <p>The high housing densities set out in the plan are not conducive to appropriate communal living and the fact that the North Grove Link Road will not be delivered until after 1,500 houses (in a 2,500 scheme) are built is out of line with the Government NPPF Select Committee Inquiry findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many house projects for the Wantage area. • Unbelievable figures. • Developers should be bished if they do not build the promised houses. May be a self-build scheme is much more suitable.
875809	Mrs Jennie Cosgrove			LPPub3704			No		
828243	Linda J Tillotson			LPPub984			No		
873721	F Sketch			LPPub1482		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Infrastructure Delivery	<p>A number of comments relate to the delivery of infrastructure associated with proposed development in Wantage and Grove. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is stated that the NPPF requires that all developments shall have infrastructure plans developed in parallel with developments. The Vale's local plan proposes ANOTHER 5,500 houses in Wantage/Grove with no local transport infrastructure to support employment in Science area. • Other infrastructure to support any level of development (shops, schools, healthcare) remains an issue. The market town of Wantage is to be treasured. It is a very appealing town of historical interest. The local council has worked to encourage local retailers and this is commended. However, it is insufficient to accommodate the number of houses suggested in the local area and if it was expanded its appeal and its historical character compromised • The Wantage and Grove Campaign Group represents the view of approximately 1,000 individuals in the Wantage and Grove area and its aims are: We are not against any development in Wantage and Grove but Developments should be proportionate and sustainable • The infrastructure should enhance and improve quality of life for its residents.
830844	Caroline Ball			LPPub2087			No		
827932	Julie Mabblerley Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			LPPub3568			Yes		
729558	Mr Richard Waters			LPPub1013			No		
729558	Mr Oliver Gardiner			LPPub1027			No		
730292	Mr Timothy Howse			LPPub1111			No		
756116	Mr Adrian Gainer			LPPub1131			No		
756130	Mr David Marsh Harwell Parish Council			LPPub3129			No		
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3808		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Crab Hill and Monks Farm Development	The county council has no comments to make on these sites as they are live applications.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3856		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Eastern Wantage Link Road Comments	Crab Hill, Wantage - This site must provide a spine road through the residential development, suitable for bus operation. The developer must also provide bus stops along the spine road, and in addition, stops on the A417. The development must contribute to the cost of providing direct bus links to Harwell, Milton Park, Didcot, Abingdon and Oxford.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3894		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments - Grove Airfield Planning Application	Grove Airfield: 2500 homes This development is subject to current S106 negotiations, and is required to provide two new primary schools and a secondary school, and contribute towards expansion of SEN provision. Pages 46-7 of the IDP support this provision, but only includes one primary school; this should be two.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3892		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Infrastructure Delivery - Monks Farm	North Grove Monks Farm: 750 homes Parts of this development are subject to extant S106 agreements or current S106 negotiations. In total, the development is required to provide the equivalent of a 1 form entry primary school, which may be through expansion of an existing school; contribution towards new provision on Grove Airfield; or a new 1 form entry school on-site. The development is also required to contribute towards the new secondary school planned for Grove Airfield, and towards expansion of SEN provision. Page 45 of the IDP supports this provision. Page 44 of the Local Plan Appendix A states that primary provision will be through extension of Grove CE Primary School; this has not yet been confirmed.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3807		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Crab Hill and Monks Farm	No comments to make on these sites as they are live applications.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3889		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Infrastructure Delivery Crab Hill	Crab Hill Wantage: 1500 homes This development is subject to current S106 negotiations, and is required to provide a new 2 form entry primary school, and contribute towards the new secondary school planned for Grove Airfield, and towards expansion of SEN provision. Page 42 of the Local Plan Appendix A and pages 43-44 of the IDP support this provision.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3857		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Public Transport Monks Farm	Monks Farm, Grove This site must contribute to the cost of providing improved bus links from Grove to Oxford, Abingdon, Didcot, Milton Park, Wantage and Harwell, with each link operating at least twice per hour. The site must provide good walking routes to bus stops on routes passing through Grove (including eventual routes through Grove Airfield). The spatial arrangement of residential development sites in Grove is less than ideal for bus routeing. The current proposal is to route buses along Oxford Lane, Grove Green and Denchworth Road. This is

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									to avoid the withdrawal of bus services from the existing Grove settlement, which would be unacceptable. The requested strategic bus links will be insufficiently strong to operate in two variants (both via the Grove Northern Relief Road /Grove Airfield and also via the current Grove settlement, so the Oxford Lane, Grove Green, Denchworth Road bus routeing has been chosen as a compromise that can provide reasonable access to all parts of Grove.
756116	Mr David Greenaway			LPPub3766		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Planning Application Stockham Farm	Stockham Farm development Phase 3 should not go ahead. Exit ontoDenchworth Roadwhich is saturated every day Protrudes into the green space behind Wantage and Grove just as phase 2 will.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)			LPPub3342		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Social Infrastructure Monks Farm	We note that there is no indicative contribution towards the Social ("soft") aspects of development Healthy and Sustainable Communities. We note also that the plan indicates the proposed development commencing in 2017/18 and continuing to at least 2028/29. It would therefore be in the same timescales as the Grove Airfield and Crab Hill developments, both close by, as well as the proposed strategic development of Land east of the A338 at East Hanney. What approach is anticipated for the proposed Monks Farm Development for delivering the Social aspects of developing a Healthy and Sustainable Community?
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services			LPPub2300		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments Crab Hill	Crab Hill: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water supply network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand. Necessary for us to undertake investigations and completion of this will take several weeks. Up to three years lead in time will be necessary. To be included: "Developers will be required to demonstrate..." Sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand Drainage Infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity Drainage strategy would be required from the developer. Upgrade to our assets could take up to three years lead in time Alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. Grampian planning condition to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation.
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property			LPPub2309		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East	No	Thames Water - Comments Monks Farm	Monks Farm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water supply network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Services					Vale Sub-Area			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary for us to undertake investigations and completion of this will take several weeks. • Up to three years lead in time will be necessary. • To be included: “Developers will be required to demonstrate...” • Sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand • Drainage Infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity • Drainage strategy would be required from the developer. • Upgrade to our assets could take up to three years lead in time • Alternatively the developer may wish to requisition the infrastructure to deliver it sooner. • Grampian planning condition to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation.
872590	Mr Andrew McCrohon			LPPub961		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Traffic Congestion	The roads out of Wantage (A338 North) and (A417 East) are already beyond capacity at peak times. Adjustments at Frilford and Rowstock junctions will help existing traffic but would not adequately support the proposed increases.

Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829923	Dr Stephen Webb Wantage Constituency Labour Party			LPPub3556		Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station	No	Needs of Network Rail	The Plan does not make provision for the future need of Network Rail to install a grade-separated junction in the vicinity of the proposed Science Bridge.
874771	Clowes & GraftonGate Development Ltd &	860273	Ms Sophie Trouth Pegasas Group	LPPub4512		Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station	No	Policy Wording	Core Policy 16 should be amended to allow for a more flexible approach to development (B1, B2 and B8 uses). Inclusion of the word “ancillary” preceding the word ‘retail’ is overly restrictive and should be deleted to ensure the policy is in conformity with the NPPF. Sentence should be added to the end of Paragraph 4.36: It is anticipated that bulky goods retailing that cannot be accommodated at these locations will be provided for as part of the mixed use development of Didcot a Power Station Site (Core Policy 16). South Oxfordshire District Council is concerned to ensure that there are not adverse impacts on the town centre area, we suggest additional text after favourably - 'Subject to no significant adverse impact on the viability and vitality of Didcot Town Centre'.
874771	Clowes & GraftonGate Development Ltd &	860273	Ms Sophie Trouth Pegasas Group	LPPub4512			No		
729128	Gary Lees Pegasus Planning Group			LPPub4520			No		
729030	Planning Policy South Oxfordshire District Council			LPPub3843		Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station	Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council Comments Policy Wording	This council is concerned to ensure that there are not adverse impacts on the town centre area, we suggest additional text after favourably - Subject to no significant adverse impact on the viability and vitality of Didcot Town Centre.
873665	Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd			LPPub2926		Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station	No	Relience on Single Employment Site	It is suggested that reliance on a single large site (Didcot A Power Station) to fulfil the employment land needs of the District poses a number of problems and risks: i) control of the site is in a single ownership; ii) any problems bringing forward the site could result in major delays which might have damaging impacts if few other new sites were available; and iii) there would be a lack of choice and flexibility for prospective new businesses.
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4295		Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station	No	Scale of Employment Allocation	Why are only 29 of the 47 hectares being earmarked for use at the site at Didcot Power Station?
757670	Hallam Land Management (Didcot)	724475	Mr Nick Laister RPS Planning	LPPub2616		Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station	No	Science Bridge	Science Bridge alignment has not been confirmed. It should be made clear that this is an indicative alignment and could be subject to change Could inhibit developers of Valley Park until this proposed bridged is agreed. Cooperation is encouraged between OCC and developer on preferred alignment of the bridge.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3927		Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Core Policy 16 Didcot A power station: the County Council would support an employment-led mixed use redevelopment of this site. If including a residential

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								Support	element, it will be important to create a development which would be an attractive place to live with access to a range of services and facilities by means other than car.

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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730259	Mr Graham Mundy Grove Parish Council			LPPub3630		Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	No	A338 North of East Hanney	It is suggested that the plan does not make provision for highway improvements to the A338 north of East Hanney, except for improvements to the junction at Frilford.
756662	Mrs Elaine de Ridder Blewbury Parish Council			LPPub2587		Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	No	Cycling	A number of comments were made relating to cycling. These include support from Blewbury Parish Council for the proposed highway and cycle lane improvements. An extension was proposed to the cycleway to Blewbury. Other comments referred to the importance of new cycle lanes being provided between Wantage and Grove and Harwell - cyclists on the A417 is considered to be one of the main reasons for delay on this road between these towns.
756382	Ms Jean Nunn-Price			LPPub3761			No	Cycling	
875783	Mr Andrew Kerr			LPPub3629			No	Cycling	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
848989	Mrs Anne Davies Clifton Hampden and Burcot Parish Council	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub2040		Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	No	Delivery of Highway Infrastructure	A number of comments relate to the delivery of highway infrastructure. Specific comments include: There is no funding identified for key roads around Wantage and Grove. The Plan should support new transport infrastructure focused on providing opportunities for travel apart from the private car, in accordance with national planning policies. Additional lanes between M40 and Chilton. There are no plans at all to widen the A34. An A34 Strategy does not exist, showing no certainty it can in the future 'function as a major strategic route. CP18 (CP12 & 17) cannot safeguard land in South Oxfordshire. Solutions include long lengths of roads and complex structures, over both railways and floodplains. At "Science Bridge" it is readily apparent ground conditions and levels greatly add to foreseeable engineering risks, costs and complexity. The land forms part of a Scheduled Monument and therefore in direct conflict with CP39. The Halcrow Abingdon transport report suggested 3 bridges of the Thames, including one to take the pressure of the Culham and also Clifton Hamden bridges. No particular route has been suggested, however, a route across the fields near Long Wittenham (which regularly floods) which will form an eventual link to the M40. The proposed scheme will be exceptionally expensive as it would involve a lengthy approach road built up high to avoid flooding. Alternative bridge possibility should be considered; a second bridge at Culham, a few yards down stream from the existing bridge where the banks are high to avoid flooding (avoiding the cost of raising the section of road) avoiding private properties and linking up with the Dorchester Rd, with traffic calming measure installed around the school. The road will run from the Didcot perimeter through the bridlepaths (soon to stop being used) and will then be upgraded into a public highway, saving money. This will utilise the current rough roads and relieve pressure on the ancient river crossing bridges, providing another route from the North of Didcot. A cheaper and better version than the proposed crossing road.
873665	Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd			LPPub2919			No		
874110	D Beer			LPPub3215			No		
755805	Alan Ruddell			LPPub3634			No		
829923	Dr Stephen Webb Wantage Constituency Labour Party			LPPub3560			No		
875857	Mr James Jewell			LPPub3724			No		
875857	Mr James Jewell			LPPub3725			No		
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)			LPPub3937			No		
874041	Mr Gervase Duffield			LPPub1877			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley			LPPub1244		Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	No	Public Transport and Cycling Public Transport and Cycling	<p>A number of comments relate to public transport and cycling. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport and smarter choices strategy will increase people moving of this corridor. Additional train services, additional stations, additional parking, additional connecting services, by bus or tram, are required. Welcomes “priority bus system” between Didcot and Harwell. There are limited bus services to major employment sites at Milton Park and Science Vale. The existing large settlement of Grove has lost all buses. The Plan should support new transport infrastructure focused non-car options. The diagrams on p78 could extend the network north of Oxford to Bicester.
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1157			No		
730259	Mr Graham Mundy Grove Parish Council			LPPub3624			No		
730259	Mr Graham Mundy Grove Parish Council			LPPub3626			No		
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub3540			No		
829923	Dr Stephen Webb Wantage Constituency Labour Party			LPPub3562 LPPub3560			No		
729030	Planning Policy South Oxfordshire District Council			LPPub3849		Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	No	Safeguarding of land in South Oxfordshire	CP17 (CP12 & 18) cannot safeguard land in South Oxfordshire.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3929		Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Strategic Transport Linkages outside of the District	Delivery of strategic highway infrastructure: this section could usefully expand on how transport improvements to be achieved through Science Transit will improve connectivity with employment locations outside of the Vale, particularly Bicester and Begbroke. The diagrams on p78 could extend the network north of Oxford to Bicester.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
756473	Mr Oliver Gardiner			LPPub1031		Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	No	Traffic Congestion	<p>A number of comments relate to traffic congestion. Specific comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district suffers from capacity issues exacerbated by in-commuting. A34 and A40 have significant impacts on businesses and restrict innovative growth. A34 and the A417 being close to full capacity at peak times are not addressed. A415 east of Abingdon and the Culham and Clifton Hampden river crossings congestion concerns. Co-ordination is needed at Milton Interchange traffic lights and the mini-junction and pedestrian crossing inside the park, to relieve congestion off the A34. An A34 south-bound slip is needed coming across the old Milton Village Football Club field into a new mini-roundabout at that Milton Village junction (see map) This will alleviate the amount of traffic trying to converge from the two lanes, from the A34 and Milton Interchange, while reducing the amount of the A34 build up. Several park and rides hubs could also be introduced around Grove, Harwell Campus, Milton Park and Culham. With a regular bus service at reasonable cost, more people would use the service. Mine and a lot of locals are concerned with many businesses going out of business, loss of jobs due to not getting to work on time, unhappy customers and delivery schedules not met.
872741	Mr Adrian Gainer			LPPub1135			No		
730292	Mrs Julia Evans West Hendred Parish Council			LPPub2172			No		
829007	Mr Don Smith			LPPub2136			No		
728489	Mr David Marsh Harwell Parish Council			LPPub3137			No		
874158	Antony E Hughes			LPPub3420			No		
875625	Ms Janet Williams			LPPub4472			No		
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub1207		Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	No	Transport Assessment	<p>The Transport Assessment of the preferred strategy compared to alternative options is mis-leading, and hence has not been robustly justified. The Evaluation of Transport Impact, Nov 2014, Table 2.5 provides trip rates for housing and a Generic Business (Class B) use. For Stage 1, in which 13,300 homes are proposed at 0.63 AM Peak trips p. dwelling = 8,400 trips. For Stage 3, in which 20,500 homes are proposed at 0.63 AM Peak trips p. dwelling = 13,000 trips (an increase of 54%). For new jobs, Stage 1 proposes 14,300 jobs, and for Stage 3, 23,000 jobs are proposed, (an increase of 61%). The Transport Evaluation conclusions do not reflect the increased number of AM Peak (and daily) trips of 54% to 61%. The environmental impact in terms of noise, pollution and health of this increase has not been assessed.</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873621	Stockham Properties Ltd Stockham Properties Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub3467		Core Policy 17: Delivery of Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	No	Western Wantage Link Road	The provision of a Western relief road to Wantage would be beneficial.

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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler			LPPub3279		Core Policy 18: Safeguarding of Land for Transport Schemes in the South East Vale Sub- Area	No	A4130 widening	It is stated that te plan refers to land (along/beside the A4310) being 'safegaurded' for future road-widening. Widening stops short of the East roundabout at the entry to Didcot. The result will push the traffic jams up the road towards Didcot.
756099	Mr Francis Walsh			LPPub3691		Core Policy 12: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	A417	No details are provided for the A417 corridor improvements. The Council have indicated that the HA will not introduce roundabouts at the junctions of the villages south of the A417 as they interferes with the flow of the traffic. Changing the roundabout at Rowstock and the Junction at Featherbed Lane will do nothing for the village residents south of A417 (hendreds, Ardington, Lockinge and Ginge) who have long delays accessing the roads during rush hour, which will be exacerbated with the new developments in the Wantage area. Hendred Parish Council traffic survey (16 years ago) determined traffic volumes were 230 vehicle movements at peak times against a road capacity of 180. Nothing has been done to improve the road capacity. There are now 1200 more houses and 600 less jobs in Wantage increasing the number of cars. There is nothing in the plan to address the basic capacity of the A34. The increase of the Science Vale will amplify the A34 bottleneck and have even further dramatic effects on the road networks of the surrounding villages. When traffic is diverted from the M4 through Wantage the town grinds to a halt.
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2838		Core Policy 18: Safeguarding of Land for Transport Schemes in the South East Vale Sub- Area	Yes	English Heritage Comment Policy Wording	The proposed Harwell Link Road is likely to adversely affect the setting of the grade II listed hotel. A light touch road at grade with minimal signage and other traffic paraphernalia is needed to ensure that the scheme would not be unacceptably damaging.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3835	5.99	Paragraph	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments Public Transport	New residential development should be shaped around the emerging core public transport network. Provide priority measures for buses to avoid congested junctions and road link
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1165		Core Policy 18: Safeguarding of Land for Transport Schemes in the	No	Public Transport	Delivery of efficient and direct public transport to or through new developments is in itself a matter that is exceptionally easy to compromise through inconsiderate urban design. Even within Oxfordshire, there are multiple

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						South East Vale Sub- Area			recent developments of significant size where, despite the intent of master planners and transport strategies supporting their conception, it is practically impossible to penetrate with bus services, or to provide convenient access for residents to nearby services.
729030	Planning Policy South Oxfordshire District Council			LPPub3850		Core Policy 18: Safeguarding of Land for Transport Schemes in the South East Vale Sub- Area	Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council Safeguarding of land in South Oxfordshire	Policy CP18 cannot safeguard land in South Oxfordshire. Wording needs to be adapted to reflect this. Whilst this Council realises that there is often serious congestion in this area and that solutions need to be found we have some concern about the potential impact of these proposals in South Oxfordshire and therefore reserve judgement on these schemes (South Abingdon Bypass and new Thames Crossing at Culham).
757670	Hallam Land Management (Didcot)	724475	Mr Nick Laister RPS Planning	LPPub2621		Core Policy 18: Safeguarding of Land for Transport Schemes in the South East Vale Sub- Area	No	Southern Didcot Bypass	The area shown for the Southern Didcot Bypass is excessively large and would preclude the ability of a viable and deliverable housing development to come forward in this region in conjunction with the strategic housing allocation for Valley Park. This Southern Didcot Bypass is also not specifically referred to in Core Policies 17 or 19
756382	Ms Jean Nunn-Price	830006	Mr Mark Richards	LPPub3760		Core Policy 18: Safeguarding of Land for Transport Schemes in the South East Vale Sub- Area	No	Western Wantage Link Road	<p>A number of comments relate to the Western Wantage Link Road. Specific comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that a new link road is needed to the west of Wantage linking to the A417 and bypassing the west of Wantage and East Challow. The land proposed to be safeguarded for the West Wantage Link Road does not follow a route which is deliverable. Land ownership or topography not considered so it's undeliverable. Only travel options for leaving Wantage are A417 or the B4507 which involve travelling through the busiest parts of Wantage. A Western Link would provide a much needed alternative route out of the town. Excellent opportunity to deliver the new road, which can be part funded by development on this land and by contributions pooled through CIL. <p>It is suggested that additional development to the West of Wantage would help to deliver the Western Wantage Link Road. The provision of this road has a demonstrable benefit and it is self-evidently desirable and has been a long term local aspiration. However, there is no clear mechanism for its delivery. Support for the safeguarding of the route of the Western Wantage Relief Road is provided.</p>
874656	Mr & Mrs W M Wasborough			LPPub2512			No		
874656	Mr & Mrs W M Wasborough			LPPub2503			No		
729558	Mr David Greenaway	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub3764			No		
872095	Stockham Properties Ltd Stockham Properties Ltd			LPPub3471			No		

Core Policy 19: Re-opening of Grove Railway Station

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874460	Mr James Colgate			LPPub1966		Core Policy 19: Re-opening of Grove Railway Station	Yes	General Comments	Comments are received relating to the safeguarding of plan at grove for a new railway station. These provide both support and objection and include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that the re-opening of Grove Railway Station is not adequately justified and that Network Rail has no firm intentions to deliver such scheme. The Vale is encouraged to lobby for this change and for this to happen without delay.
830844	Caroline Ball			LPPub2084			No		
756382	Ms Jean Nunn-Price			LPPub3759			No		
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3829		Core Policy 19: Re-opening of Grove Railway Station	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Appendix E Plan E8 and Core Policy 19 - the re-opening of Grove station is an aspiration of the County Council. We would wish to be flexible about the precise location of a station, which may be best located outside the area of safeguarded land shown on Plan E8.

Science Vale Area Action Plan Comments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub855	Figure 5.6b	Map showing the proposed Science Vale strategic cycle network	No	Cycling Strategy	Seeking the proposed cycle network to link to cycle networks in adjoining Districts, as District boundaries are not relevant for those making cycle trips. The proposed network needs to demonstrate co-operation with South & West Oxfordshire, Oxford and West Berks. Links need to be extended to Faringdon/Swindon to the west, to Witney to the north, to Didcot and Wallingford to the east, and towards Newbury to the south.
756654	Mrs Alice Gardiner			LPPub1050	5.82	Paragraph	No	Protection of Harwell Village	This paragraph disregards the aim stated in paragraph 5.57 that: “ The countryside and villages will have maintained their distinctive character. The Larger Villages will have retained their separate identities...”. Treating development within Harwell village as expansion of Didcot, as this paragraph implies, does exactly the opposite: it turns Harwell village into a suburb of Didcot, thus removing its 'separate identity'.
729030	Planning Policy South Oxfordshire District Council			LPPub3854	5.79	Paragraph	Yes	South Oxfordshire District Council Comments Scope of AAP	Overview Para 4 – This overview implies that Science Vale is only concerned with employment. It would be helpful to refer to the Science Vale area stretching across parts of both Vale and South and its mission to provide employment and housing opportunities, to be an attractive and thriving place, to attract infrastructure and investment It is suggested that insufficient detail is provided about the joint Science Vale Action Plan.
874584	Linda Martin	0		LPPub3114	5.79	Paragraph	No	Scope of AAP	There is reference to a joint Science Vale Action Plan with South Oxfordshire District Council, but there is no detail. Given that Sutton Courtenay is included in the Science Vale area how can the Parish Council comment on this plan without considering the Action Plan in tandem. This is a consultation with only partial information. Evidence as to the action plan should be provided.
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2867	5.79	Paragraph	Yes	Support	Support is provided for the proposed preparation of the Science Vale Area Action Plan as a means of promoting the international significance of Science Vale as a location for research and innovation and of ensuring that growth in the area is delivered effectively and sustainably. Adopting a joint approach with South Oxfordshire District Council and Oxfordshire County Council in the preparation of the Action Plan is welcomed as a means of coordinating the delivery of housing, jobs and infrastructure across Oxfordshire.
874584	Linda Martin			LPPub3121	5.81	Paragraph	No	Supporting Text	Milton Parish does not have a border with Didcot as stated in 5.81. Amend Para 5.81: Sutton Courtenay, Milton and Harwell all...

Summary of Representations: Chapter 5 Spatial Strategy for Western Vale

Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area

General Comments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872794	Mr Alexander Meredith			LPPub1197		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Balance of housing and employment provision	Object to the balance of housing provision at Faringdon and Shrivenham reflecting the level of employment.
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2666			No		
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3231			No		
872452	Ms Anna Hoare			LPPub913		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Separation between retail & employment uses should be maintained in Faringdon	One comment stating a clear spatial and functional separation between retail and other employment uses should be maintained in Faringdon, except where above-shop office space makes these uses compatible in the town centre.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729558	Mr Ken Dijkman Dijkman planning for Southern Construction and Surfacing Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub2386		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	East Challow	A number of comments regarding East Challow; relating to; Site 23 for 200 dwellings should be reinstated as submitted evidence demonstrates 200 can be accommodated; East Challow should not be within the Western Sub-Area as it separating the village from its service centre Wantage and the Science Vale area; and the western field adjoining Canal Way (1.2ha) is considered suitable for the development of around 30 dwellings.
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2283			No		
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2284			No		
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2266			No		
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2270			No		
874789	Mr & Mrs Comley	872479	Mr Paul Slater Edgars Limited	LPPub2264			No		
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub4005			No		
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2840		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	English Heritage General Comment	English Heritage welcomes the reference to the historic character and landscape setting having been maintained in the vision for the Western Vale Sub-Area on page 84, although we would prefer “conserved and enhanced” as part of the positive and clear strategy for the conservation, enjoyment and enhancement of the historic environment as required by the NPPF. We also welcome the statement that “The countryside and villages will have maintained their distinctive character”.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873767	Mrs Lynda Howes			LPPub1514		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	General Comment	Around 5 general comments regarding CP20, relating to; the process of the Local Plan; villages should escape major developments partly due to lack of infrastructure; refers to Great Coxwell Parish as being a larger village which is incorrect, as identified in the settlement hierarchy; Stanford in the Vale has become hyphenated which it is not; the Plan fails to recognised the roles that development at the lowest older settlements have played in the past in maintaining a housing supply; and support for rural/village character being maintained. It is proposed by one comment that four tiers of the settlement hierarchy should be expanded to refer to the lowest order rural communities and settlements as a fifth tier.
831878	Keith and Margaret Eddey			LPPub683			No		
829968	Dr Yuka Kobayashi			LPPub3104		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No		
872662	Dr Ron Colyer			LPPub1089		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No		
872743	Ms Alison Muldal			LPPub1114		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No		
730282	Mr Michael Dew Stanford in the Vale Parish Council			LPPub2054		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	General Comment on Policy Wording	<p>A number of comments are made relating to the policy wording. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core Policy 20 refers to Great Coxwell Parish as being a larger village. This is incorrect, as identified in the settlement hierarchy. Furthermore, throughout this (and many other sections of the Local Plan Stanford in the Vale has become hyphenated – it is not, and should not be referred to in this way. As currently drafted, Core Policy 20 fails to recognise the important role that development at the lowest order settlements (those ranked below the current four tiers of the settlement hierarchy) have played in the past in maintaining the supply of housing in the Vale. Consequently the Plan is not justified and is inconsistent with national policy and it is thus unsound. Little Coxwell Parish Council supports the sentiments expressed that "The quality of the rural environment will have been maintained" and "The countryside and villages will have maintained their distinctive character". However various policies within the plan make these predictions seem highly optimistic.
875603	Mr Jeremy Flawn			LPPub3163			No		
872136	Mr Douglas Lines Little Coxwell Parish Council			LPPub857			No		
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4123			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1865	5.112	Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Impact on A420 from the Vale and Swindon's growth	Around 20 comments regarding the impact of development on the A420 which is a major road which is already congested and has capacity problems in particular on the Buckland to Pusey stretch. This issue has slipped between the three responsible authorities and no specific improvements are included in the Plan. There is also concern there is no mention of the level of growth at Swindon within the Local Plan and the impact this will have on the Vale.
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1878			No		
868065	Mr Gerard Lewis			LPPub2159			No		
868065	Mr Gerard Lewis			LPPub2160			No		
831326	Henry Snell Woolstone Parish			LPPub2904			No		
831190	Mr Simon Jenkins			LPPub3387			No		
874689	Mrs Sarah Day			LPPub3501			No		
722498	Mrs Annabelle Zinovieff			LPPub3782			No		
872452	Ms Anna Hoare			LPPub914			No		
874475	Mrs Alexandra Woddy			LPPub2405			No		
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3235			No		
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3235			No		
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2663			No		
828290	Mrs Marion Turner Ashbury Parish Council			LPPub291			No		
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2663			No		
831807	Ms Angela Raymond			LPPub2897		Local Plan 2031 Publication	No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831190	Wanborough Parish Council Mr Simon Jenkins			LPPub3363		Version Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No		
759310	Peter Martin Western Vale Villages Consortium of Parish Councils			LPPub4234 LPPub4235 LPPub4239		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No		
722498	mrs Annabelle Zinovieff			LPPub3774		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No		
874773	Mr Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3996	5.111	Paragraph	No	Oxfordshire County Council General Comments	Swindon Local Plan 26.The local plan examination and consultation on proposed main modifications has taken place. These do not change the scale of the new Eastern Villages allocation (8000) and do not include additions to the plan to refer to transport impacts outside of Swindon or the need to work in liaison with neighbouring authorities to mitigate them. The proposed main modifications only deal with local public transport services between the site and Swindon town centre rather than in the context of the strategic public transport network linking Swindon with Oxford. The Vale's plan includes a commitment to work with Swindon to overcome cross boundary issues and our consultation response urges the Inspector to reconsider these points. We are now awaiting the Inspector's report.
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1166		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Stagecoach Comments	Stagecoach supports the Western Vale Sub Area Strategy. They also greatly welcome, the recognition in paragraph 5.125-5.126 that junction improvements on A420 at Coxwell Road, and west of Shrivenham in particular, are to be taken forward, improving the safe and efficient operation of both existing service and its further improvement. They share the concerns of all stakeholders about congestion on the A420, in particular at Swindon and for the avoidance of doubt, consider that service 66 should be seen as providing a major inter-

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									urban strategic public transport link, and be developed as such, focused as the first priority on cross boundary trips originating /terminating within Oxfordshire.
874630	Mr Philip Smith Swindon Borough Council			LPPub2547		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Swindon Borough Council General Comment	Swindon Borough Council support para 5.125 regarding joint working however suggest links are make between the Core Policies and the Site Templates to provide a clear indication to the decision maker

Faringdon Sites

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828186	Mr David Burn			LPPub40	5.112	Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Balance of housing and employment provision in Faringdon	A number of comments raised concerns relating to the balance of housing provision at Faringdon reflecting the level of employment and that housing growth has been imposed and led by developers.
872452	Ms Anna Hoare			LPPub916			No		
871748	Ms Shona Hay			LPPub223			No		
865833	Mr Mark Sandels			LPPub9			No		
869005	Taylor Wimpey Uk Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	853993	Mr Andrew Ross	LPPub1063	0	Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub	No	Capacity of South West Faringdon Site	The proposed saving of the previous Grove Airfield allocation (Local Plan policy H5) is essential to ensure that the policy position in respect of the Grove Airfield development is preserved, whilst the development is brought forward. The Council's strategy relies on the completion of this development and its policy status (as a commitment) should be unambiguous within the Plan.
874401	H Sherman			LPPub3010	4	Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub	No	Amount of Growth	Faringdon is allocated 550 houses, 350 of which were in the 2011 LP and with which we agreed. However, the other 200, plus the 400 for Great Coxwell (that are effectively in Faringdon), give an unsustainable growth of 28% on the current tax base of 3373. This does not include the houses currently under construction and unoccupied. The 2011 census reported 3013 occupied dwellings; hence, Faringdon is predicted to grow by at least 43% since the last census. Abingdon, population 35,000 has an allocation of 1,000 houses ~the same number as for Faringdon.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	326118	Mr David Barnes Star Planning &	LPPub4208		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub	Yes	Support for land south of Faringdon	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP support the principle of the land south of Faringdon.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
			Development						
874403	Driveswalk Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub2126		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for South West Faringdon	The allocation south west of Faringdon is well located in terms of pedestrian and cycle way accessibility.
872136	Mr Douglas Lines Little Coxwell Parish Council			LPPub858		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	East of Coxwell Road / South of Faringdon Sites General Comments	A number of comments relating to too many houses and concerns raised regarding the A420, infrastructure capacity, coalescence of Faringdon and Great Coxwell, an error relating to Site 18 which does not list the site as being in the Parish of Great Coxwell and due to large amount of houses being built, and concerns Great Coxwell is defined as a larger village.
871970	Mr Richard May			LPPub376			No		
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3670			No		
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1876			No		
722498	Mrs Annabelle Zinovieff			LPPub3769			No		
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2776		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	English Heritage Comments on Land south of Park Road Site	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the principle of an archaeological investigation. However, we would like this principle to go further and require the investigation to inform the scheme, with any significant remains being retained in situ wherever possible. This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any future planning application for the development of this site.
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2777		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	English Heritage Comments on South West of Faringdon Site	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the principle to "Retain the historic field pattern within the site.....". This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any future planning application for the development of this site.
729356	Ms Gene Webb			LPPub1768		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan	The District Council have failed to take notice of the infrastructure requirements within the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan.
872452	Ms Anna Hoare			LPPub920		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Faringdon's Settlement Boundary	One respondent would like Faringdon's settlement boundary to be limited in respect of the town's development boundary, its relation to the A420, and allocated/ safeguarded employment land, including

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									Wicklesham Quarry.
872452	Ms Anna Hoare			LPPub912		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Growth at Faringdon / Great Cowell	A number of comments are concerned over the level of growth at Faringdon being unsustainable reflecting the number of existing dwellings.
874401	H Sherman			LPPub3009			No		
874127	Mrs Judith Heathcoat			LPPub2056			No		
872136	Mr Douglas Lines Little Coxwell Parish Council			LPPub859		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Objections to East of Coxwell Road / South of Farindgon Sites	A number of comments objecting to the allocations at East of Coxwell Road and South of Faringdon sites, reflecting the following; Great Coxwell will coalesce with Faringdon, which is contrary to the Settlement Hierarchy; too many houses proposed on these sites which will will destroy the character of the village; the existing infrastructure of both Faringdon and Great Coxwell operate already at capacity; the site will make the traffic situation on the A420 even more severe as it is already the case; the developments on the site of Swindon (which aren't considered in the Plan) will make a bad situation considerably worse and Site 18 is not listed as being in the Parish of Great Coxwell which is incorrect.
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3668			No		
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3667			No		
871970	Mr Richard May			LPPub376			No		
872136	Mr Douglas Lines Little Coxwell Parish Council			LPPub858			No		
872136	Mr Douglas Lines Little Coxwell Parish Council			LPPub859			No		
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3664			No		
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3667			No		
829379	Mr Simon Renfrey			LPPub3664			No		
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3899		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Education	Other Faringdon/Coxwell sites: totalling 600 homes These developments are subject to current S106 negotiations, and are required to contribute proportionately towards a new primary school, and towards expansion of secondary and SEN provision.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
								at Faringdon / Great Coxwell Sites	Pages 49-53 of the Local Plan Appendix A and pages 49-52 of the IDP support this provision.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3897		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Education at Land South of Park Road Site	Park Road, Faringdon: 350 homes. This development is subject to current S106 negotiations, and is required to provide a site and proportionate capital funding for a new primary school, and contribute towards expansion of secondary and SEN provision.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3811		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Highways at East of Coxwell Road Site	East of Coxwell Road (200 dwellings) This site has been the subject of an Outline Planning Application for 200 dwellings and a formal transport response has been made to the planning authority. Highway improvements will be required including major improvement to A420/Coxwell Road junction. Footway provision and widening will be necessary along Coxwell Road as well as new bus stops and a pedestrian crossing point. Amendment to a local speed limit will also be necessary. • Improvement to a Public Right of Way (PROW) will be required. PT contributions will be required.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3862		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Highways at Land South of Park Road Site	Land south of Park Road, Faringdon This site is adjacent to the strategic 66 bus route between Oxford, Faringdon and Swindon, which was improved recently to operate twice per hour and for which contributions are being sought towards an improvement towards an eventual four buses per hour and towards infrastructure improvements along the route, such as the proposed roundabout at the junction of Coxwell Road and the A420 main road. Financial contributions would be expected towards both the bus service and the infrastructure improvements, which would benefit bus operation. New bus stops on Park Road have already been requested from developers of this and adjacent sites
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3810		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Highways at Land South of Park Road Site	Land South of Park Road (350 dwellings) This site has been the subject of an Outline Planning Application for 380 dwellings and a formal transport response has been made to the planning authority. Highway improvements will be required to Park Road (widening and pedestrian crossing) and its junction with A420. A change to the local speed limit will also be necessary. PT contributions would be required as well as new bus stops. Public Right of Way (PROW) would be affected.
729057	Ms Amanda			LPPub3812		Core Policy 20:	Yes	Oxfordshire	South Faringdon, Great Coxwell (Site for up to 200

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council					Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area		County Council Comments on Highways at South of Faringdon Site	dwelling) Could be expected to generate 1000 veh trips per day, 100 trips in peak hour. Development proposal (The Steeds) has been submitted as a planning application (P13/V1102/O) and a full Transport Response has been made. Major upgrade of A420/Great Coxwell Road junction will be delivered but contributions to wider improvements along A420 will not be secured.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3813		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Highways at South-West of Faringdon Site	South West of Faringdon (Site for up to 200 dwellings) • Could be expected to generate 1000 veh trips per day, 100 trips in peak hour. Expected to contribute towards upgrading the A420 junction at Coxwell Road and wider improvements along the A420 corridor. However, the upgrade of this junction has been secured through other funding. Contributions towards wider improvements along the A420 corridor would depend upon there being defined and deliverable route strategy objectives. A development proposal on part of this site has been submitted as a planning application (P13/V1653/O – 126 dwellings) and a full Transport Response has been made. Satisfactory site access could be taken from B4019 Highworth Road. Local mitigation (e.g. footways, crossing points, traffic management, etc.) would be required. PT contributions would be required.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3861		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Public Transport at East of Coxwell Road Site	East of Coxwell Road, Faringdon This site is adjacent to the strategic 66 bus route between Oxford, Faringdon and Swindon, which was improved recently to operate twice per hour and for which contributions are being sought towards an improvement towards an eventual four buses per hour and towards infrastructure improvements along the route, such as the proposed roundabout at the junction of Coxwell Road and the A420 main road. Financial contributions would be expected towards both the bus service and the infrastructure improvements, which would benefit bus operation. New bus stops on Coxwell Road have already been requested from developers of this and adjacent sites.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3859		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Public Transport at South of Faringdon Site	South Faringdon. This site is adjacent to the strategic 66 bus route between Oxford, Faringdon and Swindon, which was improved recently to operate twice per hour and for which contributions are being sought towards an improvement towards an eventual four buses per hour and towards infrastructure improvements along the route, such as the proposed roundabout at the junction of Coxwell Road and the A420 main road. Financial contributions would be expected towards both the bus

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									service and the infrastructure improvements, which would benefit bus operation. New bus stops on Coxwell Road have already been requested from developers of this and adjacent sites.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3860		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Public Transport at South-West of Faringdon Site	South West Faringdon. The location of this site is less satisfactory, being at least 500 metres (and considerably more from parts of the site) from the nearest Highworth Road bus stops on the Coxwell Road. The developer should consider funding the relocation of these stops nearer to the Highworth Road junction, to reduce walking distances and also redesign these stops to deter car parking. The developer would contribute to the route 66 strategy of improved bus service frequency (up to four buses per hour) between Swindon, Faringdon and Oxford, and associated infrastructure improvements, such as the proposed roundabout at the Coxwell Road/A420 junction.
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1879		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	South of Faringdon Site General Comments	One comment generally agrees with the principle of the site however raises a number of concerns; impact on the Great Barn; potential coalescence; and impact on views and public enjoyment of space.
869005	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd and Persimmon Homes Limited	853993	Mr Andrew Ross	LPPub1061		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	South-West of Faringdon Site Capacity	Concern that the proposed capacity of 200 dwellings is over estimated, as the Landscape Capacity Study indicates that the majority of the site is unsuitable for development on landscape and visual grounds, with a maximum capacity of 115 homes.
827898	Mr George Paton WebbPaton			LPPub2416		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Support for Land South of Park Road Site	Support the principle of allocating land at South West Faringdon (respondent part owns)
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	326118	Mr David Barnes Star Planning & Development	LPPub4214		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for South of Faringdon Site	One comment supports this allocation.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874403	Driveswalk Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub2123		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support for South-West of Faringdon Site	A number of comments support this allocation however the following comments were raised regarding the Site Template; there is ability to relocate the overhead power line; the provision of access from South Faringdon allocation should not be discounted and would direct traffic to Coxwell Road rather than Highworth Road; a need for contributions towards the 66 service to be justified; the delivery of adequate pedestrian and cycle links from Fernham Road is unrealistic however, the potential for access from Coxwell Road through the scheme should address any concerns; the allocation is a distance from the A420 and there should be no requirement to consider noise and air quality impacts from this road; no contamination risk exists; and none of the allocation is susceptible to flooding.
879523	Mr Andrew Liddiard	827830	Mr George Paton WebbPaton	LPPub2417			No		
874403	Driveswalk Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub2125			Yes		
874385	Aubrey and James Cole			LPPub2005			No		
874403	Driveswalk Ltd	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub3587			No		
759155	SGR (Faringdon) Limited	759153	Mr Richard Boother RPS	LPPub3536			Yes		
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	326118	Mr David Barnes Star Planning & Development	LPPub4218		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Supports for East of Coxwell Road Site	One support for allocation however the following comments were made regarding the Site Template; reference to 'existing and planned facilities and services on site', however, there are none identified except for open space therefore the on-site linkages can only be to open space and this should be referred to in the policy; a major upgrade of A420/Great Coxwell Road junction should be the subject of a financial contribution to fund the improvements proposed which ought to be delivered by the Highway Authority; the delivery of 'adequate pedestrian and cycle links from Fernham Road to Coxwell Road' involves land outside the proposed allocation; unclear why, when the proposed allocation is such a distance away from the A420, there is any requirement to consider noise and air quality impacts from this road; unclear what contamination risk exists; landscape buffer

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									would not necessarily prevent the coalescence however a landscaping buffer is more appropriate for assimilating development into the area and enhancing the existing hedges and hedgerow trees.
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services			LPPub2302		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments on East Coxwell Road Site	Thames Water have highlighted a number of concerns stating the water supply network, sewage treatment capacity and sewerage network capacity in this area are highly unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. In regards to waste water, Thames Water request 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.”
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services			LPPub2314		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments on Land south of Park Road Site	Thames Water have highlighted a number of concerns stating the water supply network, sewage treatment capacity and sewerage network capacity in this area are highly unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. In regards to waste water, Thames Water request 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.”
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services			LPPub2326		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments on South of Faringdon Site	Thames Water have highlighted a number of concerns stating the water supply network, sewage treatment capacity and sewerage network capacity in this area are highly unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. In regards to waste water, Thames Water request 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

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									overloading of existing waste water infrastructure.”
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services			LPPub2329		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments on South-West of Faringdon Site	Thames Water have highlighted a number of concerns stating the water supply network, sewage treatment capacity and sewerage network capacity in this area are highly unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. In regards to waste water, Thames Water request 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.”

North of Shrivenham Site

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874384	Oxford Diocese Board of Finance	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2534		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Alternative Site South Shrivenham	The Local Plan Part 1 would be more effective and better justified if it allocated land south of Shrivenham for development (as proposed in the Housing Update Consultation February 2014), alongside a smaller scheme north of Shrivenham. Further consideration should be given to this land in the Local Plan Part 1, and the role it might play in helping meet Oxford's unmet housing needs.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2947	5.79	Paragraph	No	General Comment	Shrivenham is a Local Service Centre and not a Larger Village
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2774		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage makes no comment on the merits or otherwise of this site allocation but we welcome the principles “The layout of any development scheme must take account of important views in this area”, “Development should be sensitively designed to conserve and enhance the setting of the Shrivenham Conservation Area”, “Retain part of the south of the site (the area closest to Shrivenham Conservation Area) to preserve the existing character of the conservation area” and “Views across the site to the listed church (St Andrews) should be accommodated in the site layout”.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any future planning application for the development of this site.
876999	Derek White			LPPub4558		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Impact of Swindon's Growth on Shrivenham	A number of comments are concerned of the level of growth at Swindon and the impact this will have specifically on Shrivenham and the A420 and a lack of recognition of this in the Local Plan.
876999	Derek White			LPPub4561			No		
729299	MR D W White			LPPub71			No		
876999	Derek White			LPPub4568		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Level of Growth at Shrivenham	A number of comments raised concerns that too much housing is proposed at Shrivenham in particular reflecting the SHMA as 500 homes would be a 55% increase.
876999	Derek White			LPPub4563			No		500 houses are planned for Shrivenham without due consideration to the village's needs and rural character.
729299	MR D W White			LPPub73			No		The level of increase is higher than the 18% increase in households identified in the SHMA 2011-2031. To maintain its rural character no more than 150 houses up to 2031 should be planned in Shrivenham.
873535	Dr Ron Colyer			LPPub272			No		
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England			LPPub2231		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Natural England Comments on North of Shrivenham	North of Shrivenham. The Landscape Capacity Study says that the capacity for this site is for some 400 dwellings, while some 500 have been allocated. 20. The expanded North of Shrivenham site now adjoins Tuckmill Meadows SSSI. We are concerned that development here will have an adverse impact on the SSSI due to recreational and hydrological effects. 21. In terms of recreational effects we are confident that recreational effects can be managed by way of mitigation, but advise that to be sound this needs to be covered in the development requirement, which should be amended as follows: "Contribute towards redressing the identified Green Infrastructure deficit in the area surrounding Shrivenham, and ensure there is no recreational impact on Tuckmill Meadows SSSI". 22. In terms of hydrological effects, we are not confident that it will be possible to Demonstrate that development will not affect the hydrological systems which feed into the Tuckmill Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and consequently we advise that there is no certainty that the policy is deliverable. Additional evidence is needed to show that this policy and thus the plan as a whole is deliverable and thus sound.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
832269	Penny Silverwood Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			LPPub2954		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Object to North of Shrivenham regarding landscape/bio diversity	A number of comments raised concerns regarding potential significant risk of hydrological and recreational impacts too the Tuckmill Meadows SSSI from a development in this location and there is a need for additional evidence to show that this policy is deliverable in this respect and lack of clarity regarding potential air quality impact on Oxford Meadows SAC (HRA).
832269	Penny Silverwood Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			LPPub2956			No		
872586	Mr Ian Wright			LPPub1211		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Object to North of Shrivenham Site	A number of comments are objecting to the site, relating to: Shrivenham is too small for so many additional people and houses, lack of employment provision and opportunities to reflect increase in housing: lack of capacity with existing infrastructure to handle growth in particular the A420; lack of consideration to Shrivenham as a village and its rural character and concerns regarding the impact on wildlife, disturbance of noise and light from leisure facilities.
872583	Mrs Sarah Church			LPPub949		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No		
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2666		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No		
874689	Mrs Sarah Day			LPPub3505			No		
729299	MR D W White			LPPub74			No		
872820	Mr N McNally			LPPub2021			No		
820629	Mr Colin Williams			LPPub13			No		
831307	Ms Carolyn Francis			LPPub3443			No		
729299	MR D W White			LPPub75			No		
826476	Dr Antony Crockett			LPPub224			No		
872583	Mrs Sarah Church			LPPub950			No		
876999	Derek White			LPPub4572			No		
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3900		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Education	North Shrivenham: 500 homes Shrivenham Primary School has previously had spare places, but demand has risen in recent years. The underlying growth in local population which is shown in the rising trend in pupil numbers is expected to further reduce the level of future spare places. Recently permitted housing developments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									will lead to rising numbers at the school. When considered in addition to this, the housing levels in the revised Local Plan would require the village to have a total of 1.5 forms of entry in primary education provision. Initial school site expansion analysis indicates that the current school site area is below the minimum recommended for a 1 form entry school, and thus even more so for any larger size of school. Acquisition of additional site area for the school is needed to support its expansion. Options for acquiring land are being explored. If the school cannot be satisfactorily expanded, a new primary school will be required, within the allocated development site The county council is working with the Faringdon Academy of Schools, of which Shrivenham Primary Schools is a member, to explore options for meeting the needs of housing development in this area. Expansion of secondary school and SEN school capacity serving the area will also be required. The village is in the designated area of 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.
874773	Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub4001		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Shrivenham – Extant permissions and this allocation will require a solution of expansion of the existing primary school on its current site or relocation elsewhere.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3823		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Highways	Oxfordshire County Council have raised a number of transport concerns specifically relating to A420, the need for the developer to contribute to route 66 for improved infrastructure and frequency of service, number of trips generated, footways, satisfactory accesses and local mitigation will be required. They have also raised education concerns specifically relating to capacity at Shrivenham Primary School and potential solutions and capacity at Faringdon Community College.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3864		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Public Transport	North Shrivenham Much of this large site is over 500 metres from existing and possible new bus stops on the strategic 66 bus service between Oxford, Faringdon and Swindon. The developer would fund a pair of new stops on Faringdon Road near the junction with Pennyhooks Lane, as well as a connecting footpath from the

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									development. The developer would contribute to the route 66 strategy of an improved bus service frequency of up to 4 buses per hour between Swindon, Faringdon and Oxford, and associated infrastructure improvements, such as the proposed junction improvement roundabout at the western end of Townsend Road at its junction with the A420.
874384	Oxford Diocese Board of Finance	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2529		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Reinstate South of Shrivenham Site	A number of comments stating they would like site 30 - South of Shrivenham to be reinstated and amend dwellings requirements at both sites to reflect previous iteration of the Plan. Delivery of two sites reduces risks associated with one site, this site is available for development, planned A420 junction upgrade could be financed jointly by contributions from both developments.
737058	Mr Andy Cattermole Taylor Wimpey	860277	Mr Steven Neal Vail Williams LLP	LPPub4174		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Reinstate South of Shrivenham Site	Would like the South of Shrivenham Site reinstated.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2951	5.113	Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Support	A number of comments support the allocations however a few issues were raised; they would like Shrivenham to be identified as a Local Service Centre (Spatial Vision and on page 87); and would like specific changes to the Site Template to reflect discussions on the application including; there is nothing to suggest where the important views are and if the Plan has specific ideas about what views should be retained, then evidence will have to be provided; recommended that the first bulletpoint is clarified to show that junction upgrades will be elsewhere; in terms of conservation area the 4th bulletpoint should be amended to remove the word "character" and replace it with "setting" and should be modified to reflect design discussions; and it is unrealistic to seek the retention of all the hedgerows on the site however it should allow for their replacement elsewhere on site.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2949			No		
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2989			No		
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services			LPPub2320		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments on North of Shrivenham Site	Thames Water have highlighted a number of concerns stating the water supply network, sewage treatment capacity and sewerage network capacity in this area are highly unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. In regards to waste water, Thames Water request the following paragraph is included in the Development Plan. "Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									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."

West of Stanford-in-the-Vale Site

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730282	Mr Michael Dew Stanford in the Vale Parish Council			LPPub2065 LPPub2058 LPPub2059 LPPub2061 LPPub2063		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No No No No	Concerns regarding West of Stanford in the Vale Site	A number of comments raised specific concerns regarding the site relating to; inadequate local bus service, close to capacity at Stanford in the Vale Primary School, infrastructure requirements to be delivered in advance of development, relocation of Seven Acres Nursery to the area NW of the site; new Mains Sewer required; improvements to the Treatment Works; improvements to Water Pressure as pre-requisite of development; no flood mitigation in particular the provision of SUDS and green buffer; improvements to the Junction at A417 and Cottage Road; more traffic calming measures crossing facilities and provision of safe, off-road cycle route along A417; healthcare has not been fully considered; SHLAA considers unsuitable access points; and provision of superfast broadband. Also contributions towards bus services has been sought however there is still a lack of money to fund a bus service therefore OCC must prepare a detailed strategy that will deliver real results in terms of public transport availability for inhabitants. Also a number of the issues raised above should be included in the Site Template.
874672	Mr Peter Gill Stanford in the Vale Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NPSC)			LPPub3345 LPPub3344 LPPub3333 LPPub3353 LPPub3337 LPPub3338 LPPub3348 LPPub3343			No No No No No No No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730282	Mr Michael Dew Stanford in the Vale Parish Council			LPPub2055		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Object to West of Stanford in the Vale Site	A number of comments object to the site, relating to: access points considered unsuitable; outcome of recent Public Enquiry (Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/A/13/2203341) states there should not be a precedent of development on the western side of the road; so many additional houses and will alter the nature and character of the village; and impact on roads and landscape.
874767	Mr Andrew Smith			LPPub2129			No		
874659	Ms Jessica Reynolds			LPPub2411			No		
874649	Ms Karin Williams-Cuss			LPPub2532			No		
874672	Mr Peter Gill Stanford in the Vale Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NPSC)			LPPub3340			No		
872120	Ms Tessa Forsyth			LPPub553			No		
875720	Mr Mark Jackson Gleeson Strategic Land			LPPub3392		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Site Capacity of West of Stanford in the Vale Site	A number of representations support the allocation however four of these stated the site can deliver more than 200 homes, and there is no technical evidence to support the reduction in housing numbers at this site. One representation stated the Council should be taking account of the additional housing demand arising from the housing need unable to be met within Oxford City Council.
875720	Mr Mark Jackson Gleeson Strategic Land			LPPub3438			No		
875720	Mr Mark Jackson Gleeson Strategic Land			LPPub3399			No		
879516	Carter & Jones	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4202			No		
875720	Mr Mark Jackson Gleeson Strategic Land			LPPub3373			No		
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire			LPPub3809		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council on Highways	Oxfordshire County Council have raised a number of transport concerns specifically relating to A420, number of trips generated, satisfactory accesses, local bus service and improvements, and local mitigation will be

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	County Council								required. Also they have raised education concerns specifically relating to capacity at Stanford in the Vale Primary School and Faringdon Community College.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3901		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council on Education	Stanford in the Vale: 200 homes Stanford in the Vale Primary School currently has a low level of spare places, evenly distributed across age groups. Children at the school mostly live within the catchment area. The level of housing growth recently permitted is expected to result in the school being completely full, and may result in some in-area children not being able to get into school. The Local Plan proposal in addition would require the school to expand to 1.5 form entry. Initial school site expansion analysis indicates that the current school site area is below the minimum recommended for a 1 form entry school, and thus even more so for any larger size of school. Acquisition of additional site area for the school is needed to support its expansion. Options for acquiring land are being explored. Initial estimates of the cost of expanding the school to 1.5 form entry significantly 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. 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 the area will also be required. Stanford in the Vale is within the current designated area of King Alfred's Academy, but is closer to Faringdon Community College, and some children from the village choose each school. It will be closer to the new Grove Airfield secondary school when it opens than to King Alfred's. Page 47 of the Local Plan Appendix A and page 54 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan support this requirement for educational provision. In both cases Faringdon is specified in the context of secondary education; Stanford in the Vale is currently part of the Wantage/Grove partnership of schools, and for the purposes of school capacity planning should be considered in the context of the planned new Grove Airfield secondary school. As such, those contributions should be assessed at the new school building rate rather than at extension rates. Please note that all sites will be expected to contribute towards Special Education Needs schools, which needs to be reflected in the IDP

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									and Site Templates.
874773	Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub4002		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Oxfordshire County Council on Education	31.Stanford in the Vale - Recently permitted housing growth is expected to take up the already limited primary capacity. Therefore an allocation in the Local Plan would mean the school would need to be expanded to create a 1.5 form entry school. Evidence to show that an expansion of the school is feasible, or that there is another satisfactorily viable solution, is required to make the allocation of development in this location acceptable. Therefore the delivery of this site is contingent on a solution being able to be delivered within the required timeframe for the development.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3858		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council on Public Transport	West Stanford in the Vale This site is served by the Faringdon - Wantage bus service 67, as well as some other local routes. Additional bus stops would be required near the junction of Cottage Road and Faringdon Road, along with a high-quality footpath connecting to the development site. The developer would be expected to contribute to the cost of maintaining and enhancing the Faringdon-Wantage bus route. This link is currently not strong, and there is a risk of this bus services being curtailed as a consequence of the Council's revenue funding reductions.
872358 875720	Dr John Travis Mr Mark Jackson Gleeson Strategic Land			LPPub728 LPPub3403 LPPub3407 LPPub3409 LPPub3426 LPPub3428 LPPub3436		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area continued from previous page	Yes No No No No No No	West of Stanford in the Vale Site (site promoter issues)	A site promoter is supporting the site however has raised a number of specific issues; linkages (preferable to the south however limited due to existing permission south of the site); landscape mitigation (recognising the relationship with White Horse Business Park and how development to the west of the allocated land can add to the landscape character of the area); upgrade to Sewer Network considered through development management process, not policy without evidence, access from Ware Road needs to be allowed to enable good linkages to surrounding facilities, Environmental Health Assessments will be carried out, specific landscape requirements are imposed in such a broad brush policy however the landscape strategy will respond to analysis and technical constraints, and flood risk and drainage will be considered.
725556	Ms Carmelle Belle Thames Water Property Services			LPPub2331		Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Thames Water Comments	Thames Water have highlighted a number of concerns stating the water supply network, sewage treatment capacity and sewerage network capacity in this area are highly unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. In regards to waste

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									water, Thames Water request 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."
729744	Mr Jonathan Waite			LPPub4199	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Support	In support of the allocation site West of Stanford in the Vale,.

Core Policy 21: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Western Vale Sub-Area

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831469	Nick Small			LPPub1167		Core Policy 21: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	A420 Junctions	A number comments were received providing support for the proposed safeguarding of land for highway improvements. However a number of points of concern/clarification were also raised; bus priority on approach to relevant junctions be incorporated; the policy does not go far enough given the scale of housing; clarity is required in the policy as to what improvements will be necessary, how development will need to provide/contribute to improvements as not clear as to what junction upgrades will be required or the cost; it is recommended that the policy be modified to remove the third paragraph to address the uncertainty it generates and it should be recognised that the need for junction improvement is due to locally delivered growth and broader development proposals along the A420 corridor and funding of an improvement scheme should reflect this and not be left to local development alone to deliver (as implied at paras 5.124 to 5.126); and by reason of the wider transport benefits which will be secured along the A420, it would also be prudent in the policy to identify that the works would be promoted by the Highway Authority.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	326118	Mr David Barnes Star Planning & Development	LPPub4215			Yes		
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2957			No		
872136	Douglas Lines Little Coxwell Parish Council			LPPub862			No		
872452	Anna Hoare			LPPub918	5.125	Paragraph	No	A420 Route Strategy	One representation specifically relating to the need for the A420 Route Strategy to already be in place.

759310	Peter Martin Western Vale Villages Consortium of Parish Councils			LPPub4237	5.123	Core Policy 21: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Capacity on A420	Around 8 representations raised specific concerns regarding the capacity of the A420, in particular that the road is already at capacity, inadequate improvements proposed, infrastructure should be in place prior to development and lack of joint working between the Vale and Swindon Borough Council.
874401	H Sherman			LPPub3012			No		
729299	D W White			LPPub72			No		
872136	Douglas Lines Little Coxwell Parish Council			LPPub861			No		
872452	Anna Hoare			LPPub917			No		
758014	Frank Mullin			LPPub2662			No		
831807	Angela Raymond Wanborough Parish Council			LPPub2750			No		
730268	Mackay Littleworth Parish Meeting			LPPub2699		Core Policy 21: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Western Vale Sub-Area	No	Object to Policy	A number of objections were received stating that more junctions should be safeguarded; that the Western Vale Villages submission on Core Policy 7 of the Plan, which outlines modifications and improvements that are required to the A420 is supported; that there is cumulative impact within the Vale and in Swindon which needs to be further understood to provide the County Council with confidence that growth in this area can be satisfactorily supported. A route based study will be conducted under LTP4.
785816	Jeanette Halliday Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub2910			No		
729057	Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3836	5.123	Paragraph	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Oxfordshire County Council state that development adjacent to this route can be accommodated by improving the frequency of the Route 66 core bus route and by providing improved junction arrangements, to avoid delays.

874773	Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3994	0	Core Policy 12: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	A420 development 25. The cumulative impact of growth within the Vale and in Swindon needs to be further understood to provide the county council with confidence that growth in this area can be satisfactorily supported, transport and education is a particular concern. As many of the sites are planning applications this is currently being done through the planning system. A route based study will be conducted under LTP4
874630	Philip Smith Swindon Borough Council			LPPub2548	0	Core Policy 21: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Western Vale Sub-Area	Yes	Swindon Borough Council - CP21	Swindon Borough Council supports the safeguarding of land for junction improvements and would like to continue joint working.

Summary of Representations: Chapter 6 District Wide Policies

Core Policy 22: Housing Mix

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
879102	Greenlight Developments	879101	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub3374		Core Policy 22: Housing Mix	No	General Comments on Core Policy 22 Housing Mix.	A number of comments raising concerns regarding CP22: Housing Mix, relating to: an overly prescriptive policy on house-types which could stifle housing building, the Local Plan needs to recognise developers of market housing understand the local market demand better and smaller properties tend to be the affordable units, unclear how would the housing mix be deemed not appropriate, and where is the evidence, and Oxfordshire County Council states it is essential that the mix of development include a range of smaller dwellings to provide choice for older people looking to downsize. Furthermore, it is suggested that Core Policy 22 needs to recognise that developers of market housing will understand the local market demand better than anyone and this information will be used to determine an appropriate market housing mix for both site allocations and in the determination of planning applications. A need is identified for supporting self build housing types.
850975	Philip Rawle			LPPub3816			No		
865833	Mr Mark Sandels			LPPub2426			No		
879104	Leslie Wells			LPPub4017			No		
874174	H Rees			LPPub3405			Yes		
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2844		Chapter 6: District Wide Policies	Yes	English Heritage – Comments on Overview section	English Heritage welcomes the reference to protecting the Vale's high quality natural and built environment in the Overview on page 90, but we would prefer "conserving and enhancing" to "protecting" as terminology more consistent with the NPPF and "high quality natural, historic and built environment" as not all historic features are "built".
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2727		Core Policy 22: Housing Mix	No	Objections to Core Policy 22: Housing Mix	A number of comments object to CP22: Housing Mix, relating to: the Policy not being in conformity with the NPPF, as too much reliance in the SHMA providing an overly prescriptive decision being taken which could lead to imbalances in the provision of housing on sites, not providing a mix, and the test for an alternative non-SHMA mix is excessive in the plan in that it requires an alternative to be demonstrated which could bring into question the validity of the SHMA .
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP			LPPub2959			No		
879120	Gow Family			LPPub4539			No		
874773	Mr Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3987		Core Policy 22: Housing Mix	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Core Policy 22 Housing Mix	The Plan seeks a dwelling mix on new development in accordance with the SHMA. It is essential that it also includes a range of smaller dwellings to provide choice for older people looking to downsize.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3959		Core Policy 22: Housing Mix	Yes	Support Core Policy 22 Housing Mix	A number of comments support CP22: Housing Mix specifically the flexibility to respond to changing circumstances.
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub805			Yes		

Core Policy 23: Housing Density

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
723546	Dr Susan Nodder Watchfield Parish Council	879101	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub2716		Core Policy 23: Housing Density	No	General comments on Core Policy 23: Housing Density	A number of comments revealed regarding CP23: Housing Density, raising concerns relating to: need to explore higher densities in urban locations and the possibility of a garden city rather than bolt on developments to multiple areas; the policy is vague about maximum densities as using higher densities can lead to less high quality design with cramped layouts not providing the required infrastructure; two dense requirement as most parts of the Vale are much lower densities and this policy will have a significant impact on the character these areas; the Policy should consider the effective use of previously developed land; and it is not clear where 30 dph has come from.
850975	Karen Dodd			LPPub2829			No		
755805	Alan Ruddell			LPPub3637			No		
827932	Julie Mabblerley Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			LPPub3607			No		
861678	Mr Guy Langton East Hanney Parish Council			LPPub3483			No		
874174	H Rees			LPPub3402			Yes		
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3241			No		
879104	Lelise Wells			LPPub4025			No		
785816	Cllr Jeanette Halliday VOWH			LPPub3817			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
879102	Greenlight Developments	879101	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub3377			No		
829945	Mrs Susan Davidson			LPPub1217		Core Policy 23: Housing Density	No	Objection to Core Policy 23: Housing Density	Three comments received objecting to CP23: Housing Density, relating to; the minimum requirement and higher densities are encouraged as this is not appropriate for villages, and densities in the Local Plan should not be based on medieval villages as referred too in the text.
830951	Nick and Lyn Winton			LPPub2344			No		
730237	Mrs Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council			LPPub4058			No		
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2960		Core Policy 23: Housing Density	No	Supports for Core Policy 23 Housing Density	Around 4 comments supporting CP23: Housing Density however a few concerns were raised; there is no requirement in the NPPF for "specific local circumstances" and the minimum density requirement should not be stipulated as properties for the elderly are likely to be much lower densities.
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub806			Yes		
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2728			No		
783140	Mr Simon Tofts Blue Cedar Homes			LPPub2940			No		

Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4131		Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing	No	General comments on Core Policy 24: Affordable housing	A number of comments raised issues regarding Policy CP24; whether the evidence for the policy had factored in the need for community facilities and services from sites; consideration needed to the delivery of flats near to services to meet the needs of first time buyers and the elderly; and how the Council will successfully implement the policy given a poor track record in implementation.
874174	H Rees			LPPub3415			Yes		
872095	Dr Sarah Eccles			LPPub2465			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
850975	Karen Dodd			LPPub2847		Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing	No	Objections to Core Policy 24: Affordable housing	A number of comments have objected to Policy CP24 specifically regarding: both the target is too high and is unviable and the target is too low and should be increased to 40%; no mention of extra care housing; private rental sector is un-regulated and it is impossible to see how "affordable private rental accommodation" can be built therefore the affordable target should comprising a mix of 13.5% intermediate and 86.5% social rented housing; viability modelling has not considered the effect of 35% affordable, housing modelling has factored-in actual S106 and S278 costs but it has not factored-in a CIL, so while we accept that 35% affordable housing should improve viability, once a CIL is factored-in this could jeopardise viability; more evidence needs to be provided to demonstrate whether these strategic sites can sustain 35% affordable housing in combination with infrastructure payments; and ,the policy should acknowledge that where a proposed development addresses a specific local need, such as retirement housing, it may be appropriate to seek an alternative to onsite provision through, for example, an offsite financial contribution.
874127	Mrs Judith Heathcoat			LPPub2062			No		
726565	Mr J Stevens Home Builders Federation Ltd			LPPub3199			No		
872084	Mr Chris Henderson			LPPub506			No		
872589	Mr Jonathan Armitage			LPPub8			No		
874034	GC Miller			LPPub1830			No		
783140	Mr Simon Tofts Blue Cedar Homes			LPPub2942			No		
874773	Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3986		Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Oxfordshire County Council supports Policy CP24 however would like to see CP7 revised to clarify the assessment steps required to demonstrate viability is an issue (as stated within para 6.12) .
874720	Philip Rawle	724322	Mr Nick Lyzba John Phillips Planning Consultancy	LPPub3380		Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing	No	Planning Practice Guidance Comments	A number of comments have highlighted the recent changes to the Planning Practice Guidance and therefore the wording of CP24 needs to be less prescriptive, in particular the required split for rented and intermediate housing is too rigid and as such the Council should include 'subject to negotiations' regarding split.
831779	Landowners land at South Cumnor			LPPub3884			No		
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub3820			No		
875603	Mr Jeremy Flawn			LPPub3168			No		
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub4030			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub808		Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing	Yes	Supports for Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing.	A number of comments support CP24 stating that lowering the percentage of affordable housing on qualifying sites to 35% will assist viability, whilst still ensuring that the OAN for affordable housing can be met in full. Also the flexibility set out in the policy will help to ensure that irrespective of changing circumstances sites will be deliverable. However one comment did highlight the implications of the changes to the Planning Practice Guidance with a change to the first sentence of CP24 as follows: "The council will seek 35 % affordable housing on all sites capable of a net gain of 10 or more dwellings or which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of more than 1000sqm."
874676	Greg Shaw			LPPub3632			Yes		
873484	Redrow Homes Ltd	876188	Mr Robert Barber Pegasus Group	LPPub4088			Yes		
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2835			No		
737058	Mr Andy Cattermole Taylor Wimpey	860277	Mr Steven Neal Vail Williams LLP	LPPub4194			Yes		
874433	Mr & Mrs N G Lay	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub2858			Yes		
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2946			Yes		
758065	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	864481	Mr James Stewart-Irvine Savills	LPPub2899			No		
858479	Mr Nick Madden			LPPub3247			No		
874174	H Rees			LPPub3422			Yes		
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3960			Yes		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729744	Mr Jonathan Waite			LPPub4074			Yes	.	
874473	Mr Richard Burke Commercial Estates Group (CEG)	874264	Ms Clare O'Hanlon Carter Jonas	LPPub4016			No		

Core Policy 25: Rural Exceptions Sites

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3932		Core Policy 25: Rural Exception Sites	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Oxfordshire County Council supports this policy however would like the criteria to include that highways issues can be mitigated
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2845		Core Policy 25: Rural Exception Sites	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage welcomes criterion vii however reference to Registered Historic Parks and Garden is incorrect, the list of designated assets should include Scheduled Monuments rather than "etc" and Non-designated heritage assets should be referred too. This omission in combination with other omissions does not quite set a positive strategy for the historic environment.
879102	Greenlight Developments	879101	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub3385		Core Policy 25: Rural Exception Sites	No	General comments on Core Policy 25: Rural Exception Sites	Around 4 comments have raised two concerns; in agreeing methods for housing assessments with Parish Council as stated in the Policy , the Parish will refuse to undertake such surveys as an excuse not to place pressure upon them to deliver rural exception sites; and there is a real threat to rural sites under this policy, to the countryside and to character of Vale villages.
879104	Leslie Wells	879101	Philip Rawle PRP Consultants	LPPub3824			No		
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub4037			No		
828771	Karen Rhodes			LPPub4134			No		

Core Policy 26: Accommodating Current and Future Needs of the Ageing Population

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828796	The Revd Graham Sykes	0		LPPub1105		Core Policy 26: Accommodating Current and Future Needs of the Ageing Population	No	Botley Boundary	One comment raised that the redlined area in Map 5.3 is based on a developers idea of expanding the Botley Local Centre into a District Centre. The western end of that redlined area is the location of Field House' an age restricted housing complex with 67 units. If the redlined area is left as it is a future developer could argue for the demolition of Field House and have no obligation to replace it.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	7373530	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2963		Core Policy 26: Accommodating Current and Future Needs of the Ageing Population	No	Core Policy 26: Accommodating Current and Future Needs of the Ageing Population.	A number of comments regarding Policy CP26, which relate to: further clarity is required from the policy as to whether it is seeking a specific provision of lifetime homes on all sites or whether this expressly focuses on age restricted dwellings; shooter shelters should be provided; and the Plan does not provide measures against which performance can be reviewed.
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2729			No		
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2071			Yes		
760211	Dr Andrew			LPPub3352			No		
874174	Pritchard H Rees			LPPub3417			Yes		
874773	Mr Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council	0		LPPub3988		Core Policy 26: Accommodating Current and Future Needs of the Ageing Population	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Oxfordshire County Council supports this Policy however the policy does not set out the circumstances in which such specialist provision will be required. The County Council will work with the Vale to Plan and deliver specialist housing.
783140	Mr Simon Tofts Blue Cedar Homes			LPPub2939		Core Policy 26: Accommodating Current and Future Needs of the Ageing Population	No	Support Core Policy 26: Accommodating Current and Future Needs of the Ageing Population	A number of comments support Policy CP26 however they have also highlighted a few issues; the policy should encourage the provision of retirement housing; reference to the provision of specialist, market housing for the elderly is a necessity; and the policy could be taken even further as specialist accommodation, such as retirement housing, should have its own separate development scenario
783140	Mr Simon Tofts Blue Cedar Homes			LPPub2944			No		
783140	Mr Simon Tofts Blue Cedar Homes			LPPub2933			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
879120	Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4540		Core Policy 26: Accommodating Current and Future Needs of the Ageing Population	No	Object Core Policy 26	The Gow family object to the requirements of the policy as it is not clear what the Policy is seeking from other forms of residential development which are not specifically targeted to meeting the needs of an ageing population

Core Policy 27: Meeting the Housing Needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2848		Core Policy 27: Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage welcomes criterion v. of Core Policy 27 for the reference to the AONB and heritage assets and their setting, as part of the positive and clear strategy for the conservation, enjoyment and enhancement of the historic environment required by the NPPF.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3919		Core Policy 27: Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	Yes	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	Gypsy and Traveller Sites The Plan states that expanding existing sites will be one of the ways of identifying the extra need. The county owns and manage two sites within the Vale, these are the Red Bridge Hollow Caravan site just off the Old Abingdon Road near to Oxford and WoodHill Lane Caravan site in East Challow near Wantage. The Red Bridge Hollow site no longer has any room for expansion as within the past two years 9 extra pitches have been provided to the site which has been on OCC land. The site now has 24 pitches and if was any bigger it would be unmanageable. The Woodhill Lane site is a 12 pitch site and is surrounded by farm land so expansion would only be sort by purchasing land but with the reputation of the site it is very unlikely the land owner would be open to this.

Core Policy 28: New Employment Development on Unallocated Sites

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873665	Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd			LPPub2915		Core Policy 28: New Employment Development on Unallocated Sites	No	Milton Heights Services	There was one comment of support for Core Policy 28, with no objections however would like Milton Heights Services to be allocated.

Core Policy 29: Change of Use of Existing Employment Land and Premises

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872558	Universities Superannuation Scheme	872553	Ms Julia Chowings Deloitte Real Estate	LPPub892		Core Policy 29: Change of Use of Existing Employment Land and Premises	No	Objection; Flexibility of Policy	Three objections were made to CP29, predominantly that part or all of the policy in its current position was overly restrictive and not in compliance with the NPPF, namely paragraphs 14-17, and 51. Nuffield Industrial Estate seeks relaxation of the policy to allow for greater flexibility for its units to be used for alternative uses and thus acknowledge the important role that sustainable alternative employment generating uses can have on the promotion of sustainable economic growth. Crown Packaging seeks a relaxation of the policy through removal of references in the supporting text to time related restrictions. Another comment states the policy approach is too onerous and the policy should be more positive to change of commercial uses to residential, in line with the NPPF (para 51), thus second section policy should be reworded.
874720	Philip Rawle			LPPub3389			No		
831534	Crown Packaging UK Plc (CROWN)	831537	Mr Jonathan Stoddart CBRE Ltd	LPPub3939			No		
874401	H Sherman			LPPub3016		Core Policy 29: Change of Use of Existing Employment Land and Premises	No	Objection	One other objection states the policy could allow developers to sit on employment land thus proposed the policy includes a time restriction to demonstrate that there is no reasonable prospect of land or building being used for employment purposes.
874460	Mr James Colgate			LPPub1968		Core Policy 29: Change of Use of Existing Employment Land Premises	Yes	Support	There was one comment of support from Williams F1 towards Core Policy 29

Core Policy 30: Further and Higher Education

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
728927	Oxford Brookes University	724498	Mr Steven Pickles West Waddy	LPPub2101		Core Policy 30: Further and Higher Education	No	Minor objections	There were around three comments submitted for Core Policy 30 (Further and Higher Education). These were all broadly supportive of the policy, but sought minor amendments to the policy and/or supporting text, in particular that the same approach is taken to Harcourt Hill Campus and Cranfield University. Suggested modifications included making specific reference to certain educational facilities across the district.
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2090			Yes		
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3933			Yes		

Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor Economy

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
828796	The Revd Graham Sykes			LPPub1106		Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor Economy	No	Botley/Local Service Centre Objection	Five comments object to the level of hotel accommodation that Core Policy 31 allows for Local Service Centres. Two of these make specific reference that there is a lack of identified need for a hotel in Botley and three comments suggest the policy states that larger scale development will be supported in market town and local service centres to support visitor economy however shouldn't there be some evidence of need.
871866	Dr Kathryn Davies			LPPub1184			No		
831733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2181			No		
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2855			No		
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3358			No		
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2850	0	Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage welcomes the reference to museums and heritage centres in clause ii. of Core Policy 31. We also welcome the reference to the re-use of a historic building as one of the exceptional circumstances in which larger developments will only be supported, although we would prefer "sensitively re-use". We

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Economy			would also prefer to see the addition of “and which would not adversely affect heritage assets or their setting” after “scale and character of the locality” in the final paragraph of the Policy. In itself and in isolation, English Heritage does not consider that these omissions are 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).
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2107	0	Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor Economy	Yes	General Comments	Three general comments were made. Abingdon Town Council seek budget hotels as well as high end hotels. A separate comment states that the provision of hotels for Milton Park and Harwell Campus will damage the prospects of Didcot acquiring a town centre hotel. The final one is a comment on the level of visitor related development that can be provided at service areas on main transport corridors.
850975	Karen Dodd			LPPub2842			No		
873665	Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd			LPPub2921			No		
872752	Mr Peter Smith			LPPub1200	0	Development to support the visitor economy	No	General Objection	One general objection to Core Policy 31 stating that there is too much reliance on the visitor economy as it is labour-intensive and low-paid. It recommends the deletion of paragraph 6.42.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3935	0	Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor Economy	Yes	Support	One comment from Oxfordshire County Council support in principle the provision for new development which would support growth of the visitor economy

Core Policy 32: Retail Development and Other Main Town Centre Uses

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871866	Dr Kathryn Davies			LPPub1183		Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor Economy	No	Botley/Local Service Centres	There were four specific objections to Core Policy 32 which sought the removal of references to Botley and Local Service Centres supporting large scale developments, as well as the omission of any reference to Core Policy 11. There is also confusion about the separate functioning roles of West Way (Botley) and Seacourt Retail Park and applying town centre policies to local service centres. There is also an objection to the
871866	Dr Kathryn Davies			LPPub1195			No		
831733	Ms Mary Gill			LPPub2188			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829002	West Way Community Concern Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2862			No		provision of town centre uses in Botley. The Policy should be much clearer in regard to these issues.
873665	Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd			LPPub2922		Core Policy 32: Retail Development and other Main Town Centre Uses	No	General Comment	A general comment made with respect to the level of retail provision that may be acceptable at transport service areas.
873089	Mr Andrew Turner			LPPub1328		Paragraph	No	Abingdon Comment	One comment made with respect to the level of traffic congestion and pollution in Abingdon Town Centre. The comment seeks the provision of a park and ride to the north of Abingdon, at the expense of part of the strategic site allocation, that would serve Abingdon-on-Thames and alleviate such issues.

Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3355		Core Policy 33:	No	Air quality.	It is suggested that a reference should be included in the policy to show how and how often air quality will be monitored.
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1170		Core Policy 33:	No	Bus services.	It is suggested that the policy is not specific and therefore ineffective. A strong and robust higher-level policy will be essential for the Science Vale AAP to ensure proper provision is made for bus services.
867076	Mr Norman Downie			LPPub18		Core Policy 33:	No	Car parking	The plan fails to make adequate provision for managing car parking.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872735	Mr Timothy Howse			LPPub1113		Core Policy 33	No	CP33 - General	Traffic congestion on A34, A415, A417, A420 and A4130 is already at or above capacity in peak periods. Commuter rail services to London are already inadequate. Proposed public transport improvements are often aspirational and other infrastructure (incl. sewerage) already at capacity. Reduce the housing allocations to a level where there are not significant sections of the infrastructure (of all types, not just roads) operating at or above operational capacity.
872741	Mr Adrian Gainer			LPPub1137			No		
827959	Mr James Krol			LPPub2606			No		
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3726			No		
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler			LPPub3276			No		
873665	Minscombe & Mays Properties Ltd			LPPub2923		Core Policy 33:	No	Delivery of highway infrastructure	<p>A number of responses have been received that relate to the provision of highway infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that the policy is unsound as it does not include a commitment to deliver transport infrastructure before homes are built. It is also suggested that the plan makes inadequate provision for transport infrastructure more generally. The plan policies will significantly increase the population and employment in leading to a lot more people needing to travel. Traffic along rural roads will increase significantly because the car is the only reasonable option for travelling. There is no credible plan to deliver the core transport policies. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan appears to increase road capacity to accommodate more traffic. This will only serve to increase noise and pollution. The plan should look to reduce the number of car journeys by locating housing near to employment and services, improving public transport and by providing safe cycling routes. Measures that are clearly against the core policies should be removed from the plan (e.g. junction improvements to increase traffic along rural roads and through villages). Oxford City Council supports CP33 and in particular clause iv 'support improvement for accessing Oxford'. However, this will be challenging given the relatively dispersed pattern of proposed development. The response describes how proposals for the Truck Road Services Area at Milton Park Didcot would accord with CP33.
872794	Mr Alexander Meredith			LPPub1191			No		
874395	Mr David Steele			LPPub2119			No		
829953	Dr Paul Birkby			LPPub1198			No		
724877	Mr Martin Small English			LPPub2856		Core Policy 33: Promoting	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage welcome the reference to making towns and villages more attractive in clause Vi of CP33. However, we would prefer clause v to say 'amenities, character and special qualities

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Heritage South East Region					Sustainable Transport and Accessibility			of the surrounding area'. We also suggest the policy includes a reference to traffic calming/ management and public realm enhancement. Another response suggests that the importance of providing coherent transport solutions for the whole journey is not acknowledged as most journeys involve more than one mode of travel. More focus is needed to make modal transfer as easy as possible.
725573	Ms Barbara Morgan Network Rail			LPPub2494	5.1	Paragraph	Yes	Network Rail Rail Services	A response from Network Rail confirms support for upgrading the railway station at Didcot (which falls within South Oxfordshire District Council area).
874773	Mr Bev Hindle Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3992		Core Policy 33:	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments	The County Council raise awareness of the emerging Local Transport Plan (LTP 4) and would welcome discussion in the lead up to the examination so that appropriate elements of emerging LTP can be included in the Local Plan.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2209		Core Policy 33:	No	Oxford City Council Comments	District wide policies Core Policy CP33 (sustainable transport) – The City Council supports in particular criterion (iv) 'support improvements for accessing Oxford'. However it is noted that this will be challenging given the relatively dispersed pattern of development set out in the Spatial Strategy, particularly given the challenges that exist on the road network especially the A34.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3304		Core Policy 33	No	Transport strategy	It is suggested that the plan makes little reference to transport linkages between the Vale and with adjacent settlements.
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England			LPPub2232		Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Natural England Comments	Natural England are concerned that the quality of public rights of way running through or adjacent to the various allocations will not be maintained in line with NPPF 75. The text needs amendment to ensure protection.

Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
832269	Penny Silverwood Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			LPPub2962		Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy	No	Air quality.	The Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust state that CP34 does not identify what 'further measures' would be required in order to rectify any adverse impacts of air pollution upon the Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation. The HRA states that: "The Council should supplement this [collaborative working with the Oxfordshire Planning Policy Group] via a plan commitment (...) to develop a framework by which air quality measures can be linked to monitoring of the air quality in the Oxford Meadows SAC before and for a number of years after introduction of the measures such that further measures can be devised if the air quality does not improve." The local plan has not secured a commitment to such further measures as recommended in the HRA should the monitoring indicate that there is an impact on air quality. It is suggested that for the Local Plan to be sound, Policy 34 needs to include a commitment to further mitigation measures should the monitoring indicate an effect on the SAC, and such mitigation measures need to be identified and demonstrably effective. A separate response suggests that the Council need to be more effective in dealing with poor air quality, particularly through Botley.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3316			No		
874348	Susan Garrett			LPPub3660 LPPub3674	6.7	Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy	No No	Delivery of highway Infrastructure	It is suggested that road improvements, including a diamond junction on the A34 at Lodge Hill and additional lanes between the M40 and Chilton are needed to be in place before any housing development takes place. It is suggested that without these improvements traffic congestion will be a critical factor. A separate response suggests that any improvements to the A34 will be prohibitively costly. The recent government announcement of highways improvements includes only CTV and information signs for the A34 (and minor changes to approach roads to 2 junctions north of Oxford). This will let drivers know how many miles long the queue is but will do nothing to prevent the frequent long queues. There appear to be no plans to widen the road or provide a much needed hard shoulder.
872108	Mr Jonathan Noys			LPPub2472			No		
872941	Dr Andrew Turner North Abingdon Local Plan Group			LPPub1324			No		
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4163			No		
874584	Linda Martin			LPPub3113			No		
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub845 LPPub850			No No		
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub753			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873673	Mr David Beer			LPPub4718			No		
872794	Mr Alexander Meredith			LPPub1185		Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy	No	Policy wording	It is suggested that the policy wording is too narrow and should be replaced by a Strategic Roads policy which ensures that the east-west routes across the district are given as much attention as the main north-south route.
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley			LPPub121		Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy	No	Relationship between proposed growth and A34 Strategy.	It is suggested that as the A34 has been identified as a major barrier to economic growth, and that there is a likelihood that development at the Harwell Oxford Campus would add to traffic issues on the A34, it would appear unsound to proceed with large strategic housing allocations within the protected landscape of the North Wessex Downs AONB until (a) there is a proven track record of economic growth in the area (b) issues surrounding capacity on the A34 have been addressed and (c) it has been proven that housing must be located in this area with a full analysis as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. It is also suggested that the plan proposes a significant number of houses within a few miles of the A34 which will increase the traffic congestion on it to a level that seriously impacts on its ability to adequately meet the needs of the residents and businesses. The capacity of the A34 should be increased through additional lanes and consideration should be given to re-routing it away from the section through Botley.
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub158			No		
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub182			No		
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub335			No		
829387	Mr Keith Russell			LPPub480			No		
872051	Mr Ian Page			LPPub450			No		
872161	Mr Keith Mintern			LPPub591			No		
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub1002			No		
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung			LPPub1725			No		
874461	Paul Turner-Smith			LPPub3092			No		
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4503			No		
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub667			No		
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub370			No		
874442	Mr Jonathon Acres			LPPub1991			No		
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton			LPPub297			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
875989	AONB Action Group			LPPub4097			No		
828246	Mr Derek Tisdall			LPPub4332			No		
829482	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4467			No		
831003	Mr Paul Beasley			LPPub4421			No		
872461	Steven and Jane Hale			LPPub4320			No		
874124	Mr Timothy Kapp			LPPub4187			No		
876244	Mr David Tilbury			LPPub4201			No		
872790	K Slater			LPPub4373			No		
874609	Mrs Lorraine Elliott			LPPub4278			No		
874640	Dr Jonathan Hogg			LPPub4446			No		
874477	Mrs Karen Beasley			LPPub2406			No		
	I Jackson								

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3307		Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy	No	Traffic Congestion	It is suggested that improving access to the A34 is likely to lead to the route becoming more congested and that the route is already congested. Furthermore, the incidence of congestion of the A34 is frequent and often leads to congestion on the local highway network. It is suggested that the plan does not adequately seek to address this problem and is therefore unsound. y.It is premature to proceed with large scale strategic housing allocations adjacent to the A34 until road traffic implications have been better quantified and viable solutions included within associated infrastructure funding, to be implemented broadly concurrent with any roll-out of new housing. It is also suggested that the Solent-Midlands Route Based Strategy should be used to inform the development of the A34 Policy.
874494	Lloyd Czaplewski			LPPub3148			No		
829332	Mr Nicholas F Astley-Cooper			LPPub251			No		
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler			LPPub3276			No		
730229	Mrs Sally Rowley-Williams			LPPub979			No		
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4581			No		
872717	Mr Brian Morris			LPPub4604			No		
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4643			No		
876244	K Slater			LPPub4676			No		
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater			LPPub4699			No		
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2210		Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy	Yes	Oxford City Council Comment	Core Policy CP34 (A34 Strategy) – the City Council supports this policy.
872565	West Berkshire District Council			LPPub2634		Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy	No	West Berkshire District Council - Transport strategy	Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy The Local Plan recognises the A34's dual role as a nationally important strategic route as well as forming part of the local road network. The development sites and associated junction improvements identified in the Local Plan will undoubtedly increase traffic on the A34 corridor south of the Science Vale area, which are likely to generate significant additional demand for travel. The Downland section of the A34 in West Berkshire is a relatively unimproved section of dual carriageway which contains short slip roads from

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									adjacent rural communities and steep inclines (in particular Gore Hill) that can slow down laden heavy goods vehicles. Even minor collisions have the ability to cause delays on this section, which can adversely impact on the connectivity between the Science Vale and the M4. The wider improvements considered for the A34 should show look beyond the Vale's boundary down to the A34 at Chieveley.

Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2088 LPPub2085		Core Policy 35	Yes Yes	Accessibility	It is stated that CP35 should make provision to ensure that pedestrian routes can be easily used by buggies and wheelchairs, such as the provision of dropped kerbs and even, flat surfaces.
749047	Fraser Old			LPPub2507		Core Policy 35	No	Cycling	It is suggested that the plan lacks imagination and gives too little attention to cycleways. These should be provided in new development from the outset and should offset initial costs by health benefits, reduced emissions, and reduced wear and tear of roads.
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2857		Core Policy 35	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage welcomes Core Policy 35, but suggest that the Policy could include a reference to traffic calming/management and public realm enhancement schemes that enhance cycling and walking.
725573	Ms Barbara Morgan Network Rail			LPPub3002		Core Policy 35	No	Network Rail Level Crossings	Network Rail request a policy is added to the local plan confirming the councils statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaken where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3831		Core Policy 35	No	Oxfordshire County Council Comments on Public Transport	Oxfordshire faces immense challenges in accommodating planned residential and commercial development, whilst at the same time facilitating movement on a constrained transport network. In general, locating development along the main public transport corridors (such as Premium Bus Routes and close to rail stations) offers the best chance of attracting a high proportion of movement by public transport and thus reducing the number of additional cars which need to be accommodated on the County's road network. Bus services along the main Premium Bus Routes from Wantage, Abingdon and Botley to Oxford already operate quite frequently and these bus services can be increased relatively easily. Frequencies on some other routes, such as Swindon-Faringdon-Oxford and Harwell to

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									Didcot have increased recently, and will now become Premium Routes. Providing a credible level of public transport at a distance from rail stations, and/or a distance from Premium and 'development' bus routes is more difficult, although larger development sites in the Science Vale area (such as Great Western Park, Valley Park, Crab Hill and Grove Airfield) have been requested to fund additional bus services to significant centres (such as Oxford, Didcot) and to workplaces. As Oxfordshire's road network becomes more congested, it has become increasingly important to plan and provide priority measures for buses, including at traffic signals, along bus lanes and through providing fully-segregated busways.
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2211		Core Policy 35	No	Oxford City Council Comments on Public Transport	CP35 Public Transport Walking Cycling – the City Council supports this policy. It is noted that paragraph 6.75 acknowledges that increasing these modes will be difficult in rural areas, which points to need to focus more development close to urban areas and particularly Oxford which has amongst the highest non-car mode share in the country.
756473	Mr Chris Sperring West Berkshire Council			LPPub2629		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	West Berkshire Council Comments Public Transport	South East Vale Area The draft Local Plan shows numerous development sites that are proposed in the vicinity of the A34 corridor, in particular those associated with the growth and development of the Science Vale area. Fig 5.6c shows proposed improvements to the bus network within the Science Vale area, which includes an "At least 4 per hour link to/from Newbury. This would appear to match an aspirational primary bus route linking Newbury/Harwell Campus/Didcot/Oxford which is identified in the recently approved West Berkshire Local Transport Plan Passenger Transport Strategy, and improve connectivity where no such direct passenger transport link currently exists. It should be noted that discussions have taken place in recent years between West Berkshire, Oxfordshire CC and a local bus operator regarding proposals for a similar service as part of the (unsuccessful) West Berkshire bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. This bid highlighted the possibility that following a period of initial pump priming, such a service could become commercially viable within a few years. The large number of development sites identified in the South East Vale area is likely to generate significant additional travel demand on the A34. West Berkshire would not wish to see undesirable increases in traffic on unsuitable cross-boundary routes, in particular the A338 south of Wantage and the A417 east of Didcot through Streatley as an alternative to the A34/M4 towards Reading.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871756	Mr Ron Phillipps			LPPub237		Core Policy 35	No	Parking Standards	It is suggested that the plan should include new parking standards for residential development.
850975	Karen Dodd			LPPub2837			No		
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1172		Core Policy 35	No	Policy wording	Stagecoach state that the policy is non-committal on the imperative to achieve mode shift towards sustainable modes, and is weakly drafted, with insufficiently robust statement of intent. Given the distances that many residents will need to cover to access jobs education and facilities, the lack of reference to appropriate design of developments to facilitate efficient bus penetration is a major omission. Delivery of efficient and direct public transport to or through new developments is easy to compromise through inconsiderate urban design. Wording of Core Policy 35 is out of conformity with national policy. English Heritage welcomes Core Policy 35. However, they suggest that the policy is amended to make reference to quality of areas subject to transport improvements and include reference to traffic calming and schemes to enhance public realm.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
756168	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1152		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	Public Transport	<p>A number of comments relate to public transport provision. These include:</p> <p>Stagecoach state that the policy language within the Plan is highly focused on providing for car-borne movements first. While improvements to public transport are repeatedly referred to, there is little or no definition of how this will be specified or accomplished, and at least as importantly.</p> <p>The objective of reducing use of cars though for example improvement of the frequency of buses is also a worthy one. However the argument for this actually happening is not convincing.</p> <p>The Plan does not support sustainable public transport enough. It should say that no planning permission should be granted for house building until a firm plan is drawn up to re-open Grove station. Greater emphasis on such schemes - into of road building/improvements would create a better environment. Locating development along the main public transport corridors (such as Premium Bus Routes and close to rail stations) offers the best chance of attracting a high proportion of movement by public transport and thus reducing the number of additional cars which need to be accommodated on the County's road network. As Oxfordshire's road network becomes more congested, it has become increasingly important to plan and provide priority measures for buses, including at traffic signals, along bus lanes and through providing fully-segregated busways.</p> <p>Increased capacity on the existing bus services will be required as more houses are built to cope with demand, otherwise car usage will be the only viable option for most people. There are no deliverable plans to increase capacity bus routes before housing development takes place.</p>
756280	Dr Sarah Eccles			LPPub2468			No		
871635	Malcolm Hurdus			LPPub2199			No		
829953	Dr Paul Birkby			LPPub1203			No		
853514	Linden Homes	724542	Mr Kenneth Dijkman Dijkman Planning LLP	LPPub3608		Core Policy 35	Yes	Public Transport	The East Hanney allocation is very well positioned in terms of pedestrian and cycle way accessibility to key local facilities. Some off-site highway works may be required to facilitate the implementation of this non-vehicular connectivity.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3308		Core Policy 35:	No	Transport strategy	No mention of considerable potential of existing rail corridors (notably Oxford-Culham-Radley-Didcot-Milton Park-Grove) for providing faster communication between key sites.
872565	Mr Chris Sperring West Berkshire Council			LPPub2634		Core Policy 35	No	West Berkshire District Council - Transport strategy	West Berkshire District Council supports this policy which appears to fit well with the aspirations for a strategic bus corridor linking Oxford, Didcot, Science Vale with Newbury. A separate comment suggests that the plan makes no consideration of the potential for light rail solutions which offer more sustainable solutions than bus or car.

General Transport Comments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873089	Mr Andrew Turner			LPPub1334	6.71		No	Air pollution	It is suggested that increasing local traffic will increase greenhouse emissions, NO2 and particulates leading to damaging the living environment.
872452	Ms Anna Hoare			LPPub919	6.61		No	Transport strategy	The comment states that the council has not considered its duty to cooperate with its residents. Measuring 'likley' impacts in an abstract is meaningless. It is the people who experience these problems on a daily basis who should be consulted.

Core Policy 36: Electronic Communications

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3938		Core Policy 36: Electronic communications	Yes	Electronic communications	The County Council supports the draft policy as it reflects the emerging joint working across all districts to proactively plan for Superfast Broadband connections.
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2730		Core Policy 36: Electronic communications	No	Policy wording	Concern is raised that the definition of “appropriate infrastructure” could be used to require developers to provide systems which are simply not within their control or technical capacity to do so. Also concern is raised as to what constitutes “superfast broadband” and how this requirement will be assessed through the planning application process.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2968		Core Policy 36: Electronic communications	No		
879120	Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4541			No		

Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2971 LPPub2731		Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	No	Balance between local circumstances and site specific consideration	Two comments support the need for a high quality design policy however the criteria should be amended to reflect the need that a balance has to be struck between local circumstances and site specific considerations.
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council	0		LPPub2073		Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	Yes	Car Parking Provision	Abingdon Town Council consider adequate car parking provision needs to be provided in developments as households have more vehicles than ever before and unless adequate provision is made there will be increasing parking problems. It is acknowledged this may be more relevant for the Design Guide SPD.
723546	Dr Susan Nodder Watchfield Parish Council	0		LPPub2718		Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	No	Coalescence of villages	Watchfield Parish Council note that the Local Plan states that the special character of villages (Shrivenham and Watchfield) should be conserved or enhanced but does not contain any policies for how this is to be achieved or the criteria used for maintenance character. There must be a policy included to eliminate coalescence of villages. The absence of a policy for proportional development of villages shows that the character is unimportant to the Vale.
879120	Gow Family Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4542		Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	No	Core Policy 37 criteria	One comment broadly supports the aims of the Policy however, not all of the requirements will be relevant to all developments (criterion vii) and there are conflicting requirements such as the need to provide convenient access for vehicles along with the need to provide a high quality public realm therefore the policy should set out the criteria as a series of relevant aim to be applied where appropriate.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3736		Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	No	CPRE Design Comments	CPRE acknowledge good words within CP37 however consider that CP37 & CP38 do not give sufficient strength to refuse an application if faced with a large development of a uniform and mediocre standard. CPRE suggest inserting the following text into the preamble to Policy 38: 'The Vale accepts that good design should ensure that larger developments contain a variety of architectural styles and of materials, all of the highest quality, wholly and essentially to avoid mediocrity and uniformity. The Vale is therefore introducing a 'Certificate of Quality' and will employ outside consultants, independent of both applicant and the District Council, to judge if an application for larger developments meets the requisite standards.' Also insert, either as part of Core Policy 38 (Part 3) or as a new Core Policy 38(b): 'The District Council will seek a 'Certificate of Quality' from an expert, independent of the Council and the proposer, to guarantee the quality and variety of building design in larger

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									building developments. No larger development will be approved without such a Certificate.'
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2873 LPPub2870	6.86 6.84	Paragraph	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage welcome the Council's preparation of a comprehensive design guide and the recognition that quality design and the historic environment are linked. However would like to see the policy strengthened to ensure a positive and clear strategy for the conservation, enjoyment and enhancement of the historic environment. Suggest the opening sentence read "All proposals for new development must be of high quality design that:" Clause i should be amended to read ".....cultural diversity and history, conserves and enhances historic character and reinforces local identity.
831326	Henry Snell Woolstone Parish			LPPub2426		Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs	No	Local Character	Development should be in keeping the local character of Abingdon
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub2070		Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy	Yes	Minimum standards	There should be a general policy requiring minimum standards for accommodation, such as size of rooms. The Local Plan should specify standards for dwellings so that they provide acceptable living accommodation for residents (although it is acknowledged this may be more relevant for inclusion in the Design Guide).
872577	DR David Forrow			LPPub2488		Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	No	Need to maintain rural aesthetic	Need to maintain the rural aesthetic quality alongside a massive programme of house building
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2875		Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	Yes	Policy Wording (English Heritage Comments)	Welcomes policy in principle however would like to see the policy wording strengthened.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872347	Mr John Clements			LPPub908		Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	No	Strengthening of policy required	Five comments consider this policy requires strengthening to provide a more robust emphasis on the need for high quality design. It is suggested the opening sentence of the policy should be amended to include 'must be of high quality design' and also suggested the policy should include a requirement for community engagement on major applications.
8718668	Dr Kathryn Davies			LPPub1196					
31733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2192					
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2865					
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Oxford Preservation Trust			LPPub1435					
874676	Greg Shaw			LPPub3639		Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness	Yes	Supports CP37	Three comments support the policy in particular two comments consider the approach in Core Policies 24, 37 and 38 provide a coherent framework to bring forward development which respects local circumstances and one comment states the policy is in accordance with national guidance and addresses the need to connect people with places and take into account the natural, built and historic environment.
873484	Redrow Homes Ltd	876188	Mr Robert Barber Pegasus Group	LPPub4089			Yes		
872083	Green & Co	872081	Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub809			Yes		

Core Policy 38: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Developments

Consultee ID	Consultee or organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
871866	Dr Kathryn Davies			LPPub1186			No	Community engagement	Four comments state the policy should give a higher profile to engaging communities in the design process, in particular two of these comments also consider that the Masterplan part of the policy should include an extra bullet point stating “consult widely with the community on both the concept and the design and its implication for local people”.
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Oxford Preservation Trust			LPPub1436					
831733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2193					
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2882					
827932	Julie Maberley Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			LPPub3610		Core Policy 38: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	No	Concerns regarding CP38	Four comments have raised concerns regarding CP38 relating to a number of matters including; the requirements of a vision is not achievable because a vision comprises of a number of elements, all of which cannot be translated into a single masterplan, a better alternative is to seek the provision of a Vision Statement; requiring an indicative layout is not appropriate at the scale of a major development site and the wording of this requirement is at odds with other Statutory Instruments governing the level of detail required for outline planning applications because it places a higher burden on applicants than what is required by other Regulations; the requirements are not necessary or appropriate for a design and access statement, especially in the case of outline applications; the Sustainability Assessment Report should also include standards for water use, and SUDS, amongst other aspects and maintenance costs of SUDS is mentioned in the Plan or in the sustainability assessment and this should be taken into account in the viability of individual sites; the Plan still appears developer-led and, if implemented, will adversely affect existing and future residents of the Vale; the importance of the qualities and characteristics being protected in the vale is not backed up by any definite proposals for how this is to be achieved; there are no commitments to ensuring that houses are built to the highest sustainability standards; and the opportunity has not been taken to insist on green technology options as standard
723546	Dr Susan Nodder Watchfield Parish Council			LPPub2720					
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2972					
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2732					
724877	Mr Martin			LPPub2879		Core Policy 38: Design	Yes	English Heritage	English Heritage welcome the 4th bullet point however would like to see the policy strengthened to ensure a positive and clear

Consultee ID	Consultee or organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Small English Heritage South East Region					Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites		Comment	strategy for the conservation, enjoyment and enhancement of the historic environment through suggesting that a new bullet point; “conserve and enhance the historic environment, including the retention and incorporation into the scheme of buildings and other features of historic interest”, should be added to Core Policy 38.
831469	Mr Nick Small			LPPub1174		Core Policy 38: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	No	Opportunities for sustainable transport	Stagecoach considers the policy for urban design ignores the role of design in facilitating the rebalancing of transport towards more sustainable modes. If this is not achieved, buses take over 20 minutes to travel from one end of a scheme to the other, within which time, even at peak times, a motorist is on the strategic network and a good way toward their local destination. This risks being the outcome within Science Vale, without consistent strong urban design “rules” that structure place-making around high-quality public transport arteries and the delivery of any meaningful network enhancement is likely to be practically closed off before a single new home is built on the schemes in question. To make the Policy CP38 effective strengthen Policies CP18 and CP35 and CP38 could be amended to read: “.. Integrate with surrounding historic, built and natural environments, in particular maximising existing and potential movement connections, and accessibility, to encourage and facilitate the greatest possible use of walking, cycling and public transport, including measures to structure development where appropriate to facilitate delivery of efficient and direct public transport routes, incorporating full segregation of bus movements from general traffic where appropriate.”
874676	Greg Shaw	876188		LPPub3647		Core Policy 38: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	Yes	Support CP38	Three comments support CP38, in particular two comments consider the approach in Core Policies 24, 37 and 38 provide a coherent framework to bring forward development which respects local circumstances and one comment supports the approach of requiring a Masterplan to ensure an integrated approach with all aspects of sustainable development.
873484	Redrow Homes Ltd	872081	Mr Robert Barber Pegasus Group	LPPub4090					
872083	Green & Co		Miss Alice Brighton Planning Potential	LPPub810					
756099	Mr Francis Walsh			LPPub3693		Core Policy 38:	No	Housing density	1 respondent observes that the Design Guide states that a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare should be achieved. Such a density should be restricted to the central areas of new developments because it would inappropriate in certain areas. No mention at all of providing bungalows.

Core Policy 39: The Historic Environment

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3913		Core Policy 39: The Historic Environment	Yes	Archaeology	Oxfordshire County Council has no significant objections or concerns as CP39 is acceptable although fairly basic which will be expanded on in Part 2. It should be noted that on two transport schemes (Abingdon Southern by pass and Science Vale Thames Crossing) the land for safeguarding includes scheduled ancient monuments.
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2804 LPPub2891 LPPub2884 LPPub2887 LPPub2892 LPPub2803 LPPub2802 LPPub2799	6.94 6.91 6.90 6.91 6.92 6.95 6.96	Paragraph Paragraph Paragraph Paragraph Paragraph Paragraph Paragraph	Yes No	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage made eight comments regarding CP39 and state the attractive historic environment is one of the reasons people want to visit and work in the District. Overall English Heritage welcomes and supports CP39 however they consider that the Plan requires additional references throughout the Plan which comments have been submitted on as to ensure the Plan has a “positive” strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of, and a “clear” strategy for the enhancement of, the historic environment. English Heritage also welcome paragraphs 6.90, 6.93, 6.94, 6.95, 6.96-98, however they would like to propose three modifications: at paragraph 6.94 the Plan should indicate that there are five existing Character Appraisals and how they have been used to inform the policies and proposals of the Plan; paragraph 6.93 could be more detailed on what assets are currently at risk and what may be at risk in the future; and reference in 6.90 to non-designated heritage assets which are important features to local communities and provide a sense of place, community identity and local history.
832469 725173 875603 832469	George Lambrick Policy Unknown Oxford City Council Mr Jeremy Flawn George Lambrick			LPPub3159 LPPub3165 LPPub2212 LPPub3173 LPPub3175		Core Policy 39: The Historic Environment	No	Object to CP39	Five comments objecting to CP39 in relation to; the plan has failed to exclude areas of heritage sensitivity from development; the plan has not applied heritage policy correctly and in particular has not given due weight to the LPAs’ special statutory duty - under the 1990 planning (listed buildings and conservation areas) act - to give “considerable weight” to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the setting, character and appearance of listed buildings and conservation areas situated in and adjacent to the sites selected and thus policies HE1, HE2 and HE3 should be carried forward; and Oxford City Council object as there is no reference to Oxford skyline as a heritage asset.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2975		Core Policy 39: The Historic Environment	No	Policy Objectives	Two respondents identify a need to ensure that the level of influence exerted by heritage assets on the layout of development proposals is proportionate and evidence based.
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2733					
832469	George Lambrick			LPPub3175		Core Policy 39: The Historic Environment	No	Saved policies	The draft plan does not carry forward heritage policies HE1, HE2 and HE3 which give valuable guidance on how statutory heritage duties will be applied
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Oxford Preservation Trust			LPPub1437		Core Policy 39: The Historic Environment	No	Strengthening of Policy	A few comments consider CP39 could be strengthened to give it more weight as follows; changes should be made to CP39 (i) omit 'and where possible', new (v) add (at end) "engaging the local community in this process." and (vi) Add "and protecting" after "assessing"; and suggest the following additions a) add "architects and designers" in the first sentence b) stuck with: i) encourage the building and development of the historic Houses and Monuments of the future which will add lustre interest and beauty to the Vale.
831733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2195					
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2889					

Core Policy 40: Sustainable Design and Construction

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
756382	Ms Jean Nunn-Price			LPPub3763		Core Policy 40	No	Fracking	1 respondent is opposed to fracking
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3362		Core Policy 40:	No	Incorporation of Design Guide	1 respondent considers that the policy could incorporate measures from the Design Guide and include a reference to the Guide as follows after the first sentence 'that new development and re-development should take full account of the measures described in Section 7 of the Design Guide'.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2734		Core Policy 40	No	Object to CP40	Around 2 respondents consider the requirements of the policy to be onerous, not in accordance with national guidance.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP			LPPub2976					
725115	Mr Jack Moeran Environment Agency			LPPub2983		Core Policy 40	No	Environment Agency Comment	Environment Agency note a Water Cycle Study has been undertaken which recognises the Vale is in a water stressed area which is reflected in the Plan and indicates a higher level of water efficiency standard will be formalised within Local Plan 2031 Part 2, at a later date. The Environment Agency consider when taking account of the above evidence base, this policy is not justified, in so far as it does not reflect the evidence base documents of the Plan. Given the Local Plan Part 1 will allocate a significant proportion of the growth within the district, and development may come forward prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Part 2. There will be no mechanism to deliver such water efficiency measures in this scenario. Therefore suggest revised policy wording to ensure higher water efficiency standards are delivered within the strategic growth allocated, the following inclusions: vii New developments shall be designed to a water efficiency standard of 105 litres/head/day (l/h/d) for new homes, and BREEAM (BRE Environmental Assessment Method) 'Excellent' with a maximum number of 'water credits' or equivalent.
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3314		Core Policy 40	No	Renewable energy requirements	Around 4 comments regarding renewable energy requirements, relating to; lack of commitment to measure energy targets in which targets should be included in Chapter 6 regarding zero carbon homes; and the need for all new dwellings to be more sustainable and have renewable energy sources.
868466	Mr Duncan Cox			LPPub26					
866288	Mrs Maxine Bullock			LPPub1667					
756382	Ms Jean Nunn-Price			LPPub3762					
730229	Mr Nigel			LPPub2104		Core Policy 40	Yes	Sewerage System	Abingdon Town Council consider there to be a need to update the map of the sewerage system in Abingdon

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Warner Abingdon Town Council								
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2798		Core Policy 40	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage welcomes CP40 however suggest, for clarity, the penultimate sentence of the Policy should read “where historic assets would be adversely affected”.
879120	Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4543		Core Policy 40	No	Building Performance	Matters relating to building performance are best suited to be addressed through the Building Regulations process. In terms of the need to orientate habitable rooms within 30 degrees of south, this will not be possible on all development sites for all units proposed and the need to demonstrate that it is not appropriate to do so places an unnecessary burden on developers, especially where the layout of a site and its physical characteristics are the key in addressing this issue.
875920	Daniel Scharf			LPPub4616		Core Policy 40	No	Carbon Reduction	The Plan does not include a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed requirements of the Climate Change Act and the related carbon reduction budgets

Core Policy 41: Renewable Energy

Consultee ID	Consultee or organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872794	Mr Alexander Meredith			LPPub1193		Core Policy 41: Renewable Energy	Yes	Concerns regarding CP41	Around 3 respondents raised concerns regarding CP41 relating to; the Council should make a commitment to support community renewable energy schemes; include a requirement in policy for new homes to be designed for maximum energy efficiency and needs for proactive plan to increase renewable and low-carbon generation
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2106			Yes		
755805	Alan Ruddell			LPPub3642			No		

Consultee ID	Consultee or organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2797		Core Policy 41: Renewable Energy	Yes	Support CP41	English Heritage and Oxfordshire County Council support Core Policy 41.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3940			Yes		

Core Policy 42: Flood Risk

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
725115	Mr Jack Moeran Environment Agency			LPPub2988 LPPub2974		Core Policy 42: Flood Risk	No No	Environment Agency Comments	The Environment Agency have made two comments regarding CP42, relating to; they have requested the inclusion of a Core Policy within the Plan to safeguard land to prevent development from precluding the delivery of flood risk management measures; and point out that a Water Cycle Study is currently being undertaken but it has yet to be completed. Until the WCS is finalised concerns about effectiveness and consistency with the national planning policy (raised in the EA's letters dated May 2013 and April 2014) are still applicable.
871182	Mr William S.D McCall			LPPub409		Core Policy 42: Flood Risk	No	Flood risk - East Hanney	4 respondents believe development of the site in East Hanney would increase the existing level of flood risk and that the Council should reconsider their site selections accordingly.
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell			LPPub824					
868674	Mr Oliver Cornish			LPPub1297					
874268	Mr & Mrs Clarke			LPPub2187					
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2096		Core Policy 42: Flood Risk	Yes	Flood risk - north west of Abingdon	Abingdon Town Council consider that development of land north west of Abingdon would mean that a proper drainage and flood alleviation scheme for this area would be essential.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872095	Dr Sarah Eccles			LPPub2466		Core Policy 42: Flood Risk	No	General Comments	3 respondents have raised concerns regarding CP42, relating to; the Vale is vulnerable to flooding, therefore reassess likely growth and housing need; there should be acknowledgement and reference to the proposed Western Flood Channel; and have river basin management plans, water resource plans and flood risk management plans been considered?
760211	Dr Andrew Pritchard			LPPub3366					
872577	DR David Forrow			LPPub937					

Core Policy 43: Natural Resources

Consultee ID	Consultee or organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2735		Core Policy 43: Natural Resources	No	Agricultural land	3 respondents object to criterion viii of the policy as it could be used to support a sequential approach to the development of sites.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2981					
879120	Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4544					
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub840	6.105	Paragraph	No	Air pollution	3 respondents consider that further development in Abingdon will increase traffic flow and air pollution in Abingdon town centre (which is a designated AQMA) and a more robust approach needs to be taken to air quality issues (including enhanced monitoring) which is not limited to the Air Quality Management Areas.
827405	Mr Geoff Broughton Mr			LPPub3606		Core Policy 43: Natural Resources	No		
730229	Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2105		Core Policy 43: Natural Resources	Yes		

Consultee ID	Consultee or organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3785 LPPub3914	6.107	Paragraph Core Policy 43: Natural Resources	No Yes	Minerals and Waste	Oxfordshire County Council consider that the text within Paragraph 6.107 is not aligned to its strategy for Minerals and Waste and should be amended accordingly and consider that the policy should also refer to composting in addition to recycling.
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler	0		LPPub3468	0	Core Policy 43: Natural Resources	No	Object to CP43	1 respondent suggests a new additional Core Policy relating to 'Farming' which recognises the vital importance of farming in the Vale in the context of development proposals.
874487	Dr Anthony Webster	0		LPPub3497	0	Local Plan 2031 Publication Version	No	Brownfield Land	Worthwhile to develop on Brown Field sites and infilling within town centres, Population control is needed, and large number of buy to lets are having an detrimental effect on affordable housing.

Core Policy 44: Landscape

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews			LPPub1801		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Add AONB Policy and Exclude development from AONB	Three comments have suggested either a new policy be introduced on just AONB or additional paragraph in policy. AONBs have a great level of protection against development and thus those allocations in the AONB should be removed from the Plan. Also CP44 does not make sufficient cross reference to the statutory North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan and the implications of Paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF in respect of development within the AONB.
831397	B Read			LPPub4192	6.113	Paragraph			
472647	Mr Andrew Lord North Wessex Downs AONB			LPPub267		Core Policy 44: Landscape			
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler			LPPub3305		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	AONB General Comment	One comment has suggested amendments to the policy; the first and fourth paragraphs should read "AONBS are what they state: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. any attempts to introduce into them artificial buildings is a contradiction in terms and will under no circumstances (except in the case of a national emergency) be permitted and in section b the second paragraph and subsections vii and viii should be terminated
749581	Dr Elizabeth Boon			LPPub469		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	AONB General Comment	One comment expressed the view that planning decisions have paid scant regard to the high priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the North Wessex Downs AONB.
873626	Mr Peter Bowell			LPPub2541		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	AONB General Comment	One comment states there is a failure to protect areas of outstanding natural beauty.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2736		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Blanket Approach Landscape Policy	Two comments have stated the Policy is contrary to national guidance by virtue of the fact that it seeks to protect the "landscape" of the district from harmful development where as the NPPF requires a criteria based policies and not a blanket approach.
879120	Gow Family			LPPub4545					
756130	Mr Norman Staples			LPPub1563		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Coalescence of Harwell with Didcot	Around two comments have suggested the need for the character of the countryside and villages to be maintained will not be achieved at Harwell which will coalesce with Didcot.
749572	Mrs Joyce Doughty			LPPub4746					
832188	Ms Stephanie Cottriall			LPPub2631		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Environmental Impact of Proposals	Two comments stating little consideration of the environmental impacts of the proposals and thus sites from the greenbelt should be dropped and should concentrate on brownfield sites.
872362	Dr Charles Cottriall			LPPub3695					
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley			LPPub108	6.110	Paragraph	No	Exclude development from AONB	Around 51 comments have pointed out that the plan allocates a further 1,400 homes in the North Wessex Downs AONB (the largest strategic housing allocation within any National Park or AONB in the whole of the UK). There is no exceptional need to build in the North Wessex Downs AONB. It is not in accordance with paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF. The allocation of sites is contrary to paragraph 6.111 of the Local Plan. Reallocate sites accordingly and remove the area within the AONB from the ring fenced area.
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley			LPPub122	6.110	Paragraph			
829387	Mr Keith Russell			LPPub481	6.110	Paragraph			
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub669	6.110	Paragraph			
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub336	6.110	Paragraph			
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub371	6.110	Paragraph			
872051	Mr Ian Page			LPPub451	6.110	Paragraph			
872161	Mr Keith Minter			LPPub592	6.110	Paragraph			

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831397	B Read			LPPub4186	6.110	Paragraph			
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub159		Core Policy 44: Landscape			
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub183					
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group			LPPub298					
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub1006					
874461	Paul Turner-Smith			LPPub3093					
829328	Mrs Ros Page			LPPub4501					
874629	Mr Mark Taylor			LPPub4370					
874664	Mr Paul Griffiths			LPPub4459					
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4487					
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley			LPPub4449					
874640	Mrs Karen Beasley			LPPub4452					
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung			LPPub1726					
829511	MR Stephen Heath			LPPub3475					

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3737					
831003	Steven and Jane Hale			LPPub4424					
831003	Steven and Jane Hale			LPPub4422					
872461	Mr Timothy Kapp			LPPub4321					
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub1009					
828246	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4333					
829258	Miss Josephine Cormier			LPPub4273					
829482	Mr Paul Beasley			LPPub4468					
875989	Mr Derek Tisdall			LPPub4076					
876244	K Slater			LPPub4203					
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg			LPPub4279					
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4507					
830045	Mrs Judy			LPPub3223					

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874243	Roberts Mrs Valerie Krol			LPPub3656					
828390	David and Norah Charlesworth			LPPub2421					
725244	Mrs Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4582 LPPub4584					
877486	Miss Rosemary Brown	877485	Ms Jane Guest court of protection	LPPub4588					
877493	Mrs Lilian Mary Norridge	877485	Ms Jane Guest court of protection	LPPub4589					
827386	Dr Christopher Prior			LPPub791					
874660	Jane Guest			LPPub4590					
872717	Mr Brian Morris			LPPub4605					
872717	Mr Brian Morris			LPPub4607					
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4644					
877876	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4646					
876244	K Slater			LPPub4677					

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
876244	K Slater			LPPub4679					
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater			LPPub4700					
831771	Mrs Audrey Slater			LPPub4702					
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley			LPPub124		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Exclude development from AONB and level of protection of AONB	Around 5 comments have referred to North Wessex Downs AONB having a greater level of protection against development than the Oxford Green Belt and allocations in the AONB accordingly should be removed.
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub149					
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub173					
872363	Dr James Vincent			LPPub926					
756473	Mr Oliver Gardiner			LPPub1024		Core Policy 44	No	Exclude development from AONB and Green Belt	Around 43 comments have expressed they would like the allocated sites within the AONB and greenbelt to be removed. A number of comments state the Vale's uncritical acceptance of the SHMA figures as targets has led to the inappropriate allocation of sites within the Green Belt and North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). These allocations threaten to undermine the rural character of the Vale. There is no evidence to demonstrate exceptional circumstances, or that the allocations in the AONB are in the public interest. They note that, according to the Strategic Sites Summary Table produced by the consultants commissioned to carry out sustainability appraisals of potential sites for new housing, no "significant weighting" is applied to sites within the AONB and that therefore sites should be reallocated. At Harwell Campus, limit development to the north end within the existing campus, and remove the extension into greenfield land in East Hendred Parish (275 houses).
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth			LPPub2479					
872741	Mr Adrian Gainer			LPPub1128					
756280	Mr Richard Waters			LPPub2492					
730242	Mrs Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4504					
872790	Mrs Lorraine Elliott			LPPub4374					
831631	Marguerite Osbourne			LPPub1809					
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub338	6.112	Paragraph			
829387	Mr Keith			LPPub482	6.112	Paragraph			

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
831832	Russell	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub673	6.112	Paragraph			
871947	Joel Dothi			LPPub372	6.112	Paragraph			
872051	Mr David Scott			LPPub452	6.112	Paragraph			
872161	Mr Ian Page			LPPub593	6.112	Paragraph			
831397	Mr Keith Mintern			LPPub4059	6.112	Paragraph			
871358	B Read			LPPub160					
871400	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub184					
871793	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub299					
871143	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group			LPPub1018					
874461	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub3095					
829328	Paul Turner-Smith			LPPub4502					
874629	Mrs Ros Page			LPPub4377					
737200	Mr Mark Taylor	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2984					
876404	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP			LPPub4490					
	Miss Jacqui								

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
820249	Stabler Mr Gareth Morgan			LPPub2437					
871802	Professor Basil Crowley			LPPub2454					
828246	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4336					
829258	Miss Josephine Cormier			LPPub4275					
829482	Mr Paul Beasley			LPPub4469					
876219	Mrs Dina Tisdall			LPPub4119					
876244	K Slater			LPPub4205					
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg			LPPub4282					
828996	Mr Richard Benton			LPPub4453					
874124	Mr David Tilbury			LPPub4189					
874124	Mr David Tilbury			LPPub4190					
876219	Mrs Dina Tisdall			LPPub4126					
876219	Mrs Dina Tisdall			LPPub4121					
874696	Mr Tom Davies			LPPub4288					
725244	Mrs			LPPub4583					

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872717	Mary Elizabeth Morris Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4606					
877876	Mr Brian Morris			LPPub4645					
876244	Mr Chris Broad Chilton Parish Council			LPPub4678					
829328	K Slater			LPPub4502					
831771	Mrs Ros Page			LPPub4701					
872937	Mrs Sandra Belcher			LPPub1312		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Exclude development from the Greenbelt	One comment states the Green Belt should be protected at all costs in its entirety and not nibbled away at.
873605	Mr Bill Kler	873604	Ms Gemma Field Barton Willmore	LPPub3296		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Flexibility to enable local housing provision	One comment considers that the Policy should both protect the AONB but also allow sufficient flexibility for local housing and other needs of settlements to be met.

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
826255	Dr Patrick Moseley			LPPub109	6.113	Paragraph	No	Impact on Landscape from the East Harwell Site	Around 24 comments state that the site allocated for residential development at East Harwell falls entirely within the AONB and it is a high value landscape of high sensitivity. Consequently, it does not comply with the stated aims of the AONB, AONB guidance and policy, or Vale of White Horse Core Policy 44 relating to the protection of the AONB. Overall, the landscape impact of the proposed development will be negative. In landscape terms, the potential residential development of East Harwell will have significant and irreversible negative impacts. This conclusion is commensurate with the findings of the Vale of White Horse District Council Landscape Capacity Study. Reallocate sites accordingly.
871874	Ms Judith Russell			LPPub340	6.113	Paragraph			
829387	Mr Keith Russell			LPPub483	6.113	Paragraph			
831832	Joel Dothie			LPPub675	6.113	Paragraph			
871947	Mr David Scott			LPPub374	6.113	Paragraph			
872051	Mr Ian Page			LPPub454	6.113	Paragraph			
872161	Mr Keith Mintern			LPPub594	6.113	Paragraph			
871329	Mrs Heather Moseley			LPPub123		Core Policy 44: Landscape			
871358	Mr Brian Payne			LPPub161					
871400	Mrs Teresa Griffiths			LPPub185					
871793	Dr Pamela Dothie Save Chilton AONB Action Group			LPPub300					
871143	Mrs Alexandra Kapp			LPPub1020					
873924	Mrs Patricia Chung			LPPub1707					
873984	Mrs Valerie Andrews			LPPub1843					
874461	Paul Turner-			LPPub3099					

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
829328	Smith Mrs Ros Page			LPPub4506					
874629	Mr Mark Taylor			LPPub4381					
876404	Miss Jacqui Stabler			LPPub4491					
875989	Mr Derek Tisdall			LPPub4101					
828246	Mr Keith Robbins			LPPub4338					
829258	Miss Josephine Cormier			LPPub4276					
829482	Mr Paul Beasley			LPPub4470					
876244	K Slater			LPPub4209					
874609	Dr Jonathan Hogg			LPPub4286					
874154	A Anson			LPPub2274		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Landscape Impact	Plan is not compliant with the European Landscape Convention (ELC)
872735	Mr Timothy Howse			LPPub1110		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Maintaining village character of Harwell	Around 13 comments state there is no effective mechanisms to deliver the stated aim that: “ The countryside and villages will have maintained their distinctive character. The Larger Villages will have retained their separate identities...”. Saved policy NE10 should be updated to reflect the reality of the Valley Park allocation, and the proposals map should be extended to provide protection to Harwell Village. Add “to mitigate the against the coalescence of Harwell Village with Valley Park, a green wedge should be introduced east of the A34.”
872741	Mr Adrian Gainer			LPPub1129					
872778	Mr Andrew Fautley			LPPub1145					
873536	Miss Katherine Laing			LPPub1406					
873539	Mr Andrew Laing			LPPub1403					

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
873540	Mrs Anne Laing			LPPub1405					
873616	Mrs Margaret Hughes			LPPub1413					
873866	Dr J Watterson			LPPub1642					
726370	Ms C Quarini			LPPub2339					
831900	PJV Rounce			LPPub1873					
872589	Mr Jonathan Armitage			LPPub1455					
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3242					
756188	Mrs C Cornish			LPPub2353					
873535	Mr William Laing			LPPub4651					
872642	Mr Philip Sandford			LPPub4723					
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2860		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	North Abingdon Site	Around 4 comments regarding landscape impact at the North Abingdon Site. One comment points out that the masterplan for North Abingdon will take into account the requirements of CP44 and findings of the landscape capacity work and will be supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The other three comments are concerned this site will be urban sprawl into Green Belt land which is progressively destroying Abingdon's unique character, and views from the high land to the north of the town.
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub836					
741313	Radley College	724293	Mr Gillespie Carter Jonas LLP	LPPub2859					
873089	Mr Andrew Turner			LPPub1329					

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2796 LPPub279	6.113	Paragraph	Yes Yes	Oxford Views Study	English Heritage and the Oxford Preservation Trust share the view that the Plan should include reference to Oxford and the importance of its views and landscape setting which had previously be included as saved Policy NE8 and that three of the identified views in the Oxford Views Study are from viewpoints within the Vale (Raleigh Park/Harcourt Hill, Boars Hill and Hinksey Hill A34 Interchange) although its is recognised that this might be more appropriate for a more detailed landscape/views policy in the Local Plan Part 2
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance Oxford Preservation Trust			LPPub1430					
871866	Dr Kathryn Davies			LPPub1194		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Green setting of Oxford	Around 4 comments state that CP44 should make reference to protecting the green setting of Oxford and the importance of protecting views into and out of the city.
871866	Dr Kathryn Davies			LPPub1188					
831733	Ms Mary Gill West Way Community Concern			LPPub2196					
829002	Mr Grant Nightingale			LPPub2890					
868674	Mr Oliver Cornish			LPPub1298		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	South East of Hanney Site	One comments stated the proposal to build a new housing development South East of Hanney will be on an ancient ridge and furrow site and therefore present a negative impact on the natural environment.
873845	Mr Christopher Brand			LPPub1590		Core Policy 44: Landscape	No	Statutory Requirements of AONB	Around 5 comments highlight the statutory duty of having regard to the North Wessex Downs AONB and the provisions within the NPPF that "Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest"
829328	Mrs Ros Page			LPPub4501					
829328	Mrs Ros Page			LPPub4506					
829213	Ms Celina Sykes			LPPub230	6.107	Paragraph			
873946	Mrs Grace Garrett			LPPub1763					

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874128	A Smith			LPPub3023					
873946	Mrs Grace Garrett			LPPub1760					
874685	Maggie Brown			LPPub3242		Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy	No	Policy to protect important areas of greenspace	Develop in main settlements and limit elsewhere There needs to be a policy included in the Local Plan to prevent building on important areas of green space between villages to prevent coalescence, ie as in Shrivenham and Watchfield.
831994	Mr Charles Cottriall			LPPub3097		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe	No	Exclude development from Green Belt	Policy 44 There has been little made of the environmental impact to the proposals. Loss of rural view from Wytham Woods

Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure

Consultee ID	Consultee or organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2738		Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure	No	Green Infrastructure Audit /Strategy	4 respondents have raised concerns regarding the evidence base supporting this policy, in particular 1 respondent states there is a lack of evidence, rigour, urgency and the ANGst model has not informed the proposed sites; and 2 respondents have pointed out that the joint Green Infrastructure Strategy document has yet to be produced, and question the role and function of the Green Infrastructure Audit in the Plan's preparation as, whilst the standards set out are obtained from Natural England, these are not necessarily relevant to the District because the pattern of accessible natural green space is fractured across the district. The concern is that this audit represents an unachievable set of requirements for development sites. The Plan cannot require development proposals to improve assets, which do not relate to those proposals.
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub2987					
879120	Gow Family	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin McLoughlin Planning	LPPub4546					
850975	Karen Dodd			LPPub2834					
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural			LPPub2238	6.118	Paragraph	No	Natural England Comments	Natural England point out that the Oxfordshire authorities are undertaking more detailed studies to investigate air quality within the Oxford Meadows SAC adjacent to the A34 and A40, which will in turn inform specific mitigation

Consultee ID	Consultee or organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	England								interventions. They advise that the Council seeks to reconcile the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the plan with that of Cherwell which assessed the growth and found that none of the policies present in the draft plan would lead to likely significant effects on Oxford Meadows SAC, alone or in combination with others.
873089	Mr Andrew Turner			LPPub1331		Core Policy 45:	No	Impact on wildlife from North of Abingdon Site	8 respondents object to development at North Abingdon in the greenbelt due to the associated loss of wildlife habitats and adverse impact on neighbouring Black's Wood Ancient Woodland and the Sugworth SSSI.
870958	Mr David Adams			LPPub239	6.115	Paragrap			
873089	Mr Andrew Turner			LPPub1333	6.115	Paragraph			
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub837					
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub838					
872471	Dr Gill Turner			LPPub839					
872880	Mr David Hastings			LPPub1231					
831316	Mr R Garrett			LPPub4188					
730229	Mr Nigel Warner Abingdon Town Council			LPPub2074	0	Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure	Yes	Support CP45	2 respondents support CP45 stating all new housing sites should have green leisure areas which need to be identified and safeguarded and pleased to see the Council has commissioned a joint Green Infrastructure Strategy with South Oxfordshire District Council and that within Policy 45 there is a requirement for all new development to provide adequate GI that will provide a net gain for biodiversity.
832269	Penny Silverwood Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			LPPub2964					

Core Policy 46: Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
730191	Councillor Jim Halliday Vale of White Horse District Council			LPPub4759	6.123	Paragraph	No	Chapter 6 Para 6.123	Safeguard the land along the route of the former Wilts and Berks canal as per the saved policies: L14 and L15
724877	Mr Martin Small English Heritage South East Region			LPPub2792	6.123	Paragraph	Yes	English Heritage Comments	English Heritage suggest that the plan should also refer to historic significance of the Wilts and Berks Canal within the second bullet point at para 6.124
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England			LPPub2233		Core Policy 46	No	Farmland birds (Policy Wording)	Natural England states the Sustainability Appraisal advises net gain in biodiversity particularly targeting farmland birds therefore National England suggest that emphasis should be put on targeting farmland birds in the text supporting this policy.
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England			LPPub2233		Core Policy 46:	No	Farmland birds (Policy Wording)	Natural England advise one small change of policy wording to ensure it is effective. Policy CP46 should read: "...measures can be provided (and are secured...)".
829463 756521	Mrs Philippa Manvell Ms Sally Wallington Letcombe Brook Project			LPPub826 LPPub3186		Core Policy 46:	No	Impact on biodiversity at East Hanney site	2 respondents concerned regarding the impact of development at the site at East Hanney on the wildlife area at Letcombe Brook. Suggest the Council should reconsider site selection and either reduce or remove East Hanney site.
873089 831316	Mr Andrew Turner Mr R Garrett			LPPub1332 LPPub4191		Core Policy 46	No	Impact on biodiversity at North Abingdon	2 respondents object to development at North Abingdon in the greenbelt due to the associated loss of wildlife habitats and adverse impact on neighbouring Black's Wood Ancient Woodland and the Sugworth SSSI.
832467	Hazel Oliver			LPPub2659		Core Policy 46:	No	Impact on biodiversity	1 respondent is concerned that site 28 (North West Radley) at White's Lane, Radley for 240 houses will impact on biodiversity which has not been addressed.
830844	Caroline Ball			LPPub2082		Core Policy 46	No	Object to CP46	1 respondent considers that the impact on the environment and the countryside has not been fully considered.
729057	Ms Amanda Jacobs Oxfordshire County Council			LPPub3906		Core Policy 46	Yes	Support CP46	Oxfordshire County Council support CP46

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
872112	Mr Ken Oliver Wiltshire Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership			LPPub766	6.123	Paragraph	Yes	Wilts & Berks Canal	Wiltshire Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership, the Wilts & Berks Canal Trust and 2 other respondents would like the previous policy to be reinserted. The Partnership seeks assurance from VWHDC that the saved Local Plan Policies (L14 & L15) are to be
872554	Mr Chris Coyle Wilts & Berks Canal Trust			LPPub898	6.123	Paragraph	Yes		
728843	Mr James Halliday Foreman Laws LLP			LPPub3141	6.123	Paragraph	No		
756622	Mr Brian Stovold			LPPub1139	6.123	Paragraph	Yes		

Summary of Representation: Chapter 7 Implementing the Plan

Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3964		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	5 year supply	Four representations seek for Core Policy 47 to make greater reference to addressing five year housing land supply. Recommendations include how any shortfall will be accrued and a methodology of how this will be done, including a monitoring trajectory. Another seeks a commitment to the delivery of a five year housing land supply in the policy. Another requests an addendum to the Sustainability appraisal so that the Sedgefield approach to delivery can be assessed as a 'reasonable alternative'
723103	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS	723097	MR DAVID BAINBRIDGE BIDWELLS	LPPub3961		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	5 year supply	
30237	Mrs Maggie Brown Bourton Parish Council			LPPub4053		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	5 year supply	
831779	Landowners land at South Cumnor	724322	Mr Nick Lyzba John Phillips Planning Consultancy	LPPub3908		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	5 year supply	
827932	Julie Maberley Wantage and Grove Campaign Group			LPPub3612		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Employment/Infrastructure monitoring	One representation requests to provide for slower employment growth. Another requests 'when' and 'how' targets and to include monitoring of employment and infrastructure delivery
829923	Dr Stephen Webb Wantage Constituency Labour Party			LPPub3563		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Employment/Infrastructure monitoring	
725173	Policy Oxford City Council			LPPub2213		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Green belt	A representation from Oxford City Council seeks for Core Policy 47 to reflect the issues associated with development of sensitive sites within the green belt and how this may impact upon the delivery of these sites. They request that the policy also makes reference to the potential for a strategic green belt review to deal with potential under-delivery elsewhere.
756473	Mr Oliver Gardiner			LPPub1029		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring	13 comments received request that monitoring framework is revised so that checks take place every two years.
756654	Mrs Alice Gardiner			LPPub1066		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring	
831034	Philip Hawtin			LPPub1010		Core Policy 47:	No	Increase	

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
	Cumnor Parish Council					Delivery and Contingency		frequency of monitoring	
872735	Mr Timothy Howse			LPPub1112		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring.	
872741	Mr Adrian Gainer			LPPub1133		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring	
828768	Mr Christopher Bryan			LPPub2384		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring	
728489	Mr David Marsh Harwell Parish Council			LPPub3134		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring	
830045	Mrs Judy Roberts			LPPub3225		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring.	
730245	Ms Tina Brock Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3550		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring.	
829511	MR Stephen Heath			LPPub3477		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring.	
831034	Philip Hawtin Cumnor Parish Council			LPPub3738		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring.	
874243	Mrs Valerie Krol			LPPub3659		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring	
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3747		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Increase frequency of monitoring.	
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England			LPPub2234		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Landscape	One representation requests that landscape indicators should include developments that detrimentally affect the AONB.
827959	Mr James Krol			LPPub2612		Core Policy 47: Delivery and Contingency	No	Reasonable Alternatives	One representation states that the reasonable alternatives where made before the SHMA and are therefore no longer relevant.

Summary of Representations: Sustainability Appraisal Comments

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
874560	Ms Helen Marshall Campaign to Protect Rural England			LPPub3756 LPPub3751		Core Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	No	SA	<p>Previous alternatives considered in SA are unreasonable as they are pre-SHMA. Alternatives therefore cannot be described as 'reasonable' and need to be replaced. CPRE suggest four reasonable alternatives to explore.</p> <p>SA Report - Part 1 makes no mention to wider context and relationship to other plans or programmes. SA Report - Baseline information and 'future baseline' is inadequate. The 'environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected' is not adequate. Any existing environmental problems' is not adequate. The 'environmental protection objectives...' section is not adequate. No mention of the LEP and the role of the Joint Planning Board or its Implementation Plan. No effort has been made to look at overall environmental capacity of the SHMA/ LEP area to absorb the types and scale of development envisaged; No consideration has been given to whether the overall scale of development is sustainable – ie: can be achieved without significant environmental effects on the most sensitive areas and issue that must be given great weight under planning policy or statute; and No attempt has been made as a joint approach to distribute housing allocation and other development across the LEP/ SMHA area in accordance with environmental capacity and constraints, or with a view to the effects across local authority areas and environmental designations. The Sustainability Appraisal approach of defining environmental objectives in only very broad-brush terms, rolling together landscape archaeology and built heritage into a single objective and then applying only a tick-box approach to assessment of whether effects are likely to be positive or negative – with no indication of why or how effects on these topics actually interact – means that none of the above complex types of effect have been considered for any of the areas earmarked for development. The relative ratings of adverse effects in the tables in Appendix are simply not credible, and by rolling landscape, archaeology and built heritage together seriously downplay the complexity of effects where for example several separate national designations are affected. The approach has actively prevented a proper assessment compliant with the SEA requirements from being done. Not enough mention of synergistic, secondary or cumulative effects. The potential environmental effects of the scale of development that is envisaged by the Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan within the 'Science Vale Ring Fence (Section 14) have not been properly assessed. The SA does not explain at any point any technical difficulties to explain the severe shortcomings of baseline description and assessment of effects in the assessment identified above, and indeed there is no excuse for not making them far more robust and realistic based on readily available knowledge, field observation and experience of the past environmental effects of comparable types of development. NTS</p>

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									does not provide the required information. Do not agree that it is reasonable to test OAHN given constraints e.g. Green Belt and AONB in the Vale. "The sustainability assessment therefore wrongly accepts the inroads into the Green Belt, AONB, the setting of Listed Buildings etc as being sanctioned by the NPPF, when the opposite is the case"
737200	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughl in McLoughl in Planning	LPPub2911		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	Yes	SA	Supportive of the SA process in relation to justification of this site.
737357	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			LPPub2706		Core Policy 2: Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire	No	SA	The respondents consider that the plan does not have a robust and credible evidence base in respect of allocations made at Harwell Science Campus
831022	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley			LPPub1248	1.28	Paragraph	No	SA	Spatial Options: Many of the impacts are considered to require monitoring. Clarification is sought as to whether even with monitoring the preferred Option G can be demonstrated to have less negative impacts than Option A. Clarification is sought as to how the proposed mitigating measures will result in no significant environmental effects on villages of up to 500 dwellings in a rural area from an additional 8,000 dwellings, and how there would be no greater impact than the originally preferred option of 13,000 dwellings. Further justification for development in the AONB. Explanation required to whether the option of no development in the AONB has been considered as an alternative. The proposed 219 hectares of employment does not seems to be within the range tested.
832469	George Lambrick			LPPub3170	1.28	Paragraph	No	SA	The site allocations should be reviewed to ensure that the statutory duty to have special regard to preserving listed buildings and their settings and preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas will not be compromised. The SA/SEA has not followed EH Guidance (2011, 2013) on coverage of heritage in SAs and SEAs. SA criteria are wholly inadequate with regard to heritage assets. The assessment pre-supposes the effectiveness of core policies to avoid any harmful effects instead of excluding the areas where they would arise. The assessment is very formulaic with no mention of the grades of listed buildings or their topographic or visual relationship to the site or its historic character in relation to them. Further monitoring indicators suggested.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull			LPPub3547 LPPub822 LPPub2374	1.28	Paragraph	No	SA	Question the appraisal findings for the spatial strategy alternatives, stating that significant effects will occur for Objectives 3, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 under Option G (high growth). Question that there are no significant effects on rural villages through 8,000 additional dwellings

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
									in the South East Vale and how the impact would not be greater for 21,000 dwellings compared to 13,000 dwellings. The proposed 219 hectares of employment does not seem to be within the range tested. Clarification is sought as to whether in paragraph 13.3 the Sustainability Appraisal considered the option of no new housing allocations in the AONB at Harwell Campus. The SA does not take account of the additional dwellings under Option G not being located at existing Towns where the most jobs, shops and services are located.
725173	Oxford City Council			LPPub2215	1.34	Paragraph	No	SA	The option of Oxford City Council 'unmet need', should have been considered through the SA. Three further strategic housing delivery options have been suggested. The City Council considers that it is necessary to test an additional option for the 'overall pattern of development' that would focus development adjacent or in close proximity to Oxford.
831677	Mr Charles Routh Natural England			LPPub2245 LPPub2221 LPPub2222 LPPub2247 LPPub2219	1.34	Paragraph	No	SA	Disagree with LVIA findings. SA Scoring of site options is unclear. Provide further justification that all reasonable alternatives have been considered including the overall strategy to establish whether more appropriate sites are located outside the AONB to deliver all or part of this quantum of development. Provide additional justification and explanation of proposed approach in Oxfordshire and meeting individual OAHN. Concerns over landscape impact at Land south of East Hanney; East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor; North of Shrivenham in that development would be contrary to LCS findings. North of Shrivenham site is likely to have adverse hydrological effects on Tuckmill Meadows SSSI. The landscape indicators should include developments which detrimentally affect AONBs, i.e. exclude ones within which do not have a detrimental impact, and include ones outside of the designated area which do have a detrimental impact. Need to provide further justification to state the economic impact of the site allocation; and why development in adjacent is better than development further away outside the AONB. Further justification required as to the difference between February 2014 consultation sites and November 2014 sites.
725115	Mrs Valerie Andrews			LPPub1817		Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area	No	SA	Further justification for development in the AONB required.
758106	Harwell Oxford Campus Partnership	724452	Mr Steve Sensecall Kemp and Kemp	LPPub4769	1.28	Paragraph	Yes	SA	Further justification for development in the AONB is required with explanation as to why the Harwell Campus (employment site) has not been considered for further housing
879508	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	LPPub4552		Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and	No	Para 1.35 SA	This SA/SEA is lawfully defective for failure to properly consider alternatives, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in relation to meeting the needs of the Housing Market Area as a whole rather than just those of the District

Consultee ID	Consultee or Organisation	Agent ID	Agent	Comment ID	Paragraph Number	Plan Section	Plan Soundness	Category	Summary
						Oxford Fringe Sub-Area			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the inconsistencies over many stages of assessment culminating in the failure to include the Radley South site as a strategic site the exclusion of the site means a reasonable alternative has been excluded and this breaches the SEA Directive and the Regulation 12(2)(b).
874243	Mrs Valerie Krol			LPPub3659		Paragraph 1.25 (SA related)	No	Housing Contingency	Alternatives applied before the publication of the SHMA and are now completely irrelevant. They cannot therefore be described as 'reasonable' and need to be replaced.