

# **Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2 Examination**

## **List of Matters and Questions**

### **Matter 1: Duty to Co-operate and other legal requirements**

#### Questions:

- 1.1 What are the strategic matters relevant to the LPP2 and which other authorities/organisations are affected?
- 1.2 How has the engagement been carried out, what has been the outcome and how has this addressed the strategic matters?
- 1.3 Has the Council engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with the relevant bodies in maximising the effectiveness of the LPP2?
- 1.4 Overall, has the Council satisfactorily discharged its duty to co-operate to maximise the effectiveness of the LPP2?
- 1.5 Has the preparation of the LPP2 complied with the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and the relevant regulations?
- 1.6 Has the preparation of the LPP2 complied with the Statement of Community Involvement?
- 1.7 Is the LPP2 compliant with the Local Development Scheme?
- 1.8 Have the likely environmental, social and economic effects of the LPP2 been adequately addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal? Does the appraisal test the plan against reasonable alternatives for the spatial strategy of the plan and the distribution of housing?
- 1.9 Does the Habitats Regulations Assessment identify likely significant effects of the LPP2 on European nature conservation sites and, if so, put forward appropriate mitigation measures?

## **Matter 2: Unmet housing needs from Oxford**

(Note: This matter does not include detailed discussion at site specific level)

Questions:

- 2.1 How has the 2,200 working assumption for unmet housing needs from Oxford within the Vale been arrived at and is it supported by proportionate evidence?
- 2.2 What are the arrangements for reviewing or updating this working assumption?
- 2.3 Is the spatial strategy for meeting these unmet housing needs in the Abingdon on Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives and supported by proportionate evidence?
- 2.4 Is the stated strategy for meeting these unmet housing needs in the Abingdon on Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area followed through in the LPP2?
- 2.5 Given the NPPF requirement for exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated for any alterations to the Green Belt and the availability of potential sites, is the balance of the strategy between Green Belt releases (one site – Dalton Barracks) and sites outside the Green Belt the most appropriate?
- 2.6 To what extent is the strategy for meeting these unmet needs deliverable in the necessary timescale?
- 2.7 To what extent is the strategy for meeting these unmet needs sufficiently flexible if the working assumption figure is revised in future?
- 2.8 What are the arrangements for securing affordable housing to meet the needs of Oxford within this figure. Would they be effective and deliverable?
- 2.9 How would the strategy for meeting Oxford's housing needs within the Vale be monitored to ensure its delivery? Is a housing supply ring fence for Abingdon and the Oxford Fringe sub area required?

### **Matter 3: Overall housing provision in the plan and its distribution between sub-areas**

(Note: This matter does not include detailed discussion at site specific level)

Questions:

- 3.1 Is the proposal in the LPP2 to allocate 1,400 additional homes in the South East Vale Sub Area to support the economic growth of the Science Vale consistent with the strategy in the LPP1, supported by proportionate evidence and deliverable?
- 3.2 Is the proposal in the LPP2 not to allocate additional sites in the Western Vale Sub Area consistent with the strategy in the LPP1 and supported by proportionate evidence?
- 3.3 Taking the objectively assessed housing needs of the Vale and the unmet needs of Oxford together, is the overall housing provision in the LPP2, its distribution between sub areas and its various components, consistent with the strategy in the LPP1, supported by proportionate evidence and deliverable?
- 3.4 How would the overall provision of housing in the district be monitored to ensure delivery? Is the housing supply ring fence for the Science Vale area still relevant and necessary?
- 3.5 Does the LPP2 provide for the housing needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People as envisaged by, or in a manner consistent with, Policy CP27 of the LPP1?

## **Matter 4: Abingdon and Oxford Fringe Sub Area**

(Note: This matter includes site specific issues)

Questions:

- 4.1 Other than Dalton Barracks (Matter 5), are the housing allocations listed in Policy 8a the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts? Are the estimates of site capacity justified? Are the expected timescales for development realistic? Are the site development template requirements – both general and site specific – justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?
  - (a) North of East Hanney
  - (b) North East of East Hanney
  - (c) East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (in Fyfield and Tubney Parish)
  - (d) South East of Marcham
- 4.2 Are the proposals to safeguard land for (i) a Park and Ride site at Lodge Hill and (ii) a north bound bus lane along the A34 between Lodge Hill and Hinksey justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?
- 4.3 Are the proposals to safeguard land for a Park and Ride site at Cumnor justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?
- 4.4 Are the proposals to safeguard land for the Marcham by-pass justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?
- 4.5 Are the proposals to extend the area of safeguarded land for the Upper Thames Strategic Storage Reservoir justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?

## **Matter 5: Dalton Barracks**

(Note: Discussion should cover the long term proposal for 4,000+ dwellings as well as the proposal for 1,200 dwellings during the plan period. This matter includes site specific issues)

Questions:

- 5.1 Given the NPPF requirement for exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated for any alterations to the Green Belt, is the proposal to establish an inset to the Green Belt at Dalton Barracks justified by proportionate evidence in principle?
- 5.2 Is the detailed alignment of the proposed Green Belt inset boundary justified and supported by proportionate evidence?
- 5.3 Is the housing allocation at Dalton Barracks appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts? Have these been adequately assessed? Are the detailed requirements in Core Policy 8b and the site development template requirements – both general and site specific – justified and would they provide an appropriate basis for preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document for the site?
- 5.4 How would the proposal for Dalton Barracks relate to the existing community of Shippon? What new services, facilities and infrastructure links would be provided and is this realistic? Is the proposal viable? Would it comprise sustainable development?
- 5.5 Would the proposal for a Country Park as part of the development adequately mitigate any impact on nearby ecological sites or be otherwise justified and deliverable? How would it be managed and maintained?
- 5.6 Are the proposals to safeguard land for bus/cycle links between Dalton Barracks and the Lodge Hill Park and Ride site justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?
- 5.7 Is the estimate of site capacity justified in the plan period and in the long term?
- 5.8 Is it realistic for 1,200 dwellings to be delivered on the site during the plan period? What are the arrangements for the relocation of the existing military personnel on the site and are they realistic? How would the development be phased, and how would this relate to the continuing operation of the barracks?

## **Matter 6: South East Vale Sub Area**

(Note: This matter includes site specific issues)

Questions:

- 6.1 Other than Harwell Campus (Matter 7), is the housing allocation listed in Policy 15a at Grove the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts? Is the estimate of site capacity justified? Is the expected timescale for development realistic? Are the site development template requirements – both general and site specific - justified?
- 6.2 Are the seven Didcot Garden Town Masterplan Principles justified and would they provide an appropriate basis for the future preparation of more detailed planning policies for the area?
- 6.3 Are the proposals to amend the safeguarded land for the Culham to Didcot Thames River Crossing justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?
- 6.4 Are the proposals to safeguard land for access from the A34 to Milton Park justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?
- 6.5 Are the proposals to safeguard land for a pedestrian/cycle bridge across the A34 at Milton Heights justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?
- 6.6 Are the proposals to extend the safeguarded land for reopening Grove Railway Station justified? Would there be any adverse impacts?

## **Matter 7: Harwell Campus**

(Note: This matter includes site specific issues)

Questions:

- 7.1 Is the proposal in the LPP2 to allocate a site for 1,000 dwellings for an Innovation Village at Harwell Campus consistent with the strategy of the LPP1 for the district as a whole and the South East Vale Sub Area?
- 7.2 Given the exceptional circumstances and national interest tests in the NPPF for major development in the AONB, is the proposal for an Innovation Village justified by proportionate evidence in principle?
- 7.3 Is the use of employment land for the proposed Innovation Village compatible with the long term employment objectives for Harwell Campus and the Enterprise Zone?
- 7.4 Is the proposal for an Innovation Village appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives (if any) in the light of site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts? Have these been adequately assessed? How would the Innovation Village be delivered and managed in the long term to ensure it meets its objectives? Are the detailed requirements in Core Policy 15b and the site development template requirements – both general and site specific – justified and would they provide an appropriate basis for the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document for the site?
- 7.5 Are the detailed boundaries of the site justified and supported by proportionate evidence? Is the estimate of site capacity justified? Is the expected timescale for development realistic?
- 7.6 How would the proposal for the Innovation Village relate to the village of Harwell and other nearby settlements? What new services, facilities and infrastructure links would be provided and is this realistic? Is the proposal viable? Would it comprise sustainable development?

## **Matter 8: Housing land supply, viability, delivery and monitoring**

- 8.1 Do the provisions of the LPP2 make the necessary contribution towards a five year supply of deliverable housing sites against the stated housing requirement for the District as a whole and the Science Vale ring fence area?
- 8.2 Do the provisions of the LPP2 make the necessary contribution towards meeting the stated housing requirement for the District as a whole and the Science Vale ring fence area over the full plan period to 2031?
- 8.3 Are the figures for completions and known commitments (both overall and in each sub-area) accurate? Should any allowance be made for the non-implementation of commitments?
- 8.4 Is the revised calculation for windfall sites in the LPP2 (both overall and in each sub-area) compared to the LPP1 supported by proportionate evidence and consistent with national policy?
- 8.5 Has the cumulative impact of the policies and standards of the LPP1 and LPP2 together with nationally required standards on the viability of development been appropriately assessed? Would these put the implementation of the plan at risk and would they facilitate development throughout the economic cycle?
- 8.6 Do LPP2 Core Policy 47a and the monitoring framework in Appendix N provide a sound basis for monitoring implementation of the LPP2 and for the necessary action to be taken should the LPP2 not be delivered as envisaged?

## Matter 9: Development Management Policies

### Questions:

- 9.1 Are the development management policies in the plan positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy? In turn:

#### Building healthy and sustainable communities

- 1 Self and custom-build
- 2 Space standards
- 3 Sub-division of dwellings
- 4 Residential annexes
- 5 Replacement dwellings in the open countryside
- 6 Rural workers dwellings
- 7 Re-use/conversion/extension of buildings for dwellings in the open countryside
- 8 Community services and facilities
- 9 Public houses

#### Supporting economic prosperity

- 10 Ancillary uses on employment land
- 11 Community employment plans
- 12 Rural diversification and equestrian developments
- 13 Change of use of retail units to other uses
- 14 Village and local shops
- 15 Retail parks

#### Supporting sustainable transport and accessibility

- 16 Access
- 17 Transport assessments and travel plans
- 18 Public car parking in settlements
- 19 Lorries and roadside services

#### Protecting the environment and responding to climate change

- 20 Public art
- 21 External lighting
- 22 Advertisements
- 23 Impact of development on amenity
- 24 Effect of neighbouring or previous uses on new developments
- 25 Noise pollution
- 26 Air quality
- 27 Land affected by contamination
- 28 Waste collection and recycling
- 29 Settlement character and gaps
- 30 Watercourses
- 31 Protection of public rights of way, national trails and open access areas
- 32 The Wilts and Berks Canal
- 33 Open space
- 34 Leisure and sports facilities
- 35 New countryside recreation facilities
- 36 Heritage assets
- 37 Conservation areas
- 38 Listed buildings
- 39 Archaeology and scheduled monuments