



**Local Plan 2031
Part 2
Detailed Policies and
Additional Sites**

**Regulation 22
Consultation
Statement
Appendix 3**
Summary of
Representations

Appendix 3: Summary of Representations

Contents

Chapter 2.....	175
Core Policy 4a: Meeting our Housing Needs	175
Core Policy 8a: Additional Site Allocations for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	196
East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (Fyfield and Tubney Parish).....	215
North of East Hanney	238
North-East of East Hanney	253
South-East Marcham.....	262
Core Policy 8b: Dalton Barracks Comprehensive Development Framework.....	270
Core Policy 12a: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	305
Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt.....	316
Core Policy 14a: Upper Thames Strategic Storage Reservoir	324
Core Policy 15a: South East Vale Sub Area	328
North-West of Grove.....	333
Core Policy 15b: Harwell Campus	336
Core Policy 16b: Didcot Garden Town.....	360
Core Policy 18a: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	363
Core Policy 19a: Re-opening of Grove Railway Station	368
Core Policy 20a: Housing Supply Western Vale Sub-Area	370
Chapter 3.....	374
Housing.....	374
Economy	383
Transport.....	386
Environment	399
Chapter 4.....	420
Core Policy 47a: Delivery and Contingency.....	420
Appendices	424
Appendix A – Site Development Templates: General Requirements	424
Site Selection.....	429
Habitats Regulations Assessment.....	438
Sustainability Appraisal	440
Miscellaneous	448

Chapter 2

Core Policy 4a: Meeting our Housing Needs

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments from Oxfordshire County Council	Oxfordshire County Council is largely supportive of the Local Plan 2031 part 2 which is required by Core Policy 2 of the Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) in relation to Oxford's unmet need, and also includes development management policies and other matters.	Support from Oxfordshire County Council is acknowledged and welcomed.
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd					Compliance with NPPF	A number of responses make specific reference to whether the plan is consistent with National policy, including compliance with NPPF Paragraphs 158, 159, 178-182, whether it supports sustainable development and whether it is compatible with the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' and 'boosts significantly' the supply of housing. Particular reference is made to NPPF Paragraph 182 and the 'tests of soundness'.	The Council is satisfied that the plan is consistent with national policy, guidance and legislation and meets the tests of soundness. LPP1 fully meets the OAN identified for VOWH and has been found sound through examination. LPP2 seeks to fully meet the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford, to be addressed within the Vale, as identified by the Oxfordshire Growth Board. The plan also seeks to allocate additional sites in conformity with the stated aims of LPP2, set out in the adopted LPP1, and subject to Examination. Overall, the Council is satisfied that LPP1 and LPP2 significantly boost the supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF. CP1 embeds the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development into LPP1 and was found to be soundly based through Examination.
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments			No				
1144552	Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies	No				
1145068	Mr Stuart Gibson				No				
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem	Natural England					Compliance with NPPF - Statutory Natural England	Planning consultation: Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2031 Part 2. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England is of the opinion that as it stands this Local Plan is not legally compliant and currently does not meet all of the tests of soundness, namely, whether it is effective and whether it is consistent with national policy. However, Natural England's concerns centre around the need for further evidence. Discussions are already being held with regard evidence requirements and once this information is available we would be happy to review our advice with regards to soundness of the plan.	The Council considers that it's evidence base is sufficient for the purposes of satisfying the requirements of national policy and guidance. However, is committed to continue working positively with Natural England. This matter is also discussed within the Statement of Common Ground between VOWH and Natural England.
1096915		Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No	Flexibility - Insufficient Range of Sites	A number of responses consider that allocating seven sites within LPP2 is insufficient to provide flexibility in housing supply should some of the larger sites be stalled and that the plan does not encourage the release of small/ medium sized sites. Furthermore, that smaller sites are needed to maintain a supply of deliverable housing sites and that the plan is over-reliant on large sites. The Govt White Paper 'Fixing our Broken Housing Market' is cited in particular by stating the importance of diversifying the market; opening it up to smaller builders and 'making more	The Council considers that its proposed housing supply is robust and provides sufficient flexibility. LPP1 was informed by independent consultancy advice relating to housing delivery, which recommended the importance of allocating a range of sites of varying size, type and geography. The Home Builders Federation provided similar advice within their LPP1 representations. LPP1 and LPP2 achieve such a range of sites in terms of size, type and geography.
1097491	Summix (Chilton) Development LLP		1097488	Peter Frampton	No				
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire,	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144009	Mr Mark Tinson	Hills Homes Developments Ltd	1144008	Miss Emma Greening	Hunter Page Planning	No		land available for homes in the right places, by maximising the contribution from brownfield and surplus public land, regenerating estates, releasing more small and medium-sized sites'. Problems associated with delivering large sites are set out along with the assertion that VOWH has experienced recent under-delivery. It is stated that there is no agreed approach to addressing unmet housing need for Oxford City and that SODC have not signed the Memorandum of Co-operation.	Across these two plans, ten sites are allocated or proposed within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area; seven of these are smaller sites capable of delivering quickly accounting for 32 % of the plan supply through allocations in this area. Within the Western Vale Sub-Area six sites are allocated in LPP1; 4 of which are smaller sites capable of delivering quickly accounting for almost 50 % of the plan supply through allocations in this area. The South-East Vale Sub-Area contains a much higher proportion of larger sites; seven out of nine allocate 400 homes or more. This reflects the Spatial Strategy aim to focus sustainable growth within the Science Vale area, thus supporting the OX LEP SEP and assist with delivering the LTP4 package of strategic infrastructure. Core Policy 5 – Housing Supply Ring Fence provides additional flexibility for this sub-area recognising that larger sites may take longer to come forward; hence housing supply is monitored separately. This approach was found to be 'soundly based' through the LPP1 Examination.
1145048		Earl of Plymouth Estates Ltd	1145367	Mrs Sarah Moorhouse	Litchfields	No			
1145068	Mr Stuart Gibson					No			
728491	Mr Paul Gibbs	Culham Parish Council				No	Govt Consultation	A number of comments cite the recent Govt consultation on proposed methodology for calculating housing need; stating the new projections indicate that the housing need for VOWH will be lower than identified by the Oxfordshire SHMA and that the plan should be amended accordingly. Some comments refer to the transitional arrangements set out within the Govt consultation where it is made clear that plans to be submitted before the end of March 2018 should proceed using existing methodology and evidence.	The Govt consultation on the proposed new methodology for calculating housing need includes transitional arrangements for their implementation. They clearly state that any plan to be submitted ahead of the end of March 2018 should do so using existing methodology and evidence. The Govt consultation on a proposed methodology has yet to be finalised and its intended publication date (Spring 2018) may change. It is not appropriate for the Vale to plan on the basis of a future change in policy, that has yet to be finalised, and in any case would be inconsistent with the transitional arrangements. Furthermore, there is currently no evidence to indicate that the VOWH housing requirement will change if the new methodology is implemented in its proposed form. The methodology is based on a formula relating to housing affordability and income. Figures published in 207, as part of the consultation, indicate a need for 689 per annum. The existing SHMA, in relation to affordability, identified a need of 683 dwellings per annum, which is clearly comparable to the figure derived using the new methodology. However, the existing SHMA also takes account of housing need associated within economic growth, for which the new methodology does not. The Govt consultation does however make it clear that Councils should take account of economic growth when calculating their housing requirement. On this basis, it is currently not
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett					No			
828782	Mrs Emily Smith					No			
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell					No			
829470	Dr Christopher Baker					No			
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth					No			
872941	Dr Andrew Turner	North Abingdon Local Plan Group				No			
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					No			
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097646	Ian Hepburn	North Wessex Downs AONB				No			possible to conclude if or how housing need may change as a result of the Govt consultation. Work will be undertaken, in partnership with the other Oxfordshire authorities, to identify a future housing requirement as part of the shared commitment to prepare a Joint Spatial Plan for Oxfordshire for submission to the Secretary of State in March 2020.
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall					No			
1139063	Mrs Elizabeth Graham					No			
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis					No			
1142760	Mr Fergus Cable-Alexander					No			
1142975	Mrs Daphne Carrington-Ough					No			
1143141	Dr Mary Gill					No			
1144099	Mr Robert Evans					No			
1144158	Mr Matthew Stephenson					No			
1144185	Mr Yoshi Nishio					No			
1144244	Mrs Michele Magoris					No			
1144871	Mr William Hailey					No			
1145048		Earl of Plymouth Estates Ltd				No			
1145048		Earl of Plymouth Estates Ltd	1145367	Mrs Sarah Moorhouse	Litchfields	No			
1145537	Ms Clare Arnold	Ashbury Parish Council							
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Housing Delivery	A number of comments raise concerns around housing delivery, particularly amalgamating the 1,000 homes cited in LPP1 to be allocated in LPP2, along with the suggestion that the plan relies too heavily on larger sites. It is stated that the housing trajectory accompanying LPP2 indicates that some proposed LPP2 allocations will deliver within five years, yet the Council's current five-year supply statement does not include LPP2 allocations; this is described as an apparent contradiction.	The updated completions and commitments figures, set out in LPP2, mean that the Vale's Objectively Assessed Need (20,560) is already fully planned for, without any need for further allocations within LPP2. Even if the Council's proposed amendment to the windfall allowance was not supported by the Inspector, and without any site allocations in LPP2, supply would still exceed 21,000. It is important to note that the completions and commitments include around 22 percent made up of smaller sites; and so
1096329		Blanchard Enterprises	1096331	Mr Simon Handy	Strutt & Parker LLP	No			
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning				
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1098047	Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				the requirement envisaged in LPP1 for small site allocations has been more than adequately met.
1143092	Mrs Sian Keeling	David Wilson Homes Ltd (Southern)	1143090	Mrs Sophie Horsley	Strutt & Parker	No		<p>It is suggested that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the LPP2 allocations will deliver within the plan period, in particular, that there is overly optimistic lead in times and overly optimistic assumptions regarding delivery rates. Some specific examples are cited, for example that not more than 400 homes can be delivered at North Abingdon ahead of the Lodge Hill slips being delivered, concerns are also raised in relation to Harwell Campus and Dalton Barracks – it is suggested that a buffer of at least 10 % is provided on a sub-area basis.</p> <p>It is incumbent on the Council to ensure at the outset that the Local Plan makes provision for sufficient levels of housing over its plan period and to ensure that it is able to maintain a rolling five-year supply of housing land throughout the plan period. The Completions figure 2011/12 to 2016/17, at 4,680 is cited as equating to 780 dwellings per annum, which is lower than the annual requirement.</p> <p>Particular concern is also raised over the reliance of large sites within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, along with the overall quantum of development proposed within this area, which is considered to constitute an unrealistic trajectory in this area.</p> <p>The Part 2 Plan should focus growth at non-strategic sites to provide a continuity of housing land supply over the short and longer term.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the mix of sites proposed provides sufficient flexibility in size, type and location, that the identified sites are deliverable and that a five-year land supply can be maintained on a rolling basis. The approach to the South-East Vale Sub-Area differs from the other two sub-areas, as discussed separately; flexibility is provided by Core Policy 5 – Housing Supply Ring Fence, which has been found to be soundly based.</p> <p>The Council has updated its Housing Trajectory, published alongside the Submission Plan, which sets out robust evidence to demonstrate site delivery.</p> <p>The Council's current five-year land supply statement does not include proposed LPP2 allocations, as they have not yet been tested through Examination. The Housing Trajectory, accompanying the Submission Plan does include the LPP2 sites, and subject to Examination, the sites are considered to be deliverable. There is therefore no contradiction between these two documents.</p>
1143993	Mr Marc Rawcliffe					No			
1144552	Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies		No			
1145048		Earl of Plymoth Estates Ltd	1145367	Mrs Sarah Moorhouse	Litchfields	No			
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd							
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman	Bovis Homes Limited				No			
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No			
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Housing Density	It is stated that the plan is neither sound nor positive as it does not include a target housing density for proposed developments. It is suggested that increasing housing densities will assist in increasing the number of homes delivered and improve their affordability, as more smaller homes will be provided for.	Core Policy 23: Housing Density, as set out within LPP1, provides the Council's policy for housing density on new development sites. This policy was found to be soundly based and is included within LPP1 adopted in December 2016.
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill	Oxford Green Belt Network				No	Housing Requirement	<p>A number of comments raise concern over the housing requirement, particularly the validity of the Oxfordshire Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SHMA). It is stated that the housing requirement for the Vale, for Oxford and for Oxfordshire is too high. Some comments also question the technical validity of the SHMA. Furthermore, that insufficient consideration has been given to the infrastructure needed to support delivery, including the need to assess the cumulative impact of development. Reference is also made to the Govt consultation on proposed methodology for calculating housing need, which is described separately. And that no</p>	<p>The Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has been scrutinised at Examination in both Vale of White Horse and Cherwell District Council's and found to be soundly based. Furthermore, the Govt consultation on proposed methodology for calculating housing requirements sets out clear transitional arrangements whereby any plan to be submitted ahead of March 2018 should proceed using existing evidence (the Govt Consultation is also discussed in more detail separately). One of the main role's of LPP2 is to address the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale as agreed by</p>
728491	Mr Paul Gibbs	Culham Parish Council				No			
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett								
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No			
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
742134	Mr Robert Warne	S.P.A.D.E				No		consideration has been given for the implications of Brexit.	the Oxfordshire Growth Board and signed by all but one Oxfordshire Authority.
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No		It is stated by a number of respondents that the plan is unsound as it plans for more housing than that identified by the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) and the agreed quantum of unmet need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale. The identified housing requirement is 22,760, whereas the plan makes provision for around 24,748 dwellings.	The Council considers that the term 'at least' in the context of housing provision is necessary to ensure the plan is soundly based and consistent with national policy. Core Policy 1 (LPP1) sets out how the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development will apply within the district, for example being applied to the built area of Market Town, Local Service Centres and Larger Villages. This policy and approach was found to be soundly based at Examination and is included within the adopted LPP1.
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd				No			
785705	Mr Brian Rixon	Sunningwell Parish Council				No		A number of comments object to use of the term 'at least' in relation to the housing requirement for the district. Some respondents consider that the housing requirement is insufficient and that a 20 % buffer should be applied. It is stated, for example, that SODC have not signed the Memorandum of Cooperation with the Oxfordshire Growth Board and do not seek to fully meet the identified quantum of unmet need for Oxford to be addressed within South Oxfordshire.	The Oxfordshire growth Board have overseen a process to apportion unmet housing need for Oxford and all but one Oxfordshire Authority have signed the Memorandum of Understanding. The Vale of White Horse is seeking to meet, in full, the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford agreed to be delivered within the Vale. It will be a matter for the Examination of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan whether South Oxfordshire should meet the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford agreed to be met within South Oxfordshire by the Oxford Growth Board.
823359	Mr John Attree					No			
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No		Comments relating to the overall housing requirement include those that refer to the relative unaffordability of housing within the Vale and the need for workers to commute to the district, thus providing support for providing additional housing within the district.	
827932	Julie Mabblerley	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No			
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				No		The Home Builders Federation state that they are pleased to see the Council looking to bring forward necessary sites to address the needs and that the level of co-operation across Oxfordshire is welcomed and that they consider that the Duty-to-Cooperate has been met.	
865452	Mr Robin Border					No			
872591	Miss Layla Moran	Liberal Democrats, Oxford West and Abingdon				No			
872717	Mr Brian Morris					No			
872819	Mr Gordon Garraway					No			
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No			
1022242	Dr David Illingworth	North Abingdon Local Plan Group				No			
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman	Bovis Homes Limited				Yes			
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					No			
1095934	Ms P Dothie					No			
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No			
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall					No			
1098082	Phillip Carder					No			
1100261		Catesby Property Group	1096086	Taylor Cherrett	Turley				
1137748	Dr Saul Myerson					No			
1139063	Mrs Elizabeth Graham					No			
1142392	Mr Vic Johnson					No			
1143225	mr Graham Sloper					No			
1144491	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke					No			
1144552	Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies		No			
1144620	House Builders Federation		1144619	Mr Mark Behrendt					
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore				
742134	Mr Robert Warne	S.P.A.D.E				No	Housing Requirement - 5YHLS	This response sets out a number of requests, in particular, that it should be made explicit in the plan that the housing requirement for monitoring purposes should be 22,760 homes based on the Objectively Assessed Need and agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be met within the Vale. It is also suggested that the plan supply within the plan should not exceed the requirement.	The Housing Requirement (22,760 homes) is clearly set out by Core Policy 4a and this will form the housing requirement for the purposes of monitoring five-year housing land supply. The Council considers that it is prudent to plan for some resilience to ensure a rolling five-year land supply can be provided throughout the plan period.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett						Housing Requirement - Affordability	It is suggested that the Plan does not make adequate provision for Affordable Housing and a comparison is made with Oxford City policy, which requires 50 % affordable housing on a site by site basis, and West Oxfordshire, whose policy requires 40 % affordable housing. The Vale Policy requires 35 % affordable housing on sites of 11 dwellings or more.	The Council considers that it is the total amount of affordable housing being planned for that is all important, rather than the percentage required on a site by site basis. The Vale Policy for 35 % affordable housing (Core Policy 24) is based on up-to-date evidence of the need for affordable housing in the district, along with consideration for what can be delivered without affecting the viability of the
850794	Ms Sue Holmes	Oxford Brookes University							
872591	Miss Layla Moran	Liberal Democrats,				No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
		Oxford West and Abingdon						<p>It is also suggested that the plan does nothing to address affordability more generally, i.e. the general affordability of housing, over and above the provision of 'affordable housing'.</p> <p>Oxford Brookes University welcomes policies that support good quality, affordable housing options for staff across all income levels.</p>	<p>development, as required by National Policy. The Vale of White Horse Local Plan (Parts 1 and 2) makes provision to deliver the identified need for affordable housing within the Vale, in full, and to meet the identified need for Oxford, as part of the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford agreed to be provided within the Vale, in full.</p> <p>In terms of housing affordability in general terms, by planning to meet the Objectively Assessed Need for housing for the Vale, in full, and to meet the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford agreed to be met within the Vale, in full, the Council are significantly boosting housing supply, which contributes to improving housing affordability. Furthermore, the policies for Housing Density (CP23) and Housing Mix (CP22) ensure that an appropriate mix of houses are provided of both size and type, thus including smaller, more affordable dwellings, as well as family housing.</p>
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No	Housing Requirement - Delivery - Statutory Oxfordshire County Council	Oxfordshire County Council state that the Housing Trajectory is optimistic with early delivery expected on some sites and good rates of build-out on the larger sites. Nevertheless, it is understood that developers have indicated support for these delivery dates.	The Council have a robust methodology for monitoring housing delivery and consider their housing trajectory to also be robust. The methodology has been found to be soundly based at the LPP1 Examination and to be robust at a series of S78 Appeals.
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore		Housing Requirement - Distribution	A number of comments object to the subsuming of the proposed Part 2 housing requirement of 1,000 dwellings set out in the Part 1 plan with the housing proposed to address the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be accommodated within the Vale.	The Council considers that the proposed site allocations within the Part 2 plan are fully consistent with the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy included within the Part 1 plan. The Council is seeking to meet the identified Objectively Assessed Need in full and the identified quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale in full. The plan continues to make provision for the housing requirement and distribution identified by the Part 1 plan, albeit with a small adjustment to take account of the residual required to be allocated within the Part 2 plan. Matters concerning the mix of sites, site delivery, the windfall allowance, and approach to unmet need are all discussed separately. The plan does not rely on any development coming forward through neighbourhood plans, it simply reflects the fact that neighbourhood plans may allocate sites, this is a matter for the body preparing the neighbourhood plan.
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd							
879120	Gow Family								
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning			The windfall allowance for the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area is questioned as it is proposed all sites would have to be located outside the Oxford Green Belt.	
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd			Clarity is sought on how unmet housing needs for Oxford will be met. It is stated that the table on Page 30 only refers to 2020 homes being allocated in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area, thus some contribution will be from windfalls. Some comments also question's the role of the Part 1 sites, which were thought to be contributing housing for the Vale need, but is stated within Part 2 to contribute to both Vale and Oxford Need. It is suggested that Table 2.1 that seeks to demonstrate those sites that may be considered to be close and accessible to Oxford is unhelpful and that it should be replaced with a list of sites that contribute to Oxford's housing need.	
1096069	Ms Jones	Redcliffe Homes Ltd				No			
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning				The Council agrees that it is not possible to precisely define who will chose to buy individual homes and whether they fall within a Vale housing need or an Oxford housing need. For this reason, the Council does not seek to define sites precisely as 'Oxford' or 'Vale' sites. Doing so would make no difference to who purchased the housing and whether they met one housing need or another. The Council does consider that it is appropriate that at least 2,200
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning	No			
1096854		RH Systems	1144378	Mrs Sarah Kasparian	Bell Cornwell LLP	No			
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No		It is suggested that the plan is inconsistent with the Spatial Strategy, as seeking to provide housing for	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley			Oxford on sites that are accessible and close to Oxford, is clearly contrary to the Spatial Strategy key strand to provide housing in rural areas and the lack of housing being allocated within the Western Vale.	homes should be provided for that are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford, while continuing to deliver the quantum of housing needed for Vale in each of the three Sub-Areas.
1098047	Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd			It is suggested that there is no justification to depart from the LPP1 Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy as there are various locations adjacent to more sustainable settlements, including the Market Town of Wantage. Reference is made to reliance on sites within the AONB and Oxford Green Belt, these are discussed separately.	
1143322	Dr Mike Wise					No			
1145236	Mrs Penelope McCall					No		It is suggested that the relationship between housing delivered within the Vale arising from Oxford's need are complex and that it is impossible to identify new homes within any part of the Vale that will be exclusively purchased by residents who fall within the Oxford need. It is therefore suggested that whilst the housing need provided for within the Part 2 plan should include the 2,200 homes to contribution towards housing for Oxford, there is no reason why this housing should be located in proximity to Oxford, as the part 1 plan already makes provision for housing, in both the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and the South-East Vale Sub-Area. The role of alternative sites is discussed, including within Wantage; this is discussed elsewhere within the summary of responses. It is suggested that the proposed allocations within the Part 2 plan are inconsistent with the Spatial Strategy, are predominantly located within village locations, which have more limited range of services and facilities. Comments state that insufficient housing is planned for within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and that much more housing should be allocated within the South-East Vale Sub Area. Indeed, the role of the South-East Vale Sub-Area to contribute towards unmet housing need for Oxford is promoted. It is suggested, that in reality, any of the homes allocated across the two sub-areas could contribute toward unmet housing needs of Oxford. It is also suggested that the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area now makes a significantly reduced contribution to meeting Vale's housing need, along with a reduced role for the Western Vale, whereas the South-East Vale's role is significantly increased. Reference is made to an apparent under supply of housing for Oxford if SODC are unable to accommodate the quantum of unmet housing need	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>identified by the Oxfordshire Growth Board. It is suggested that Vale should therefore accommodate more housing to compensate.</p> <p>It is suggested that there is a shortfall in the number of homes planned for and that those sites proposed for allocation will not deliver quickly enough.</p> <p>Some responses support the proactive approach of the Council to provide for the Objectively Assessed Need and identified unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale in full. However, a number of responses question the reliance on Neighbourhood Plans to bring forward housing.</p>	
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council				Office use only - blank	Housing Requirement - Duty to Cooperate - Statutory West Oxfordshire District Council	West Oxfordshire District Council considers that the Vale of White Horse District Council has satisfied the Duty to Cooperate.	Noted
1096915		Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No	Housing Requirement - Flexibility	<p>The role of the Part 2 plan to allocate strategic sites is questioned along with the apparent change from its original purpose to allocate smaller sites. Whilst the amendment made by the Part 1 Inspector to remove reference to 'smaller' sites is noted, it is suggested that the part 2 plan was never intended to allocate strategic sites. The role of smaller sites to assist delivery is discussed along with the risk of relying solely on larger sites. Reference is made to national policy requirements to boost significantly the supply of housing and to allow a good mix of sites to come forward.</p>	<p>The Council considers that its proposed housing supply is robust and provides sufficient flexibility. LPP1 was informed by independent consultancy advice relating to housing delivery, which recommended the importance of allocating a range of sites of varying size, type and geography. The Home Builders Federation provides similar advice within their LPP1 representations. LPP1 and LPP2 achieve such a range of sites in terms of size, type and geography.</p> <p>Across these two plans, ten sites are allocated or proposed within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area; seven of these are smaller sites capable of delivering quickly accounting for 32 % of the planned supply through allocations in this area. Within the Western Vale Sub-Area six sites are allocated in LPP1; 4 of which are smaller sites capable of delivering quickly accounting for almost 50 % of the planned supply through allocations in this area.</p> <p>The South-East Vale Sub-Area contains a much higher proportion of larger sites; seven out of nine allocate 400 homes or more. This reflects the Spatial Strategy aim to focus sustainable growth within the Science Vale area, thus supporting the OX LEP SEP and assist with delivering the LTP4 package of strategic infrastructure. Core Policy 5 – Housing Supply Ring Fence provides additional flexibility for this sub-area recognising that larger sites may take longer to come forward; hence housing supply is</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>monitored separately. This approach was found to be 'soundly based' through the LPP1 Examination.</p> <p>The updated completions and commitments figures, set out in LPP2, mean that the Vale's Objectively Assessed Need (20,560) is already fully planned for, without any need for further allocations within LPP2. Even if the Council's proposed amendment to the windfall allowance was not supported by the Inspector, and without any site allocations in LPP2, supply would still exceed 21,000. It is important to note that the completions and commitments include around 22 percent made up of smaller sites; and so the requirement envisaged in LPP1 for small site allocations has been more than adequately met.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the mix of sites proposed provides sufficient flexibility in size, type and location, that the identified sites are deliverable and that a five-year land supply can be maintained on a rolling basis. The approach to the South-East Vale Sub-Area differs from the other two sub-areas, as discussed separately; flexibility is provided by Core Policy 5 – Housing Supply Ring Fence, which has been found to be soundly based.</p>
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Housing Requirement - Link to Employment Growth and Monitoring	This response questions the lack of phasing plans for sites and the likelihood that sites will come forward once the plan is adopted thus leading to a mis-match between employment growth and housing growth. It is suggested that a robust approach to monitoring employment growth is needed to ensure that appropriate action could be taken in the event that employment does not come forward at the envisaged rate.	The Council is satisfied that its housing trajectory is robust and that the range of sites being allocated, of different size, type and geography ensures that some sites deliver quickly, whilst others deliver more steadily over the plan period. The plan overall provides sufficient flexibility should some sites be delayed. The plan is also accompanied by a monitoring framework, which is updated from the Part 1 plan (adopted in December 2016). The Council considers that this monitoring framework is sufficiently robust and provides a mechanism for dealing with a short fall in employment growth, should this eventuality arise.
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No	Housing Requirement - Science Vale	The response objects to the additional proposed allocations within the South-East Vale Sub-Area stating that they go above the identified housing need and so are unnecessary.	The Council considers that its rationale for the additional allocations are clearly articulated within the plan and are soundly based. They are proposed for site specific reasons and are not relied upon to contribute to unmet housing need for Oxford.
878369	Mr Damian Sullivan	Thakeham Homes Ltd					Housing Requirement – South Oxfordshire District Council	The comment states that a shortfall exists in planning for unmet housing need for Oxford as SODC do not commit to meet in full the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within SODC as identified by the Oxfordshire Growth Board.	The Council considers that it is a matter for the SODC Local Plan Examination to determine whether SODC should meet the identified quantum of unmet housing need in full or not.
852191	Adrian Colwell	Cherwell District Council					Housing Requirement - Statutory Cherwell	Support is provided for the approach of VOWH to plan for unmet housing for Oxford.	Support noted.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							District Council		
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No	Housing Requirement - Statutory Oxfordshire County Council	The response includes some narrative about what VOWH is proposing in relation to addressing unmet housing need for Oxford.	Comments noted.
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)	Yes	Housing Requirement - Unmet Need	<p>It is suggested that the plan is unsound as there is no evidence of effective joint working on how to address unmet housing need for Oxford. Furthermore, it is suggested that Oxford has failed to adequately define its unmet housing need and that in any case, the need should now be reassessed following Govt consultation on proposed new methodology for calculating their housing requirement. It is suggested that it should not be the responsibility of Vale to plan for housing for Oxford, which is described as being ambitious.</p> <p>A number of responses reference the position of SODC, who have not made a commitment to meet the identified quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within SODC, in full, and as identified by the Oxfordshire Growth Board.</p> <p>Some responses support the approach of the Council describing the approach as being soundly based. One response makes reference to the National Infrastructure Commission's Interim Report that states that the lack of sufficient and suitable housing is a fundamental risk to the success of the Cambridge – Milton Keynes – Oxford corridor. The response considers that the Council are justified in seeking to fully meet the housing requirement in full. One response considers that the level of housing being planned for within Vale to address unmet housing need for Oxford exceeds identified requirement and that the proposed allocations could be suitably reduced. Other responses refer to the proposed allocations of 2020 within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and so clarification for how the shortfall of 180 homes will be provided for. The role of the Part 1 plan sites to contribute to Vale housing need, as set out within the Part 1 plan, rather than Oxford need, as suggested within the Part 2 plan, is also questioned.</p>	<p>The Oxfordshire authorities have been working jointly for several years to plan for housing need, including unmet need for Oxford. A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed by all Oxfordshire authorities, except for SODC, for how the identified unmet need figure should be planned for. The Vale is seeking to meet the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale, as agreed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board in full.</p> <p>The Council is seeking to meet the identified need for housing for Vale, within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area is met in full, that the Vale's contribution to Oxford unmet need is met in full, within the same Sub-Area, and that at least 2,200 homes are provided for on sites that are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. The total amount of housing planned for in this Sub-Area is therefore considered to be correct. It is only necessary to allocate an additional 2020 homes, rather than 2200, as only 2020 are required to meet the identified need in full.</p>
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett								
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd,							
823359	Mr John Attree					No			
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No			
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning				
1015345	MRS ANNIE THOMAS								
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No			
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning				
1096854		RH Systems	1144378	Mrs Sarah Kasparian	Bell Cornwell LLP	No			
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No			
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited		724828	Mr Roger Smith	Savills L and P Ltd, Mr R Smith, Director	No			
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley				
1098047	Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1100261		Catesby Property Group	1096086	Taylor Cherrett	Turley				
1142392	Mr Vic Johnson					No			
1143092	Mrs Sian Keeling	David Wilson Homes Ltd (Southern)	1143090	Mrs Sophie Horsley	Strutt & Parker	No			
1144552	Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies		No			
1145048		Earl of Plymouth Estates Ltd	1145367	Mrs Sarah Moorhouse	Litchfields	No			
1145068	Mr Stuart Gibson					No			
1145537	Ms Clare Arnold	Ashbury Parish Council							
1145048		Earl of Plymouth Estates Ltd	1145367	Mrs Sarah Moorhouse	Litchfields	No			
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council					Housing Requirement - Unmet Need - Statutory South Oxfordshire District Council	SODC highlight that the identified unmet need figure is a working assumption and that the correct unmet figure will not be known until Oxford have an updated Local Plan adopted. The quantum of unmet need may also be affected by the Govt consultation on proposed changes to the methodology for calculating housing need. SODC suggest that VOWH should commit to review their local plan once the Oxford City Local Plan is adopted.	The Oxfordshire authorities have been working jointly for several years to plan for the unmet housing need for Oxford and all of the Oxfordshire authorities, with the exception of SODC, signed a Memorandum of Corporation for how this need should be apportioned. The matter of the Govt consultation is discussed separately. The Oxfordshire authorities have committed to prepare a Joint Spatial Plan for Oxfordshire for the period up to 2050. This will be informed by a new process of identifying the housing need for the County and how it can be planned for and will inform future iterations of the Local Plan. On this basis, there is no need to explicitly refer to a commitment to review the Local Plan, it is required every five years by National Policy and will be informed by preparation of the JSP in any case.
1096872	Patsy Dell	Oxford City Council				No	Housing Requirement - Unmet Need - Statutory Oxford City Council	Clarification is sought in which sites contribute to unmet housing need for Oxford. A modification to the text is required to provide additional clarity to identify and cross-reference the proposed sites to help meet Oxford's unmet housing need. It is suggested that, at the very least, to avoid confusion, a cross reference to Table 2.1 should be made in Policy 4a (and Policy 8a) to ensure that it is clear which sites are being referred to, in the policy, that are close to and accessible to Oxford. In its current form, the plan is not effective as it not clear which sites are deliverable to support Oxford's unmet need within the Vale. The Plan should also contain a commitment from the Vale of White Horse to publish a housing trajectory to monitor	The Council does not consider that it is necessary to specifically define sites as contributing to either Oxford or Vale housing need. The Council has no control over who may purchase housing and their reasons for doing so are likely to be many and varied. The Council also considers that seeking to define sites as meeting precisely a Vale need or Oxford need would make no difference to who purchases the housing and whether in reality, they fall within an Oxford need, or a Vale need. The Council does seek to meet the housing need in full, including the agreed quantum of unmet need for Oxford, to be provided

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								delivery against the unmet housing need apportioned figure of 2,200.	within the Vale, for which the Council understands Oxford City supports.
1096872	Patsy Dell	Oxford City Council				No	Housing Requirement - Unmet Need - Statutory Oxford City Council	Paragraph 2.30-2.32: South East Vale Sub Area Objection: The City Council consider that the South-East Vale Sub Area as a location lacks the spatial relevance and connectivity to Oxford and does not offer a generally sustainable location to contribute significantly to meeting Oxford's unmet housing need. Support is however given for the amendment to the Plan that seeks to make some provision for Oxford's unmet needs solely within Abingdon and Oxford Fringe sub-area. Paragraphs 2.30-2.31 seem to begin to make a case for the location of Oxford's unmet need within this Sub Area. Paragraph 2.32 then concludes that it is "not considered necessary to allocate any additional sites in the Part 2 Plan within the South-East Vale Sub Area to specifically address unmet housing need for Oxford."	<p>The Council is seeking to ensure that the Vale need, including the need identified in the Part 1 Plan for the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford fringe Sub-Area is fully met within this Sub-Area, and that the unmet need for Oxford to be provided for within the Vale is also met, in full, within the same Sub-Area. The Council does recognise the importance of housing for Oxford being provided on sites that are suitably well related and close to Oxford and sets out that at least 2200 homes are demonstrably close to and accessible to Oxford.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that its approach to monitoring is sufficient and is robust and will include a break down for the number of homes provided on all sites in each year. It is of course impossible to precisely monitor whether house purchases fall within one housing need or another, and that labelling sites in this way would make absolutely no difference in this regard.</p>
1096872	Patsy Dell	Oxford City Council				No	Housing Requirement - Unmet Need - Statutory Oxford City Council	The City Council supports the commitment in the Plan by the Vale of White Horse Council to deliver the 2,200 homes agreed by the Oxford Growth Board as an appropriate apportionment for the Vale to help meet Oxford's housing need to 2031. This approach reflects the success of the joint working arrangements between the City Council and the Vale of White Horse. The proposed housing figures reflect the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding agreed at the Growth Board Meeting in September 2016. Since that time engagement between the two Councils has continued on a regular basis, reflecting the commitment of the Vale Council to meeting the duty to co-operate with Oxford City Council. The City Council is pleased that this latest version of the Plan has recognised the importance of spatial relevance, and connectivity to Oxford, as well as the need for generally sustainable locations, in addressing Oxford's unmet need. This has been addressed in the Plan by providing for at least 2,200 homes in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area. This will avoid homes designated to meet the city's needs in less accessible and less sustainable parts of the District. While it would have been preferable for there to be specific site allocations in the Plan to meet Oxford's unmet housing need, the Plan does provide reassurance that there are sites within the sub-area that are "suitably close to and accessible to Oxford" and with a capacity which meets the 2,200 apportionment. This particularly applies to the major strategic sites at north Abingdon, and we would reiterate our specific request that those sites should be referenced as contributing to Oxford's unmet needs. We are stressing this point because, as we indicate above, it is important to minimise the risk that developments to meet Oxford's needs are claimed as being delivered at less accessible locations within the sub-area. There is also evidence to demonstrate that	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								some of the sites in north Abingdon in particular are on track to deliver the apportionment in a timely manner, potentially even ahead of 2021.	
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council					Housing Requirement - Unmet Needs - Statutory West Oxfordshire District Council	West Oxfordshire District Council strongly supports the positive steps being taken by the Vale of White Horse District Council to take forward the second part of its Local Plan in order to help address Oxford City's unmet housing need. The unmet housing need of Oxford City is a major strategic planning issue for Oxfordshire. It is important that all Oxfordshire local planning authorities make appropriate provision for additional housing in order to help meet this need. The Oxfordshire Growth Board apportionment figure of 2,200 dwellings for the Vale of White Horse reflects an extensive joint evidence base. West Oxfordshire District Council welcomes the approach set out in Core Policy 4a of the Local Plan Part 2 to adopt this apportionment figure and to add this additional housing requirement to the District's housing target.	Noted.
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council					Housing Requirement - Unmet Needs - Statutory West Oxfordshire District Council	West Oxfordshire District Council has no concerns over the legal compliance of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2. It is important that housing that is intended to contribute towards meeting Oxford City's unmet housing need is accessible to Oxford, with frequent and reliable public transport linkages. This was a key consideration of the work undertaken to agree the proposed apportionment of the unmet need. Otherwise housing sites may not serve the needs of future residents and it may place an additional strain on transport infrastructure.	Noted. The Council has sought to ensure that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for VOWH is met in full, along with the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale being met in full. VOWH have ensured the sub-area housing requirements identified by the Part 1 plan are fully met, and by adding 2,200 homes for oxford to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area, and ensuring that at least 2,200 homes are provided on sites that are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford.
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council					Housing Requirement - Unmet Needs - Statutory West Oxfordshire District Council	Core Policy 4a of the Part 2 plan states that the agreed quantum of Oxford's unmet housing need will be met within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub- Area. This recognises that housing within this Sub-Area is relatively accessible to Oxford, with more frequent and reliable public transport linkages, and therefore is considered appropriate to contribute to the unmet housing needs of Oxford City. The following specific allocations within the Sub-Area are listed in Table 2.1 as close to, or accessible to, Oxford: North Abingdon-on-Thames (950 homes) North-West Abingdon-on-Thames (200 homes) North-West Radley (240 homes) South of Kennington (270 homes) Dalton Barracks (1,200 homes) However, the Part 2 plan does not ring fence any of these specific allocations for the sole purpose of addressing Oxford's unmet housing need. It would be helpful to have greater clarity on which specific housing sites within the Vale of White Horse will contribute towards Oxford's needs, as this would provide clarity on their relationship with Oxford, allow effective monitoring of delivery, and also enable affordable housing	Noted. The Council has sought to ensure that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for VOWH is met in full, along with the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale being met in full. VOWH have ensured the sub-area housing requirements identified by the Part 1 plan are fully met, and by adding 2,200 homes for oxford to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area, and ensuring that at least 2,200 homes are provided on sites that are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. The Planning Inspector presiding over the Part 1 plan made it clear in his Final Report that it was all but impossible to determine if a house purchaser on a given site would fall within a Vale need or Oxford need, ring fencing a site would make no difference to whether house purchasers fell within either housing need category. VOWH will ensure that at least 2,200 homes are provided that are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford and will monitor house completions for the district, sub-areas, and on a site

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								requirements to be considered through planning application processes. This is a soundness concern.	by site basis. This will ensure housing is planned for and delivered on sites close to Oxford.
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council					Housing Requirement - Unmet Needs Affordable Housing – Statutory West Oxfordshire District Council	The high level of housing need in Oxford is largely driven by the need for affordable housing. Another strong reason for clarity on where Oxford's unmet needs are to be delivered is to allow a proper assessment of how individual sites can contribute towards this affordable housing need. The affordable housing policy for Vale of White Horse aims for 35% of larger developments to be affordable (See Para 2.24), which is below the 50% assumed in the SHMA in connection with Oxford's needs. If sites outside of Oxford in other Oxfordshire Districts, which are intended to count towards Oxford's unmet needs, do not effectively contribute towards the need for affordable housing then this may create additional pressure for development elsewhere. It also may adversely affect the ability of important employers in Oxford, such as the health sector and the Universities, to recruit and retain staff. The Local Plan Part 2 requires additional content in policies and text, perhaps in Core Policy 4a , setting out how the plan will deliver the 1,100 homes requirement for affordable housing connected with Oxford's unmet housing needs. This is a soundness concern .	Noted. The VOWH considers that it is the total amount of affordable housing provided that is important, rather than an arbitrary percentage on a site by site basis. VOWH are making provision for 35 % AH of 24,748, which ensures the identified need for AH for Vale is fully met, and the component of AH needed to contribute to Oxford unmet need (i.e. 50 % of 2,200) is also fully met.
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore		Housing Requirement - Windfalls	A number of comments raise concern over the proposed change to the Council's Windfall allowance from 70 dwellings per year to 100. It is suggested that some years within the historic delivery data provided skew the average and if these were omitted, the average rate of delivery would be 95 dwellings per year, rather than 100 proposed by the Council. It is therefore suggested that the Council have failed to provide compelling evidence to justify the change to the Windfall allowance. Concern is raised over the reliance on housing delivery coming forward through Neighbourhood Plans and the distribution of the windfall allowance across the district.	The windfall allowance of 70 dwellings per year was found to be soundly based through the Part 1 Plan Examination. The Council have sought to update this figure based on past delivery and taken a cautious approach, proposing to increase the allowance to 100 dwellings per year. It is noted that some representations point out that if past years with higher rates of delivery are omitted the past delivery would still represent 95 dwellings per year. The Council has simply updated the windfall allowance figures for each Sub-Area, as set out in the Part 1 Plan, on a pro-rata basis, replacing the 100 dwellings per year instead of 70. The Council consider that this is based on robust evidence. The total increase is from 840 dwellings to 1100, an increase of 260 for the plan period as a whole. The plan does not rely on any sites coming forward through Neighbourhood Plans, the plan simply refers to the fact that sites may come forward through Neighbourhood plans, this is a matter for the bodies preparing the neighbourhood Plans. Past delivery is sufficient to justify the proposed windfall allowance without any sites coming through Neighbourhood planning. it may also be helpful to consider that the plan makes provision for 24,748 dwellings, which is somewhat higher than the 22,760 requirement and such that the plan already provides for sufficient flexibility/ contingency.
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No			
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No			
1143288	Mr and Mrs Kauert		872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No			
1143289		Lagan Homes Limited	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096872	Patsy Dell	Oxford City Council				No	Housing Requirement - Unmet Need - Affordable Housing - Statutory Oxford City Council	Paragraphs 2.24-2.26: Affordable Housing for Oxford's Unmet Need Objection: The absence of a clear confirmation that the proposed affordable housing can be provided in a timely way and in sustainable locations, near to Oxford, raises concerns about their delivery. The City Council therefore consider that there should be a formal agreement between the Vale of White Horse and the City Council as part of a memorandum of understanding or similar mechanism, setting out a clear process for the delivery of affordable housing that addresses Oxford's needs. This should include details on matters such as an allocations policy, tenure mix, unit size and eligibility. The addition of paragraph 2.25, which sets out a commitment to the agreement of an approach between Vale and City housing policy officers, is welcomed. Paragraph 2.26 makes reference to continuing "to work positively... to plan for housing for Oxfordshire in the longer term". Whilst this statement is supported, the phrase itself seems to suggest that the Vale is only looking to work positively in the longer term (emphasis added) whereas this joint work should begin immediately. It is suggested that this could be rephrased to reflect this, perhaps by replacing 'in the longer-term' with 'over the next 25-30 years', reflecting the work undertaken around the Oxfordshire Growth deal discussion and the recommendations from the national infrastructure commission relating to the Oxford to Cambridge Corridor.	The Council is committed to working with Oxford City Council to plan for the provision of Affordable Housing within the Vale that contributes to Oxford need. The Council considers that the precise mechanism for allocating affordable housing is a matter for the Council's housing policies, which sit outside the remit of planning policy. The plan makes a commitment to work with Oxford City Council to reach agreement on how affordable housing can be delivered. Work has commenced on this matter. The plan wording 'The allocation of affordable housing to those in need is a matter of housing policy rather than planning policy' and that 'allocations will therefore be made in accordance with an approach to be agreed between Vale of White Horse District Council and Oxford City Councils'.
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills		Housing Trajectory - Statutory Thames Water	Site Specific Comments on Additional Sites Our comments on the additional sites remain as was submitted in May 2017 to your preferred options consultation. To date Thames Water has worked closely with the Council on their Water Cycle Study which has helped inform their site selection process. Thames would like to continue working with the Council and would like to work more closely with the individual developers/promoters to understand when the proposed sites are likely to come forward.	Noted.
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)				No	Ministry of Defence Aviation Safeguarding	The remaining sites fall outside of statutory safeguarding zones therefore the MOD has no safeguarding concerns.	Noted.
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)							
872591	Miss Layla Moran	Liberal Democrats, Oxford West and Abingdon				No	Oxford City Unmet Housing Need	The Plan is unsound and the Council has failed in its Duty to Cooperate. The housing need targets for Oxfordshire's unmet need should be reviewed before this plan is adopted considering the Government's housing white paper	The Council is satisfied that the Plan is sound and that it has complied with the Duty to Cooperate as required by the Localism Act 2011, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Further details of this may be found in the Duty to Cooperate Topic Paper to

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								'Planning for the right homes in the right places' b) The Vale plan should be paused until the Oxford City Local Plan is adopted and we are clear what their unmet housing need figure is 1	support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.
1144185 1144552	Mr Yoshi Nishio Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies		No No	Oxford's unmet need	There are a couple of comments which raise concerns over Oxford's unmet housing need. The comments state: - It is unacceptable that Oxford City are choosing not to develop on brownfield land and the county's villages and green belt are being destroyed as a consequence with little regard to the impact on the rural communities affected. - The residents in rural communities are of lesser importance than those in urban settlements - The Council are relying on the delivery of Dalton barracks to meet the districts housing need. It is not considered to contribute to Oxford's Unmet need due to the distance	The Council acknowledges the comments regarding Oxford's unmet need. The Vale are proposing that a number of sites proposed within Local Plan 2031 part 1 and part 2 will contribute towards Oxford's unmet need. The Council are not proposing for Oxford's unmet need to rely on one site.
879508 1022473 1096701 1144185	Mr Yoshi Nishio	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd Rosconn Group WebbPaton	879505 737353 737353	Mr Geoff Gardner Mr Nathan McLoughlin Mr Nathan McLoughlin	Gardner Planning McLoughlin Planning McLoughlin Planning	No	Purpose of LPP2	A number of comments question the relationship between the Part 1 and Part 2 plans and the original purpose of the Part 2 plan. It is suggested that the Part 1 plan was intended as a supporting DPD to Part 1 and therefore should comply with the provisions of Part 1. In the earlier stages of the process, the Part 2 plan was anticipated to be a small site allocations DPD, dealing with non-strategic (i.e. sub 200 dwellings). Reference is made to the Sept 2016 LDS that refers to 'smaller development sites' as part of the scope of the Part 2 plan and in particular, reference is made to the spatial strategy key strand of seeking to promote thriving villages and rural communities. The comments do acknowledge the Inspector's Report into the Part 1 plan that modifies the role of the Part 2 plan to also address unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale. It is suggested that the Part 2 plan only seeks to make a small number of allocations at a level which are more reflective with the strategic approach adopted in the Part 1 plan. This is described as being unsound and being inconsistent with the Sept 2016 LDS. It is suggested that there is a lack of consistency between the Part 1 and Part 2 plan in terms of how Part 2 treats the residual requirement of 1,000 dwellings from Part 1. In particular, reference is made to the strand of the spatial strategy to 'identifying appropriate housing requirements for the rural areas to inform neighbourhood plans or the Local Plan 2031 Part 2'. It is suggested that this sets out a clear commitment for the Part 2 process to review the housing requirements for the rural areas. Concern is raised for how the 1,000 dwellings referenced in the Part 1 plan to be allocated in the Part 2 plan are being	The purpose of the Part 2 plan was modified through the Part 1 plan examination and the Inspector made a modification to define the purpose of the Part 2 plan as: Main Modification 1: 'Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Local ADDITIONAL Sites. The Local Plan 2031 Part 2 will contain detailed planning policies to guide day-to-day decisions on planning applications. The document will provide more detailed policies to those within Part 1 of the Local Plan, and identify and allocate supplementary and predominantly smaller (referred to as non-strategic) development sites'. SET OUT POLICIES AND LOCATIONS FOR HOUSING FOR THE VALE'S PROPORTION OF OXFORD'S HOUSING NEED UNABLE TO BE MET WITHIN THE CITY BOUNDARIES. THIS DOCUMENT WILL ALSO CONTAIN POLICIES FOR THE PART OF DIDCOT GARDEN TOWN THAT LIES WITHIN THE VALE OF WHITE HORSE DISTRICT COUNCIL AND DETAILED DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES TO COMPLEMENT LOCAL PLAN 2031 PART 1. IT WILL REPLACE THE SAVED POLICIES OF THE LOCAL PLAN 2011, AND MAY ALLOCATE ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT SITES FOR HOUSING AND OTHER USES1.' On this basis, the Council consider that the Part 2 plan is entirely consistent with its purpose, as set out in the Adopted Part 1 plan and is soundly based. It is clear that the purpose of the Part 2 plan is to set out policies and locations for housing for the Vale's proportion of Oxford housing need unable to be met within the City boundaries; this does not specify whether sites are strategic or non-strategic. Furthermore, the purpose of the Part 2 plan includes

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>planned for and whether they are consistent with the original objectives of the Part 1 plan.</p> <p>Reference is made to the role of Neighbourhood Plans to bring forward development, in particular for villages located within the Green Belt, where changes could only be made to the Green Belt through the Local Plan, thus limiting the scope of Neighbourhood Plans in the Green Belt to allocate new sites.</p> <p>Reference is also made to the housing trajectory accompanying the Part 2 plan indicating that some of the proposed allocations could come forward within five years. Yet, the Council's most recent five-year housing supply statement does not include Part 2 sites; this is considered to be inconsistent.</p>	<p>the provision that it 'may' allocate 'additional' development sites for housing. Again, this does not specify strategic or non-strategic scale development.</p> <p>The Council considers that the Part 2 plan is entirely consistent with the Spatial Strategy set out in the Part 1 plan. The Spatial Strategy includes the following 'identifying appropriate housing requirements for the rural areas to inform neighbourhood plans or the Local Plan 2031 Part 2'. This is fulfilled in the Part 1 plan by identifying Sub-Area housing requirements, which include residual housing requirements to be met within the Part 2 plan. There is therefore no need, or expectation, that the housing requirements for the Sub-Areas would be reviewed within the Part 2 plan. The Part 2 plan should add policies and locations to address unmet need and 'may' allocate additional sites.</p> <p>The updated completions and commitments figures, set out in LPP2, mean that the Vale's Objectively Assessed Need (20,560) is already fully planned for, without any need for further allocations within LPP2. Even if the Council's proposed amendment to the windfall allowance was not supported by the Inspector, and without any site allocations in LPP2, supply would still exceed 21,000. It is important to note that the completions and commitments include around 22 percent made up of smaller sites; and so the requirement envisaged in LPP1 for small site allocations has been more than adequately met.</p> <p>This is true for the district as a whole, and for each Sub-Area individually. The Council have prepared a short addendum to the Housing Topic Paper to illustrate this point more clearly.</p> <p>Within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area, the Part 1 plan identified a need for the Part 2 plan to allocate 722 dwellings; the Part 2 plan actually allocates 2020 dwellings. The housing requirement for this Sub-Area is 7,512 dwellings, the actual proposed supply is 7,570 dwellings.</p> <p>Within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, the Part 1 plan identified a need for the Part 2 plan to allocate 56 dwellings; the Part 2 plan actually allocates 1400 dwellings. The housing requirement for this Sub-Area is 12,150 dwellings, the actual proposed supply is 13,362 dwellings.</p> <p>Within the Western Vale Sub-Area, the Part 1 plan identified a need for the Part 2 plan to allocate 222 dwellings; the Part 2 plan actually proposes to make</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>no additional allocations in this Sub-Area, this is because the housing need for this Sub-Area has already been met. The housing requirement for this Sub-Area is 3,098 dwellings, the actual proposed supply is 3,816 dwellings.</p> <p>There is no reliance on any development coming forward through Neighbourhood Plans, the plan simply refers to the fact that development 'may' come forward through Neighbourhood Plans, this is a matter for the body producing the Neighbourhood Plan. The Council agrees that release of land from the Green Belt is a strategic matter for the Local Planning Authority to address through the preparation of its Local Plan; it is not considered appropriate for rural communities to seek to make changes to Green Belt boundaries through neighbourhood planning. The Council is satisfied that its approach to amending the Green Belt boundary is robust and consistent with national policy. The Council is also satisfied that Core Policies 13 (and 13a): Oxford Green Belt provides sufficient guidance and flexibility to inform development proposals within the Green Belt, including within rural villages.</p> <p>The Council's current five-year land supply statement does not include proposed LPP2 allocations, as they have not yet been tested through Examination. The Housing Trajectory, accompanying the Submission Plan does include the LPP2 sites, and subject to Examination, the sites are considered to be deliverable. There is therefore no contradiction between these two documents.</p>
879120	Gow Family						Role of Part 2	<p>There are a couple of comments which question the change in the role of the part 2 plan. The comments include:</p> <p>The relationship between the part 1 plan and the part 2 plan has changed since the adoption of the part 1 plan.</p> <p>Part 2 was to act as a supporting development plan document to part 1. Part 2 needs to comply with part 1 for this to happen.</p> <p>It should be made clear if the Part 2 plan is to act as a review to certain elements of the Part 1 plan. If this is the case, Part 2 is in breach of Figure 4.1 of part 1 as it does promote thriving villages and rural communities.</p> <p>Part 2 pledges to support appropriate development in smaller villages to help meet the local needs of rural communities. As drafted the part 2 plan does not perform this task as it only allocates land in larger settlements with the exception of Shippon.</p> <p>The Dalton Barracks allocation is more in line with the strategic approach as set out in part 1. - The inspector</p>	Please refer to previous responses.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								removed sites from the part 1 plan as they were for smaller sites and within the green belt and therefore not in line with the strategic strategy of the part one plan. By adopting part 1, the council had a 5YHLS and more control in planning and reducing speculative development outside of the green belt. During the examination, the council stated that part 2 plan will allocate smaller sites as these had not been tested in the same way as the strategic sites. The inspector was reluctant to release land within the green belt to allocate for sites due to not knowing the extent of Oxford's unmet housing need. The role of part 2 has now changed as it is claimed that part 2 need to address the issues of Oxford's unmet need and the duty of the council to cooperate with Oxford in addressing this need. This is contrary to the original purpose of the part 2 plan	
879120	Gow Family						Settlement Hierarchy	This comment states that directing appropriate levels of development to settlements can help protect and support the viability of important community services and facilities. The most cost effective way that the council can protect existing services and facilities is to incorporate new development into all communities and not just those that are classified as larger settlements	The Council acknowledges this comment. The proposed allocations within Part 2 comply with core policies 3 and 4 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and is consistent with national policy
1145272	Mr David Owen-Smith	Baulking Parish Meeting				No	Settlement Hierarchy	Concern is raised over the Settlement Hierarchy (Core Policy 3) as set out within the Part 1 plan, and in particular what provision is made for development within 'open countryside'. It is suggested that the policy is inconsistent with National Policy and is unsound. Greater flexibility is sought for development within open countryside.	The Council is satisfied that Core Policy 3 is soundly based and is consistent with National Policy, indeed the policy was found to be sound by an Independent Planning Inspector presiding over the Part 1 plan process. The Inspector made a modification to the policy to make reference to national policy. The Council is satisfied that this provides sufficient flexibility to support development in open countryside where it is either consistent with the Development Plan as a whole or National Policy. This does not affect the soundness of the Part 2 plan.
1142392	Mr Vic Johnson					No	Soundness	It is neither sound, nor positive, to plan without a target density to make best use of land and provide more affordable housing.	Core Policy 23 of the Local Plan 2031 part 1 sets out the required density of housing per hectare in all major residential development. The proposed housing numbers for the proposed housing allocations have been devised by this policy and are subject to masterplanning. Part 1 and Part 2 should be read as one document and applications are required to comply with the policies within both documents. This includes the provision of affordable housing.
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)	Yes	Soundness - Plan is sound	The Defence Infrastructure Organisation considers the Local Plan 2031 part 2 to be sound. It is positively prepared as it is based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities.	Support acknowledged and welcomed.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								It is justified as it is the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; and effective as it is deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and would enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework	
879120	Gow Family						Support	Core Policy 4A and Core Policy 8a 2.69. We support the need for Part 2 to make additional housing allocations to meet Oxford's unmet need.	Noted.
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning		Unsound Evidence	<p>The Site Selection Topic Paper down plays the importance of the LUC Spatial Options Assessment, when the council believe that the documents is sufficient evidence to determine the distribution of Oxford's unmet housing need. As state through the examination of LPP1 the role of LPP2 would be to allocate sites to meet its proportion of Oxford City's unmet housing need. Even though it was suggested that sites within LPP1 could be used to help meet the unmet need, it was still maintained that it would be the role of LPP2 to meet the unmet need. The HELAA identified land (ABIG01, ABIG02 and ABIG03 as being suitable in principle, available and achievable. The sites were then merged to for detailed testing and referred to as ABIG_A. The consultee is concerned with the merging of the mentioned sites for the main assessment. The Council's conclusion was inappropriately and unreasonably influenced by land to east of Oxford Road. This piece of land has a different character and is more sensitive and therefore should not have been merged.</p> <p>The Council sought to address the issue through an addendum landscape capacity assessment, a Green Belt Study of LPP2 sites and an updated site selection topic paper with no addition of new sites. The exercise was not approached with an open mind and was undertaken to seek to address a flaw in the evidence base created (in part) by Council's overly simplistic assessment of land north of Abingdon which informed the preparation of Local Plan Preferred Options.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a comprehensive approach to site selection as set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Memorandum of Understanding explains the role of the LUC Spatial Options Assessment.</p>

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

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No	Accommodation for Older People	One comment states that no provision is being made for older people, which is stated to be contrary to the NPPF and PPG. The comment states that there is currently an unmet demand for 283 extra care units, 226 enhanced sheltered and 735 residential care places by 2031 in the VOWH. The SHOP report is quoted that also demonstrates that the need for extra care units in Vale of White Horse is set to increase substantially over the next 20 years. There is a significant identified need for extra care facilities both in Oxford and nationally.	<p>The adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 addresses the requirement to meet the housing need of the ageing population. Core Policy 26 seeks to address the current and future needs. The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders and developers to help ensure that the need is met appropriately.</p> <p>The Development policies included in the Part 2 plan provide additional detail to complement district wide policies in the adopted Part 1 plan and support the provision of specialist housing to meet specific needs of current and future residents.</p>
828782 1144174	Mrs Emily Smith The Nissen Family		1144167	John Savills		No	Affordable Housing	<p>The Part 2 plan does not include much needed policies to increase the number of affordable homes. Given that the additional housing sites are specifically to meet Oxford's unmet need, the sites allocated in the plan should provide 50% affordable homes, in line with Oxford City Council's requirements. Due to the high average house price in relation to average salary within the Vale, the Liberal Democrat group would like proportion of affordable homes (as defined by the Department for Communities and Local Government) on all developments across the Vale to be raised to 50%. A shortage of public sector and other workers who can afford to live in the Vale is impacting on our communities and traffic congestion.</p> <p>Since 2012, 1,122 of the 4,680 homes – almost 1,500 less than should have been – built within the Vale have been affordable. That equates to an average of about 49 less affordable dwellings than the annual target, creating a shortfall of 245. Whilst the annual target may be reached annually from now on, this backlog needs to be recouped sooner rather than later. An alternative site is proposed to help with this.</p>	<p>The Council consider that it is the total amount of affordable housing being planned for that is all important, rather than the percentage required on a site by site basis. The Vale Policy for 35 % affordable housing (Core Policy 24) is based on an up to date evidence of the need for affordable housing in the district, along with consideration for what can be delivered without affecting the viability of the development, as required by National Policy. The Vale of White Horse Local Plan (Part 1 and 2) makes provision to deliver the identified need for affordable housing within the Vale, in full, and to meet the identified need for Oxford, as part of the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford agreed to be provided within the Vale, in full. This matter is discussed further in relation to comments received to Core Policy 4a.</p>
1096872	Patsy Dell	Oxford City Council				No	Affordable Housing contribution towards Oxford Unmet Housing Need - Statutory Oxford City Council	<p>Oxford City Council acknowledge their understanding that the 35% affordable housing requirement overall in the Plan would deliver more affordable housing than required in the Vale of White Horse and that the excess would meet Oxford's needs. However, that further explanation is required in the Plan as to how this approach will deliver the 1,100 affordable dwellings on the sites in the Abingdon and Oxford Fringe sub area (Paragraph 2.24); in other words how many affordable homes for Oxford might be expected from key sites in that sub-area, to see how close to the 1,100 it reaches. The delivery mechanism should also be clear. In the absence of this clarification the City Council would have to object on this matter since meeting affordable housing is such an important element of Oxford's unmet need.</p> <p>A Modification is Proposed: It is suggested that para 2.26, is amended as follows: "The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work positively</p>	<p>Noted. The Publication Version of the Part 2 plan included a clear commitment that the Council will work with Oxford City Council to agree an approach to the allocation of affordable housing to contribute towards the affordable housing needs of Oxford City. This is a matter for housing policy rather than planning policy.</p> <p>A Statement of Common Ground has been produced between the Council and Oxford City Council that references the council's agreed approach to addressing affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Please also refer to previous responses.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>with Oxford City Council and other Oxfordshire Authorities to plan for housing for Oxfordshire in the longer term. It is anticipated that this will include the preparation of an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Oxfordshire. Until the updated Oxfordshire SHMA and Oxford City Local Plans are completed, it will not be possible to determine the precise affordable housing need for Oxford, to be provided for within the Vale of White Horse . The Vale of White Horse DC will enter into a formal agreement with Oxford City Council to ensure the delivery of affordable housing towards Oxford's unmet needs in a timely manner on suitable sites within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area."</p> <p>Further details should also be provided on nomination rights and appropriate policies to promote a balanced mix of property types and sizes, which should either be referred to in the text as a commitment or subject to future discussion through an agreed Memorandum of Understanding between the City Council and the Vale of White Horse prior to Examination so there is a clear mechanism / process has been established.</p> <p>There are sites coming forward in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area that already have planning permission or are live planning applications under consideration, and that, according to Table 2.1 on page 23, are "close to and accessible to Oxford". It is important for the City that arrangements on an allocations policy/nomination rights for affordable housing are agreed promptly between housing officers to ensure that those sites most-sustainably connected to Oxford within the Abingdon and Oxford Fringe Sub Area benefit Oxford's residents in most need of housing. This should be secured by a formal agreement.</p> <p>Para 2.26 states "Until the updated Oxfordshire SHMA and Oxford City Local Plans are completed, it will not be possible to determine the precise affordable housing need for Oxford, to be provided for within the Vale of White Horse . It is suggested that this statement is incorrect. The Vale of White Horse Plan (and the apportionment of Oxford's unmet housing need that are being provided for in the Vale) is based on the findings of the 2014 SHMA. As part of the evidence base for the 2014 SHMA, a figure of 50% affordable housing need for Oxford was used to calculate the housing need for Oxfordshire.</p>	
741313 1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Radley College Oxford Bus Company	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore	Yes	Alternative Site - Abingdon	A number of representations identify alternative sites within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area for consideration for allocation within the Part 2 plan. These includes sites at: Abingdon-on-	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by detailed technical evidence and informal engagement with key

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning			<p>Thames, Appleton, Botley, Drayton, East Hanney, Longworth, Radley, Shippon, Steventon, Kingston Bagpuize, Wootton and Dry Sandford. The submissions variously describe the sites as being sustainable locations for development and in many cases they are considered to be more suitable/sustainable than the sites proposed by the Council. Comments highlight the importance of providing sufficient sites to provide flexibility, to support housing delivery, and to contribute to significantly boosting the supply of housing within the district. A number of the comments refer to many of the alternatives lying outside the Oxford Green Belt, or located within the Oxford Green Belt but making limited and no contributions to the Green Belt purposes and therefore providing an opportunity to bring forward development without leading to any impact on these designated areas.</p>	<p>stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council is required to make provision for sufficient housing to meet the identified needs of the district and to contribute to the unmet housing need of Oxford City within the plan period up to 2031. The Council has undertaken a comprehensive approach to site selection, including the consideration of alternatives. It is important the plan makes provision for a range of sites of different size, type and geography to assist in providing appropriate choice, meeting different housing needs, and giving consideration to housing delivery. The provision of smaller site allocations within the plan is also important and necessary to ensure housing is delivered throughout the plan period.</p>
866690	Mrs Anthea Pearson						Alternative Site - Appleton		
879120	Gow Family Gow Family								
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No	Alternative Site - Botley		
1144552	Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies		No			
1145048		Earl of Plymoth Estates Ltd	1145367	Mrs Sarah Moorhouse	Litchfields	No	Alternative Site - Drayton		
1096915		Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No	Alternative Site - East Hanney		
1143288	Mr and Mrs Kauert		872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No			
1143289		Lagan Homes Limited	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited				
1144009	Mr Mark Tinson	Hills Homes Developments Ltd	1144008	Miss Emma Greening	Hunter Page Planning	No			
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning		Alternative Site - Longworth		
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning		Alternative Site - North Abingdon		
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore		Alternative Site - Radley		
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning				
1144780	J A Pye		1144779	Mr Alan Divall	West Waddy Adp	No	Alternative Site - Shippon		
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning		Alternative Site - Steventon		
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No			
1096329		Blanchard Enterprises	1096331	Mr Simon Handy	Strutt & Parker LLP	No	Alternative Site - West of Kingston Bagpuize		
1096895	MBC Estates	MBC Estates Ltd	1096293	Mr Ashley Maltman	West Waddy ADP				
1022473		Rosconn Group	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning		Alternative Site - Wootton		
1097666		Catesby Estates Ltd	1097667	Louise Steele	Framptons	No	Alternative Site -		

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							Wootton - East of Wootton		
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Woolf Bond Planning	No	Alternative Site - Wootton - Lashford Lane		
1143092	Mrs Sian Keeling	David Wilson Homes Ltd (Southern)	1143090	Mrs Sophie Horsley	Strutt & Parker	No	Alternative Site - Wootton - Pages Farm		
1144174	The Nissen Family		1144167	John Savills		No	Alternative Site - Wootton and Dry Sandford		
776299	Tom Smailes	Linden Homes				No	Alternative Sites - East Hanney		
1143365	Mrs Sheila Greenman					No	Busway Proposals Sunningwell	<p>It is suggested that proposals to safeguard land for a Park and Ride at Lodge Hill and a cycle/busway between Dalton Barracks and Lodge Hill is unsound, should be removed from the plan and that details engagement and consultation should be undertaken with the local community. It is stated that schemes should only be safeguarded when there are detailed and costed proposals prepared and supported by Oxfordshire County Council.</p>	<p>The Council has worked with Oxfordshire County Council on the identification of sites with the potential to deliver a high quality public transport network for Oxford and Oxfordshire, having regard to strategy set out in the Local Transport Plan 4. The land safeguarded for a potential future park and ride site at Lodge Hill is included in the plan at the request of Oxfordshire County Council, who are responsible for planning for highways. This is reflected in Statements of Common Ground with OCC and Highways England to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>The Council is considering the provision of a bus/cycle link between the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks as an option for promoting sustainable modes of transport between the proposed allocation and the wider area, including Oxford City.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges Oxfordshire County Council's comments that further work is required to determine the most appropriate approach for planning for public transport in the longer term. This can be considered as part of the work informing the Dalton Barracks Comprehensive Development Framework. The Council will continue to engage constructively with OCC and other key stakeholders to ensure that proposals for enhancing sustainable modes of transport in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area are maximised.</p>
1142989	Mrs Fiona Freeman					No	Community Services and Facilities	<p>One comment was made stating that people may not choose to locate themselves in Abingdon over other towns and cities due to the competitive nature of finding a home, work or a school and other facilities. Young and old people often tend to move away from</p>	<p>In accordance with Core Policy 38 of the adopted Part 1 plan, allocations will be required to undertake a masterplan approach to ensure good design principles are incorporated into the development.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response	
								these areas and it is not certain that the remaining population in Abingdon or Oxfordshire will choose to stay there. The development at Tilsley Park is densely packed and large, and it may not be the case that demand will exist upon completion.	The masterplans will be prepared in consultation between the Council, the community and key stakeholders and will be prepared in accordance with the Site Development Templates. The Site Development Templates (General Requirements) ensure development proposals are designed to an appropriate density and make a positive contribution towards local character and distinctiveness.	
785820	Councillor Catherine Webber	Vale of White Horse District Council				No	Core Policy 8a - Highway Impact	A number of comments raise concern about the massive impact the development will have on the surrounding roads, especially as it is suggested that little mitigation will be delivered with the first tranche of houses. It is suggested that it is essential that large scale development is supported by all necessary infrastructure upfront, especially roads. The proposed increase in the number of houses greatly exceeds the jobs available in the area and thus new residents will be reliant on the roads to get to work further afield mostly using private cars. Paragraphs 2.41 to 2.45 refer to 'excellent public transport links to OXford and Swindon'. The A420 is already at or over capacity during extended rush hours putting such pressure on other connecting roads that we are finding it increasingly difficult to get to our usual destinations. The roads do not have the capacity to cope with the proposed increase in and there are no plans to improve the roads or public transport to any extent that would have a material effect. The proposed developments will result in a considerable increase in noise, light and air pollution in what is a rural area. There are no plans to mitigate this by barriers or improved road surfaces etc. Considering the recently completed increase in housing in the locality there is doubt that there is demand for more. Data relied upon to justify the development appears to be highly theoretical. The plan implies in Paragraph 2.41 etc that housing will support the jobs that will emerge in Swindon and Oxford, both 10 miles or more away. This is not sound planning without adequate transport infrastructure. The planners appear not to have consulted our Parish Council which has therefore limited its ability to represent the interests of existing residents.	The Council has worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development.	
1071740	Mr Richard Clothier				No				The partnership working includes preparing a sustainable transport study for the area that focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford. Other evidence includes the Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study and in partnership with OCC, proposals are made for a north-bound bus lane on the A34 connecting Lodge Hill and Hinksey Junctions, a new Park and Ride is proposed at Lodge Hill by OCC, along with a Rapid Transit Route connecting to Oxford.	
1094885	Mr Sonke Adlung	Oxford University Press				No				The Site Development Templates include a comprehensive package of requirements relating to access and highways, including the need for development proposals to contribute towards public transport improvements and to identify measures to mitigate or compensate any harmful transport impacts through a Transport Assessment.
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No				The General Requirements set out in the Site Development Templates also ensure that development proposals investigate potential noise and air pollution impacts. Development Policy 21: External Lighting in the Part 2 plan ensures development proposals involving external lighting are appropriately designed and located, taking into account impact on the character of the area and local biodiversity. The Council has undertaken an extensive consultation programme for the Part 2 plan in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2016). The Council's approach to consultation and community engagement is set out in the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd					Core Policy 8a - Housing Requirement	Some comments question why the Housing requirement figures set out in Core Policy 8 are being updated when the Part 1 plan was adopted in December 2016. It is suggested that no justification is given for the change being proposed. In the Part 1 plan the housing requirement for the plan period was 5,438. LPP2 para 2.14 adds the 2,200 Oxford unmet	The updated completion and commitment figures set out in the Part 2 plan, mean that the Vale's Objectively Assessed Need (20,560) is already fully planned for, without the need for further allocations within the Part 2 plan.	
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning					It is important to note that the completions and

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>need figure so should total 7,638, but CP8a gives the new figure of 7,512 - a shortfall of 126.</p> <p>Compared to LPP1, in LPP2 completions have gone up (another year added), commitments have correspondingly gone down, windfalls have increased by 68 (28%), although the period has reduced, without explanation. The 5-year housing land supply statement April 2017 has a District figure of 70 p.a., but nothing has been published to provide a Sub-Area breakdown.</p> <p>Greater explanation is required and the justification for Part 2 plan to fundamentally amend adopted policies.</p> <p>It is also questioned why 2,020 homes are added to the Part 2 plan allocations when the quantum of Unmet need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is 2,200.</p> <p>It is suggested that the sites listed in Table 2.1 as being close and accessible to Oxford is not explained how this relates to the 2,200 extra homes.</p> <p>The arithmetic of sites within the sub-area is questioned, including the assertion that sites at Kingston Bagpuize should also contribute to Oxford's need.</p>	<p>commitments include around 22 percent made up of smaller sites; and so the requirement envisaged in the Part 1 plan for small site allocations has been more than adequately met.</p> <p>This is true for the district as a whole , and for each Sub-Area individually. The Council has prepared a short addendum to the Housing Topic Paper to illustrate this point more clearly.</p> <p>Within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area, the Part 1 plan identified a need for the Part 2 plan to allocate 722 dwellings; the Part 2 plan actually allocates 2,020 dwellings. The housing requirement for this Sub-Area is 7,512 dwellings, the actual proposed supply is 7,570 dwellings. The Sub-Area housing requirements are updated simply to reflect the addition on unmet housing need for Oxford.</p> <p>The Publication Version of the Part 2 plan clearly indicates that the agreed apportionment of unmet need for the Vale (2,200 dwellings) is met by a combination of the Part 1 plan strategic allocations and the Part 2 plan additional allocations, and that at least 2,200 dwellings are provided for on sites within this Sub-Area that are suitably close to and accessible to Oxford.</p>
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Core Policy 8a - Spatial Strategy	<p>A number of comments relate to the Spatial Strategy and the distribution of housing within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. These include:</p> <p>Stagecoach state their support for the policy and that they consider the sites identified in this sub-area are all reasonably well-served by public transport, or could be.</p> <p>Other respondents suggest that sites at East Hanney and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor are a significant distance from Oxford and that reliance on public transport along the A420 are over-stated. It is stated that these allocations will lead to significant environmental impacts.</p> <p>The suitability of these sites to meet housing needs for Oxford is questioned and the suitability of sites closer to Oxford is promoted.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey suggest that development proposed at East Hanney would result in a 40 % increase in the size of the village and proposed development at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would be equivalent to a 65 % increase. It is suggested that this is a highly disproportionate amount of development for small settlements and that more development should be allocated to larger settlements, including Faringdon.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the proposed allocations within the Part 2 in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area are fully consistent with the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy included in the adopted Part 1 plan. The Council is seeking to meet the identified Objectively Assessed Need in full and the identified quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale in full.</p> <p>The Publication Version of the Part 2 plan included a list of site allocations within this Sub-Area that are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. This approach has been agreed in a Statement of Common Ground between the Council and Oxford City Council for the unmet need to be met by a combination of Part 1 strategic allocations and the Part 2 additional allocations within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.</p> <p>The Council does not consider that the Western Vale Sub-Area is sufficiently close or accessible to Oxford to be a suitable location for housing to meet the Oxford need.</p> <p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and collaborative working with key stakeholders. The</p>
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning				
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No			
1098047	Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				
1143289		Lagan Homes Limited	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited				
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Wolf Bond Planning	No			
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>It is suggested that development proposed is not consistent with Core Policy 3 of the Part 1 plan or the Spatial Strategy. To remedy this issue, it is suggested that the Western Vale housing requirement should be increased.</p> <p>It is also suggested that the plan should include more flexibility to include a much larger apportionment for unmet housing need for Oxford City and that at least a 10 % non-implementation rate should be applied. It is stated that the windfall figure has not been adequately explained.</p> <p>It is suggested that the selection of sites is flawed and that sustainable sites within the Green Belt have been selected against unsustainable sites outside the Green Belt.</p> <p>A number of comments make reference to the NPPF requirement for the plan to the 'the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence'. It is suggested that the plan is not 'sound', is not 'justified' and disregards the evidence.</p> <p>Some comments support the Council's pro-active approach to meet its proportion of Oxford City's unmet housing needs and the approach of focusing the majority of allocated sites to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area due to its proximity to Oxford.</p>	<p>Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council has published a short addendum to the Housing Topic Paper, alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan, for the purposes of improving clarity relating to the updated housing requirement figure for this Sub-Area set out in Core Policy 8a of the Part 2 plan.</p>
879120	Gow Family						CP8a - Objection	<p>A number of comments were made in objection to Core Policy 8a for the following reasons:</p> <p>The approach of providing housing at six sites spread across four separate villages is contrary to the "key strand" set out in Part 1 to provide houses in rural areas. This prevents Larger Villages not identified for additional housing growing to support the vitality of settlements in accordance with paragraph 55 of the Framework. As such the approach is unsound.</p> <p>The allocations are not sustainable as they are located in rural areas and would encourage travel</p> <p>Each of the five allocations in Core Policy 8a are considered unsound when measured against NPPF paragraph 182. Consideration should be given to identify reserve sites.</p> <p>A larger number of smaller sites should have been allocated as opposed to a small number of larger sites because:</p> <p>Reliance on larger sites poses more risk on the housing trajectory and meeting both Vale and Oxford City's need, not enough consideration has been given to the implications of any slippage on these sites. The plan also does not incorporate enough flexibility to mitigate against any changing circumstances. As such the plan may be undeliverable and Core Policies 4a and 8a are unsound.</p> <p>Core Policies 8a and 15a are not consistent with national policy as they do not identify a range and mix</p>	<p>The Council are satisfied that the sites allocated within the Parts 1 and 2 plan are consistent with national policy and provide sufficient range of sites, including in size, type and location to assist housing delivery. Indeed, of the 25 sites allocated, 9 consist of 200 dwellings or less (36 % of the total number of sites).</p> <p>Please also refer to previous responses.</p>
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No			
1096329		Blanchard Enterprises	1096331	Mr Simon Handy	Strutt & Parker LLP	No			
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning				
1096915		Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No			
1144456	Mr Graham Francis					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								of sites for development, nor do they encourage the release of more small and medium-sized sites but focus on further strategic allocations. SPADE seeks the removal of Dalton Barracks, Marcham and East of Kingston Bagpuize from the plan.	
1099907	Liz Pickering	Education & Skills Funding Agency					CP8a - Support	One comment from the ESFA in support for Core Policy 8a and the Council's use of Site Development Templates setting out the requirements for land, delivery and offsite contributions for education, specific to each of the site allocations. The requirements are consistent with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the ESFA considers the Site Development Templates to be an effective approach to ensuring education needs are addressed.	Support acknowledged and welcomed.
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)	Yes	CP8a - Support - DIO	<p>The DIO considers that the Part 2 plan is sound and in accordance with Paragraph 182 of the NPPF. It is:</p> <p>Positively prepared as it is based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including Oxford City's unmet need Justified as it is the most appropriate strategy Effective as it is deliverable of the plan period Would enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the Framework policies.</p> <p>The DIO supports: The Councils overallocation of land, which it considers to be consistent with the requirements of paragraph 157 of the NPPF The proposed additional site allocations and the focus for development at Dalton Barracks, which is consistent with paragraph 52 of the NPPF The DIO agrees that the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area is the most suitable sub-area within which to locate the Vale's proportion of Oxford's unmet housing need due to its proximity, and frequent and reliable public transport linkages to Oxford, which are likely to improve over the plan period. The DIO identify that the Dalton Barracks site has potential to deliver more housing (approximately 4,500 homes total) over a longer period, enabling the delivery of a highly sustainable, mixed-use development.</p>	Support from the Defence Infrastructure Organisation acknowledged and welcomed.
852191	Adrian Colwell	Cherwell District Council					CP8a - Support Statutory Cherwell District Council	Cherwell District Council are supportive of LPP2 and Core Policy 8a as it recognises the need for Vale to work in partnership with other authorities in delivering Oxford's unmet needs alongside the strategy for meeting this need within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.	Support from Cherwell District Council acknowledged and welcomed.
852191	Adrian Colwell	Cherwell District Council					CP8a Monitoring - Statutory Cherwell	Cherwell District Council support the approach for meeting Oxford City's unmet need within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area but would welcome more detail in the Housing	Support from Cherwell District Council acknowledged and welcomed.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							District Council	Trajectory to show the monitoring of the full quantum of Oxford's unmet housing needs to be met within the Vale.	
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill	Oxford Green Belt Network				No	Dalton Barracks Proposals	A number of comments were made in relation to the Dalton Barracks proposals.	Noted. The Council understands that development can commence from 2024 as confirmed by the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation. The masterplanning of the site will be informed by the Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and involving key stakeholders. The village of Shippon currently adjoins the built form of the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. The size of the site will facilitate the inclusion of substantial areas of Green Infrastructure and the relationship and connections to Shippon can be explored further through the masterplanning work. The Council has published the Exceptional Circumstances Report to set out its case for removing Dalton Barracks from the Green Belt. The Council considers that its proposals are consistent with national policy and that overall, the plan represents an appropriate strategy for the district up to 2031. The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The partnership working includes preparing a sustainable transport study for the area that focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford, focusing on bus/cycle/walking access to/from Dalton Barracks. Other evidence includes the Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study and in partnership with OCC, proposals are made for a north bound bus lane on the A34 connecting Lodge Hill and Hinksey Junctions; a new Park and Ride is proposed at Lodge Hill by the County Council along with a Rapid Transit Route connecting to Oxford. Discussions and work is ongoing to ensure bus services are improved along with improved pedestrian and cycle connections. The Development Site Template includes a comprehensive package of requirements relating to access and highways. Core Policy 8b includes a commitment to plan for the site comprehensively with the preparation of a Comprehensive Masterplan to be adopted as SPD.
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No		Key issues:	
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No		Deliverability: uncertainty over when the site will be released for development; there are significant constraints on delivery and a late release is likely to result in a shortfall, risking the effectiveness of the plan.	
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley			Coalescence with Shippon: Shippon is classified as a smaller village and the proposals cannot be considered proportionate. 94% Shippon residents (responding to the Parish Council consultation) have objected to this and the lack of response undermines the evidence base and justification for development at Dalton Barracks. This makes the plan unsound. The Plan needs to specify that the new development will be separate from Shippon so that Shippon can retain its historic identity.	
1142840	Mr Ian Rhead					No		The housing requirement could be met without removing the site from the Green Belt	
1143092	Mrs Sian Keeling	David Wilson Homes Ltd (Southern)	1143090	Mrs Sophie Horsley	Strutt & Parker	No		Transport and highways: the proposals are unsustainable and the highways improvements are not confirmed; it is negligent to propose allocations before funding and routes are confirmed for the South Abingdon link road, Oxford to Cambridge Expressway and improvements to the A34.	
1144120	Mr Stephen Fairman					No		Phasing: more information is required to better understand how the development will be phased.	
1144168	The Binning Family		1144167	John Savills		No		Windfalls: the Dalton Barracks windfall should have led to a review of the housing allocation in North Abingdon	
1144174	The Nissen Family		1144167	John Savills		No		The Plan fails to include the total numbers of dwellings proposed (in CP4a). The Part 2 plan sets out that 1,998 dwellings are being supplied above the housing requirement for the plan period.	
1144780	J A Pye					No		The proposed allocation is unsound as it fails the requirement at paragraph 182 of the NPPF	
1144780	J A Pye		1144779	Mr Alan Divall	West Waddy Adp	No		A number of comments were made supporting the Dalton Barracks proposals, stating:	
1145064	Mr and Mrs Simon and Gemma Hartwright		765833	Mr Jason Hill	Savills	No		Dalton Barracks will contribute 1,200 homes in a suitable location towards the 2,200 required to meet Oxford's unmet need over the plan period. Support for the development at the Dalton Barracks site The site can assist with delivering much needed affordable housing in the area	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response				
								A larger allocation should be proposed at Dalton Barracks in case South Oxfordshire are unable to meet their quantum of unmet need Support in principle from SPADE for the use of previously developed land on the basis that the development is required to meet the shortfall against OAN and potentially to support Oxford's unmet need					
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council					Dalton Barracks Proposals - support	Support in principle from West Oxfordshire to remove Dalton Barracks from the Green Belt in order to contribute towards Oxford City's unmet need	Support received from other respondents, including West Oxfordshire District Council is acknowledged and welcomed.				
829424	Mr Clive Manvell	East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes		No	East Hanney sites	A large number of comments were made objecting to the two proposed allocations in the village of East Hanney (North of East Hanney and North-East of East Hanney) in relation to: • Access and Highways • Environmental Health • Flooding • Housing Density • Impact on Heritage Assets • Lack of Community Infrastructure • Landscape Impact • Settlement Character • Village Classification • Wastewater and Drainage These issues make the proposed allocations and therefore the Plan unsound. More detailed summaries of the above issues can be viewed in the North of East Hanney and North-East of East Hanney tables. Detail of other issues raised is included below: The proposed allocations in East Hanney are not compliant with the NPPF and the following District Council's policies: Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility, Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking, and Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness, which makes the Plan unsound. Some comments raise concern that East Hanney has expanded rapidly in recent years as a result of windfall development. Consultees feel that the village has sufficiently supported growth within the District and as such the Plan should allocate housing elsewhere. Recent planning appeals for 200 homes at Steventon Road and Summertown were dismissed by the Secretary of State because they were out of scale with East Hanney. The 80 proposed homes would have a similar impact and be unsustainable. Comments question the housing requirement in East Hanney; one states that existing housing is not selling, so further housing should not be built, whilst others question how the current and future needs of the aging population will be accommodated by the new developments, which goes against Core Policy 26: Accommodating the Current and Future Needs of	The Council consider that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular as well as to Oxford. The developments proposed at East Hanney are of a scale appropriate to a settlement the size of East Hanney and are considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement. The Council would like to highlight that the outcomes of the appeal decisions to the south of Summertown, East Hanney and south of Steventon Road, East Hanney found the principle of development at East Hanney acceptable, but was dismissed on other grounds. The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and collaborative working with key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council and the Environment Agency. The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council is content that the proposed development at East Hanney will not lead to any significant highway impacts and that the site has access to relatively good public transport. It is notable that the site proposal is supported by both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, who consider that development will help to improve bus frequency. The Site Development Template sets out requirements to ensure the development proposals deliver and high quality and sustainable extension, which integrates with the centre of the village. These also ensure that appropriate access is provided to the sites. The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that appropriate access can be achieved and OCC are informing the emerging masterplans for the sites.				
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell					No							
829470	Dr Christopher Baker					No							
829926	mr david blomley					No							
831354	Tim Lancaster					Yes							
861678	Mr Guy Langton					No							
861678	Mr Guy Langton					No							
865961	Mr David Kirk					No							
867551	Mr Stewart Scott					No							
868060	Mr Paul Aram					No							
879508						Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd				879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning	No
1095766	Andrew and Camilla Symes												No
1096915						Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd				1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No
1142099	Mr Terence Palmer												No
1142467	Mr Philip Pickles												No
1142784	Mr Brian Cooper					No							
1142863	MRS EDITH CRAIG					No							

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1142868	DR JOHN CRAIG					No		<p>the Aging Population. One comments states that it is not possible to provide sufficient affordable housing within these new developments due to the flooding issues.</p> <p>One comment states the archaeological importance of East Hanney following several important finds in locations not identifiable by a desk top study. As such, if development were to go ahead then Archaeological Investigations should be undertaken.</p> <p>One comment questions what improvements are required to improve the East Hanney foul sewer system so that it can cope with the additional houses (both approved and proposed). Upgrade works would be costly and may impact the timely delivery of housing. Thames Water has not started a Stage 2 Study yet which means it is unlikely that the sites proposed would be deliverable in the timeframe the Council wishes to achieve from smaller proposed sites.</p> <p>A number of comments state that the Council have failed in their Duty to Cooperate as they have not properly addressed the issues raised by East Hanney Parish Council and its residents, and the Plan is not in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As such, the site should be removed from the Plan; more development should be proposed at Dalton Barracks or Davis Yard instead.</p> <p>If there is an identified requirement and development does go ahead in East Hanney, East Hanney Parish Council would wish to work collaboratively with the Council to achieve a better position for the village, recognizing that the detail of the current plan as provided is neither acceptable to or supported by the community – or indeed in alignment with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. If development is approved the Parish Council would also like take ownership of common areas so that they will maintain the areas and have the ability to install, inspect and maintain children's play equipment that can serve that local development.</p>	<p>The Site Development Templates require developers to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment/surface water drainage strategy based on information contained in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, to support a planning application. The Council has undertaken an SFRA of the preferred sites which has informed the site selection process. Neither OCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Environment Agency have raised any concerns over the sites in the context of flood risk. The Council has signed a Statement of Common Ground with OCC and the Environment Agency who confirm they have no objections to the site allocations at East Hanney.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates require developers to upgrade the sewer network and to liaise with Thames Water. Thames Water have confirmed that they have no infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to these sites.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out requirements to ensure development proposals undertake a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to inform the site design, layout, capacity and mitigation requirements. The Council has also prepared a district wide Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) that identifies the key features to inform an understanding of the character and local distinctiveness of the Vale's landscape.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges East Hanney Parish Council's response. The masterplanning of these sites will be prepared in accordance with Core Policy 38 in the adopted Part 1 plan, in consultation with the Council, local community and key stakeholders.</p> <p>For further detail of the other issues raised relating to the proposed allocations at East Hanney, please see the individual tables for North of East Hanney and North-East of East Hanney in Appendix 3 of this Regulation 22 Consultation Statement.</p>
1142975	Mrs Daphne Carrington-Ough					No			
1143002	Mr and Mrs F & J Smith					No			
1143055	Mr Steven Moss					No			
1143228	Mrs Gillian Parry					No			
1143230	Mrs Carleen Roseff					No			
1143313	Dr JAMES TRIFFITT					No			
1144042	Mr Derek Bowland					No			
1144099	Mr Robert Evans					No			
1144186	Mrs Judy Long					No			
1144356	Ms Barbara Burke					No			
1144491	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke					No			
1144777	Mr Bill Orson					No			
1144871	Mr William Hailey					No			
1144883	Mr Clive Fewins					No			
1145034	Mrs Elizabeth Cornish					No			
1145034	Mrs Elizabeth Cornish					No			
1145236	Mrs Penelope McCall					No			
776299	Tom Smailes	Linden Homes				Yes	East Hanney Sites - support	Some comments were made in support of the East Hanney sites. The strategy to address Oxford's unmet need in locations with good access to Oxford is supported. East Hanney is identified as a large village in the Part 1 plan and as such is a sustainable location for development consistent with the established spatial strategy to promote thriving	Support acknowledged and welcomed.
1143288	Mr and Mrs Kauert		872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								villages and rural communities whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character. It is well connected to Wantage and Grove and is located on a strategic transport corridor. The Site Promoter believes it is a sound allocation that can be bought forward early in the plan period and will make a positive and sustainable contribution to housing delivery.	
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Heritage Assets - Statutory Historic England	One comment was received from Historic England stating that none of the sites proposed in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area contain any designated heritage assets.	Noted.
1143288 1143289	Mr and Mrs Kauert	Lagan Homes Limited	872479 872479	Mr Paul Slater Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited Edgars Limited	No No	Housing Requirement - Windfalls	A number of comments raise concern over the proposed change to the Council's Windfall allowance from 70 dwellings per year to 100. It is suggested that some years within the historic delivery data provided skew the average and if these were omitted, the average rate of delivery would be 95 dwellings per year, rather than 100 proposed by the Council. It is therefore suggested that the Council have failed to provide compelling evidence to justify the change to the Windfall allowance. Concern is raised over the reliance on housing delivery coming forward through Neighbourhood Plans and the distribution of the windfall allowance across the district.	The windfall allowance of 70 dwellings per year was found to be soundly based through the Part 1 Plan Examination. The Council have sought to update this figure based on past delivery and taken a cautious approach, proposing to increase the allowance to 100 dwellings per year. It is noted that some representations point out that if past years with higher rates of delivery are omitted the past delivery would still represent 95 dwellings per year. The Council has simply updated the windfall allowance figures for each Sub-Area, as set out in the Part 1 Plan, on a pro-rata basis, replacing the 100 dwellings per year instead of 70. The Council consider that this is based on robust evidence. The total increase is from 840 dwellings to 1100, an increase of 260 for the plan period as a whole. The plan does not rely on any sites coming forward through Neighbourhood Plans, the plan simply refers to the fact that sites may come forward through Neighbourhood plans, this is a matter for the bodies preparing the neighbourhood Plans. Past delivery is sufficient to justify the proposed windfall allowance without any sites coming through Neighbourhood planning. It may also be helpful to consider that the plan makes provision for 24,748 dwellings, which is somewhat higher than the 22,760 requirement and such that the plan already provides for sufficient flexibility/ contingency.
1015345	MRS ANNIE THOMAS						Housing Supply	One comment expresses surprise that there is no total figure in the table supporting Core Policy 4a showing the number of dwellings the Council is intending to be built between 2015 and 2031. It seems as though 2,000 more homes are being planned than are needed, which is not addressed in the Plan. This seems to be an oversight and deceitful. As such, the comment objects to the development at Dalton Barracks, Kingston Bagpuize and Marcham, and believes they should be removed from the plan.	The district's housing requirement (22,760 homes) is clearly set out by Core Policy 4a and this will form the housing requirement for the purposes of monitoring five-year housing land supply. If the Council planned only for the requirement, any deviation in delivery on any site, in any year of the plan, could result in the Council being unable
1142099	Mr Terence Palmer					No	Impact of development	It is an unavoidable fact that we need expansion in the Vale but all efforts and focus should be on delivering this with the minimum impact.	Noted. The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence, including Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and collaborative working with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
831354	Tim Lancaster					Yes	Infilling Development	More focus should be put on small infilling developments rather than large developments 'bolted' on to village boundaries.	<p>Core Policy 4 in the adopted Part 1 plan makes appropriate provision for limited infill development at the smaller villages, within the existing built areas of these settlements, it allocated within an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan or future parts of the Local Plan 2031.</p> <p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and collaborative working with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p>
1093046	Mrs Claire Flint					No	Infrastructure Improvements	The proposed developments should take into consideration required infrastructure improvements. The comment makes specific reference to the existing network at Marcham, where Thames Water have questioned its ability to support further development. It is not possible to upgrade the pumping station for foul water as it can only be accessed through Hyde Farm; no remedial or improvement work can be undertaken whilst maintaining access to this property. As such, the proposed development is unsound.	<p>Noted. The Council has worked closely with Thames Water and prepared evidence, including a Water Cycle Study and Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support the plan process. The IDP is a live document and will continue to be updated. An updated version is published alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan. Whilst upgrades will be needed to the network to support development, the Council is not aware of any barriers to development.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates (Appendix A) sets out general requirements to ensure development proposals demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or waste water capacity to serve the development and to ensure developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates also set out site specific requirements, for example the proposed development to the South East of Marcham will be required to upgrade the sewer network.</p> <p>A Statement of Common Ground has been signed between Vale of White Horse District Council and Thames Water, who confirm they do not have any objection to the proposed development.</p>
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited		724828	Mr Roger Smith	Savills L and P Ltd, Mr R Smith, Director	No	Kingston Bagpuize - Support from Agent	The Agent for the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor proposal supports Kingston Bagpuize as a main focus for additional growth for the district as set out in Core Policy 8a. This is supported by the evidence based and the Part 1 plan. The Agent has undertaken various technical works on the site and its surroundings and there does not appear to be any 'in principle' reason constraining the site from delivering up to 700 dwellings alongside a mix of uses and a relief road. The allocation should therefore be amended accordingly.	Noted. Whilst this site is allocated in the Part 2 plan for 'around' 600 dwellings subject to masterplanning and policy requirements being demonstrably complied with. This does not preclude more development coming forward on the allocated site, subject to the policy requirements being met. This is a matter for the Development Management process.
1094959 1095037	Amanda Smith Christopher Smith					No No	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Proposal	The proposal for the allocation at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is unsound. It is incorrectly stated as Kingston Bagpuize and should instead be Fyfield and the Council failed to initially consult with	Whilst the development falls within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney, the development adjoins the settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, which is classified as a larger village and is

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1142522	Mr Michael Pearce	Longworth Parish Council				No		<p>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council. The Parish Council states that this was intended to ignore the objections of residents, 310 of whom signed a petition against the proposal. As such, the Council has failed its Duty to Cooperate. The development proposes a significant increase in housing in an area where it is quite clear that the current infrastructure is wholly inadequate.</p> <p>Many of the descriptions in LPP2 contain inaccurate or misleading analyses of the value of the site (e.g. ratings of landscape impact, ecology impact, historic environment and access issues all exclude important parameters). The proposed development will worsen transport and cause environmental harm, of which are so severe they cause the site to not meet the NPPF's criterion of environmental sustainability. The road past Fyfield is already one of the main bottlenecks. A new roundabout near Fyfield will worsen the problem, encouraging still more drivers to rat-run through Netherton and Tubney. Instead, this section of the A420 should be protected from future development. The infrastructure of these roads simply cannot sustain the amount of traffic nor handle the issues and problems that another 600 possibly 700 houses in this location will cause.</p> <p>Longworth Parish Council also state their objection to the East of Kingston Bagpuize allocation and welcome the opportunity to discuss this in further detail with the Council.</p>	<p>considered to be a sustainable location for development with good services and facilities and public transport. There were a number of sites allocated within the Part 1 plan which adjoin settlements such as Abingdon-on-Thames, Didcot, Faringdon and Wantage, yet fall within neighbouring parishes. It is accepted that any residents of the development to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would consider that they live at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and would use services and facilities for this settlement.</p> <p>The Council has worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council is content that the proposed development at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor will not lead to any significant highway impact and that the site has access to relatively good public transport. It is also notable that the site proposed is broadly supported by both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, who consider that development will help to improve bus frequency.</p> <p>The Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI) Study concludes that following an assessment of the cumulative growth in the Part 1 plan and additional site allocations in the Part 2 plan growth can be accommodated on the existing highway network with appropriate mitigation, including the safeguarding of land for the delivery of future transports schemes identified in the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out specific site requirements to ensure the development proposal contribute towards infrastructure improvements on the A420, A415 and necessary mitigation measures identified through the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>he Council has undertaken an extensive consultation programme in accordance with national legislation, national policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2016). Further details of the Council's consultation programme are available in the Consultation Statement that supported the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan and the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement that supports the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>The Council considers all responses to each stage of consultation and takes these into account in preparing the Plan. Notwithstanding the objections from the parish of Fyfield and Tubney and Longworth Parish Council, the Council considers that the site is sustainable and appropriate.</p>
1144178	Ms Linda McKendrick					No			
1144426	Mr Alan Woodward					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>The Council has acknowledged the petition submitted by Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council to the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan. All representations made on the Publication Version (Regulation 19) of the Part 2 plan are submitted alongside the Plan to the Secretary of State for Examination.</p> <p>A Planning Inspector will have the opportunity to examine and consider all representations, including the petition submitted by Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council.</p>
1093046	Mrs Claire Flint					No	Listed Buildings	One comment states that proposed developments should respect listed buildings with specific reference to the Marcham allocation which is immediately opposite the curtilage of a Grade II star listed building. No account has been taken of protecting the environment and access to this building.	<p>Comments noted. Historic assets are considered as part of the site selection process. Any development would need to abide by Development Policies 36,37 and 38 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, in addition to Core Policy 39 of the adopted Part 1 plan, which sets a framework to ensure proposals to conserve and enhance heritage assets in accordance with national policy and legislation.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates (General Requirements) also include a series of policy requirements relating to the Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage.</p>
1094284	Mr James Greenman					No	Lodge Hill Junction	Proposals for Lodge Hill are detrimental to the local area; whilst it gives ease of access, it also creates noise and other pollution from excessive traffic. The comment questions where the funding and resources for these projects will come from.	The land safeguarded for a future park and ride at Lodge Hill is included in the plan at the request of the County Council who are responsible for planning for highways as Highways Authority and is consistent with the adopted Local Transport Plan 4.
1142989	Mrs Fiona Freeman					No			
1143299	Ms Marie Monaghan					No	LPP1 Allocation North Abingdon	One consultee questions why 800 houses were proposed in North Abingdon, yet 950 were passed. There is no bus service to support the housing estate by Tilsley Park and thus a survey should be carried out. The comment also raises concerns regarding Development Policies 25-35 and supports the views presented by SPADE.	The Council considers that this response relates to a Part 1 allocation and does not affect the soundness of the Part 2 plan. Whilst this site was allocated for 'around' 800 dwellings subject to masterplanning and policy requirements being demonstrably complied with. This does not preclude more development coming forward on the allocated site, subject to the policy requirements being met. This is a matter for the Development Management process.
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No	LPP1 Contribution to Unmet Housing	The Part 1 plan contained a strategic housing allocation of 280 houses which represents an already significant contribution to Oxford's unmet housing need.	<p>Noted. The Part 2 plan clearly states that the agreed apportionment of unmet need for Oxford (2,200 dwellings) is to be met through a combination of Part 1 strategic allocations and Part 2 additional allocations.</p> <p>The adopted Part 1 plan includes a policy requirement (Core Policy 2) which clearly states that the Council will address the agreed apportionment of Oxford's unmet housing need through the preparation of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, to ensure the quantum of unmet need provided for within the Vale is addressed in a timely manner and is informed by a robust approach to plan making in accordance with national policy and legislation.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									The Oxfordshire growth Board have overseen a process to apportion unmet housing need for Oxford and all but one Oxfordshire Authority have signed the Memorandum of Understanding. The Vale of White Horse is seeking to meet, in full, the quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford agreed to be delivered within the Vale.
1093046 1142522	Mrs Claire Flint Mr Michael Pearce	Longworth Parish Council				No No	Marcham - Air Quality	A couple of comments were made regarding the impact of proposed development in Marcham on the AQMA. It is noted that the amount of proposed development at Marcham was reduced following County Council objection. The plan proposes that the impact of the increase in air pollution the AQMC will be minimal. This is assertion is not evidence based and is unlikely to be correct. With the fact that is already at a crawl with the existing traffic issues caused by development already completed, it can only be the same if not worse with further development. As such, the proposed development at Marcham is unsound and does not conform with policy on sustainability.	<p>The VOWH have, and continue to work in partnership, with Oxfordshire County Council and have prepared joint evidence assessing highway impact associated with the Part 2 plan. Following an objection from Oxfordshire County Council to the Preferred Options consultation to the scale of development at Marcham, the Council have significantly reduced the scale of proposed development from 520 dwellings to 90. It is considered that the majority of additional traffic will travel towards Oxford, Abingdon-on-Thames or Science Vale and so travel to the east, rather than through Marcham, however the significant reduction in growth will also help to reduce any cumulative impact.</p> <p>Development Policy 26: Air Quality ensures that development proposals of a large scale or likely to significantly impact on air quality, including where located in or near an AQMA will require an Air Quality Assessment to be undertaken in line with best practice and guidance. Applicants will also be required to take into account the Council's emerging Air Quality Developers Guidance.</p> <p>Work has been undertaken, and will be ongoing, to ensure that potential for sustainable public transport connectivity with the site can be maximised.</p>
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England					Marcham - Statutory Highways England	One comment was made by Highways England in relation to Marcham, stating that their comments on this policy no longer apply following the significant reduction of homes located in Marcham in Core Policy 8a.	Noted.
1142099	Mr Terence Palmer					No	Natural Environment	The best option should development need to take place is for it to take place in areas that have the best protection for the environment; development outside brownfield sites is going to impact the natural environment, and creating green spaces within housing developments is not a suitable substitute for the lost environments, meadows, open fields and farm lands that these developments are built over. Option 1 is viable with its 8% excess, any further development should not be approved if anything other than profit is the motivation.	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by detailed technical evidence and informal engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>Core Policy 45 in the adopted Part 1 plan ensure development proposals make appropriate provision of Green Infrastructure through new development in line with the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy. The Site Development Templates (General Requirements) ensure Green Infrastructure is part of the design process and should connect to existing Green Infrastructure assets both within the development and on neighbouring sites.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									Core Policy 46 in the adopted Part 1 plan seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity across the district, including a requirement for development proposals to achieve a no net loss of biodiversity.
1096872	Patsy Dell	Oxford City Council				No	Oxford Unmet Need - Statutory OX City Council	The City Council welcomes the amendment to provide for Oxford needs solely within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. It is also encouraging that development around north Abingdon is already advancing, such as the outline planning permission for 950 dwellings in North Abingdon.	Support from Oxford City Council acknowledge and welcomed.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No	Oxford Unmet Need - Statutory Ox County Council	Oxfordshire County Council welcome the District planning to allocate sufficient sites to fully accommodate its share of Oxford's unmet housing need as agreed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board and in line with the Memorandum of Cooperation. The County have no objection in principle to the District's strategy of allocating the agreed share of Oxford's unmet need to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and providing for it through a combination of strategic allocations from the adopted Local Plan Part 1 and new Part 2 allocations. They consider a minor amendment is required to the justification in Para 2.14 (below) to refer to the Sub-Area having greatest potential for frequent and reliable public transport, cycling and walking linkages. This is necessary for soundness given that contributions to improved transport infrastructure are needed. The County are pleased to see a commitment from the District to work jointly with Oxford City to put in place arrangements for allocating affordable housing to those in unmet need. They recognise that there are also issues which will need further joint work regarding the total number of affordable houses given that the Vale of White Horse will also need to address their own affordable housing need in this area, and the quantum of unmet need in Oxford City is based on 50% affordable housing rather than the 35% proposed in the Vale of White Horse District. The amendment proposed to Paragraph 2.14 is as follows: 'The Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area is closest to and has the most GREATEST POTENTIAL FOR frequent and reliable public transport, CYCLING AND WALKING linkages to Oxford...'	The Council acknowledge Oxfordshire County Council's support and suggested amendments to the supporting text. The Council has recommended a suggested amendment to help reflect this wording. The Publication Version of the Part 2 plan included a clear commitment that the Council will work with Oxford City Council to agree an approach to the allocation of affordable housing to contribute towards the affordable housing needs of Oxford City. A Statement of Common Ground has been produced between the Council and Oxford City Council to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.
1142099	Mr Terence Palmer					No	Plan Objectives	One comment states that for the most part the plan is well presented and considered. However, it is unsound in that despite its own conclusions it recommends a course of action that conflicts significantly with the key objectives.	The Council is satisfied that the proposed site allocations within the Part 2 plan are fully consistent with national policy and the Spatial Strategy, Strategic Objectives and Settlement Hierarchy included in the adopted Part 1 plan.
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning		Site Selection	One comment objects to Core Policy 8a as the approach taken to allocations in Part 2 is unsound and inconsistent with national policy; there are concerns about the Sustainability Appraisal and Topic	The Council is satisfied that the proposed allocations within the Part 2 in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area are fully consistent with the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy included in

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Paper which underpin the decisions made about housing allocations in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.	<p>the adopted Part 1 plan and national policy. The Council is seeking to meet the identified Objectively Assessed Need in full and the identified quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale in full.</p> <p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence, collaborative working with key stakeholders and the consideration of reasonable alternatives through Sustainability Appraisal. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p>
1100261		Catesby Property Group	1096086	Taylor Cherrett	Turley		South East Marcham - Support	<p>It is considered that the proposed allocation of land at south east Marcham, through LPP2, meets the requirements of Core Policy 2 of LPP1, in that the site is located within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub Area and accordingly has strong functional links with the city of Oxford.</p> <p>Comments state support for the allocation of 90 dwellings at South-East of Marcham and welcomes the principle that the Part 2 plan seeks to meet the unmet housing needs of Oxford City. It is clear that the continuation of the approach taken by the Vale of White Horse promotes the County's economic strategy as well as the delivery of much need affordable housing within the Housing Market Area. The approach rightly supports Oxford City to meet its housing needs given the physical constraints it faces in delivering both market and affordable housing.</p> <p>The South-East of Marcham allocation complies with Core Policy 3, Core Policy 4, in that it supports the Council in meeting a proportion of its housing requirement and is contiguous with the settlement boundary of Marcham and thereby a logical extension to the settlement, and adheres to the aims of Core Policy 8 by supporting the Council in meeting the identified requirement to be delivered through LPP2.</p>	Support acknowledged and welcomed.
776299	Tom Smailes	Linden Homes				No	Windfalls	<p>The Part 1 plan makes it clear that the housing requirement for each Sub-Area is a minimum figure. The comment argues that reliance on windfalls is unnecessary as any additional windfall development would come forward in addition to meeting the minimum requirement through allocations. Instead of relying on windfalls, the Council should be seeking to actively identify additional suitable sites within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. The comment specifically references the recent appeal decision at East Hendred, where the Inspector questioned the timely delivery of a number of sites in the Science Vale Sub-Area so soon after the adoption of Part 1.</p>	<p>The windfall allowance of 70 dwellings per year was found to be soundly based through the Part 1 Plan Examination. The Council have sought to update this figure based on past delivery and taken a cautious approach, proposing to increase the allowance to 100 dwellings per year. It is noted that some representations point out that if past years with higher rates of delivery are omitted the past delivery would still represent 95 dwellings per year. The Council has simply updated the windfall allowance figures for each Sub-Area, as set out in the Part 1 Plan, on a pro-rata basis, replacing the 100 dwellings per year instead of 70.</p> <p>The Council consider that this is based on robust evidence. The total increase is from 840 dwellings to 1100, an increase of 260 for the plan period as a whole. The plan does not rely on any sites coming forward through Neighbourhood Plans, the plan</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>simply refers to the fact that sites may come forward through Neighbourhood plans, this is a matter for the bodies preparing the neighbourhood Plans. Past delivery is sufficient to justify the proposed windfall allowance without any sites coming through Neighbourhood planning. it may also be helpful to consider that the plan makes provision for 24,748 dwellings, which is somewhat higher than the 22,760 requirement and such that the plan already provides for sufficient flexibility/ contingency.</p>

East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (Fyfield and Tubney Parish)

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095180	Mr Mark Baker	Ashbury Parish Council				No	Access and highways	There were a number of comments received, including from Ashbury Parish Council, relating to access and highways. Key comments included the following: The existing infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate the proposed growth at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Proposed allocation would increase congestion on the A420, which is already at capacity at peak hours Local employment opportunities are not reasonably accessible by existing public transport Increased congestion joining on the A420 or across the A338 Increased congestion on the A415 and the A34 would impact on Marcham Existing bus services available on the A420 and A415 are limited The proposed new roundabout on the A420 will increase congestion and rat-running through Netherton, Fyfield and Tubney Proposed by-pass through the site connecting to the A415 will create congestion on the A415 and will still have to cross the A415/A338 junction Proposal will increase noise pollution There have been several incidents on highways located at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, Fyfield and Tubney Commuter traffic from the proposed allocation would feed onto local trunk roads which are already at capacity at peak times	The Council has worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council is content that the proposed development at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor will not lead to any significant highway impacts and that the site has access to relatively good public transport. It is notable that the site proposal is supported by Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, who consider that development will help to improve bus frequency. The Council has worked in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to prepare technical evidence to support plan preparation, including an Evaluation of Transport Impact (ETI) Study. The ETI assessed the cumulative impact of growth on the strategic highway network, including the A34, A415 and the A338. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensure that appropriate access is provided to this site. The Council continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that appropriate site access can be achieved, and OCC are informing the emerging masterplan for this site. The Site Development Templates sets out site specific requirements to ensure the development proposal contributes towards infrastructure improvements on the A420, A415 and any necessary mitigation measures identified through a Transport Assessment. A requirement is also included in the Site Development Template to ensure the developer contributes towards increasing the frequency of existing bus service provision and to provide for buses to travel through the site and associated bus stop infrastructure. Development Policy 25: Noise Pollution ensures all new development proposals are acceptable in relation to noise pollution. Development proposals will be expected to take into account the Council's emerging noise planning guidance to ensure noise is adequately addressed and mitigated within their development proposals. The Site Development Templates includes a requirement to ensure potential noise pollution impacts from the A420 and A415 are investigated and appropriately mitigated.
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall								
1097547	Sarah Daley								
1097839	Nick Tucker								
1098086	Mrs SM Collins								
1142392	Mr Vic Johnson								
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis								
1144029	Mrs Lisa Spurgeon								
1144178	Ms Linda McKendrick								
1144305	Mrs Winifred Cox								
1144596	Mr William Martin								
1145537	Ms Clare Arnold								
1144426	Mr Alan Woodward								
1095962	Graham Varney					No	Access and highways - A415/A338	There were a few comments received in relating to access and highways, particularly impacts on the A338 and A415. A key comment was that the proposal does not recognise effect on the A415/A338 Frilford Junction which is at capacity at peak times. Traffic would extend to the A415 increasing rat-running on local roads.	Core Policy 12 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 safeguards land to the support the delivery for improvements to Frilford Lights which is a commitment in the adopted Local Transport Plan. In addition to this the Part 2 plan safeguards additional land to support the delivery for the future provision for a South Marcham Bypass linking the A415 to the west

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									of Marcham and east of Marcham to alleviate traffic flows through Marcham.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Access and highways - A420	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to access and highways, particularly impacts on the A420. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Proposed allocation would have an impact on the A420. Traffic between the site, the Science Vale and at Abingdon would have an adverse impact on the Marcham Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)</p> <p>Conditions on the A420 are poor. Road is single carriage and is already at capacity. Delays to join the A420 and takes a long time to get into Oxford</p> <p>Bus service 66 is often delayed in the mornings due to congestion on the A420</p> <p>Direct negative effects associated with congestion on the A420 including noise and vibration, air and light pollution</p> <p>Proposed allocation has limited access to local employment opportunities and would require commuting by car on the A420 which is at capacity</p> <p>Evidence produced by the Council in 2014 (Evaluation of Transport Impacts) indicates that the A420 is forecast to operate at or above capacity in directions at Buckland, near Cumnor and near Fyfield</p> <p>Evidence produced by the Council in 2014 (Evaluation of Transport Impacts) indicates that the A415 is forecast to operate capacity between Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield</p> <p>Evidence produced by the Council in 2017 (Evaluation of Transport Impacts) indicates an overall growth of traffic of 36%. Report states that A420 would still operate at capacity in the eastern direction during morning peak hours, and western direction during evening peak hours</p> <p>Mitigation will have limited or no impact. Improvements to the Botley Interchange will aid access to and from A420, but will not address congestion at Fyfield</p> <p>Residents of Fyfield will be forced into long detours to access the primary school</p> <p>Evaluation of Transport Impact traffic modelling relies on an out-of-date baseline</p> <p>Evaluation of Transport Impact predicts 'rat-running' along Digging Lane to the south of the A420 during evening peak hours</p> <p>There is no safe pedestrian crossing on the A420 at Fyfield and between Fyfield and the A420 bus stop (Oxford to Swindon)</p>	Please refer to comment above for Council response relating to highway issues.
1075935	Mr Tim Cruttenden				No				
1094354	Keith Budgen				No				
1095256	Mrs Sarah Clothier				No				
1095325	Mr Brian Buchan				No				
1095962	Graham Varney				No				
1096310	Robin Smith				No				
1097547	Sarah Daley				No				
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall				No				
1135791	Mr Smith				No				
1142755	Miss Emma Wardall				No				
1143428	Miss Rosemary Roberts				No				
1144044	Mr Geoff Prichard				No				
1144069	Mr Matthew Bowman				No				
1144134	Mrs Louise Willden				No				
1144178	Ms Linda McKendrick				No				
1144189	Mrs Charlotte Reaney				No				
1144426	Mr Alan Woodward				No				
1144431	Mr George Reaney				No				
1144431	Mr George Reaney				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144465	Mr Bruce Harris					No		Plan is based on historical and out of date information. ETI does not take into account the extent of recent developments along the A420 or current developments	
1144592	Miss Isabel Martin				No				
1144596	Mr William Martin				No				
1145347	Dr Dimitrios Hatzis				No				
1147114	Mrs Lisa Fox-Brunuley				No				
1144189	Mrs Charlotte Reaney				No				
1153355	Mrs Cris Leduq-Jones				No				
730184	Councillor Yvonne Constance	Vale of White Horse District Council					Access and highways - A420/A415	There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, relating to access and highways, particularly the A420/A415. Key comments included the following: A420 and A415 are already at or above capacity at peak times Crossing the A420 is hazardous for pedestrians accessing the bus stops at all times Further journeys through Marcham will increase pollution levels along the A415 New roundabout on the A420 will encourage rat-running Proposed mitigation will have limited or no impact on traffic congestion along the A420 Traffic between the site, Science Vale and at Abingdon would have an impact on the Marcham Air Quality Management Area Traffic along Abingdon Road, particularly at the A420/A415 roundabout and Frilford Junction Rat-running through Fyfield, Netherton and Tubney using the Netherton Road and Digging Lane through Fyfield Drivers wishing to access the far side of Abingdon would continue to rat-run via Abingdon Road at Tubney, Gozzard's Ford and Shippon rather than use the A415 and A415/A338 junction at Frilford No robust evidence has been presented that the effects can be mitigated There has been no assessment of growth at Faringdon or Witney	Please refer to comment above for Council response relating to highway issues.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			No				
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council			No				
828535	Mr John Watts	Fyfield and Tubney PC			Yes				
1095527	Mr John Bradley				No				
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall				No				
1098028	Mr James Holmes				No				
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis				No				
1143110	Dr Stephen Fraser				No				
1143352	Mr Gavin Newman				No				
1143352	Mr Gavin Newman				No				
1144134	Mrs Louise Willden				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1145048		Earl of Plymouth Estates Ltd	1145367	Mrs Sarah Moorhouse	Litchfields	No		<p>Oxfordshire County Council has identified the A420/A415 roundabout as exceeding capacity and the additional roundabout will increase congestion</p> <p>Proposed link road would cause further traffic restrictions on Witney Road and Faringdon Road</p> <p>Site should be excluded from the Part 2 plan pending a comprehensive Environmental Assessment by Oxfordshire County Council for the traffic impact on the A420 and A415</p> <p>Vehicular access required from the A420 and A415 will require two new developer roundabouts; additional junction capacity issues as access to Abingdon from the site would require vehicles to route through Frilford Lights</p> <p>There are allocations/planning permissions for over 11,000 houses between Swindon and Oxford who will use the A420 to travel to Oxford, causing severe impact on the A420</p> <p>A few comments suggested the following changes:</p> <p>A comprehensive Analysis including Traffic measurement and modelling is needed for the A420 and surrounding feeder roads with an associated Pollution and Noise assessment</p> <p>A comprehensive forecast model of the expansion impacts for the next 10 years growth in Traffic, Noise, Pollution and congestion</p> <p>The removal of proposed A420 roundabouts</p> <p>A reduction in the scale of the development</p> <p>Delivery of the Marcham Bypass</p> <p>A new junction at Frilford Heath as the A415 is gridlocked today at peak times, any increase can only make it worse directly because of the development.</p> <p>Newbridge A415 will need an additional bridge construction</p> <p>A420 will need an permanent enforced Average Speed of 30MPH</p> <p>A complete resurfacing of the A420 in the local area</p> <p>Traffic calming measures along Faringdon Road</p> <p>Crossings on Witney Road should be implemented</p> <p>Faringdon Road should include crossings, as well as road width restrictions, 20 mph speeds, entry/exit rumble strips, etc.</p> <p>Traffic restrictions between the current A420 roundabout and the new bypass must restrict traffic coming into the village, especially heavy vehicles, to 'village only'.</p>	
1145275	Dr Judy Bradley				No				
1145358	Mr David Webb				No				
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					No	Affordable Housing	There were a few comments received relating to affordable housing. Key comments included the following:	Appendix A: Site Development Templates includes a requirement to ensure that affordable housing provided on the site is evenly distributed across the

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall					No	Affordable Housing	<p>Proposal is now accompanied by a scoping application for 700 dwellings, including 100 dwellings for social housing</p> <p>Affordable housing is located by the new link road, making it less integrated within the existing communities of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield</p> <p>Affordable housing distant from Oxford will preclude those in temporary accommodation</p> <p>Recent developments in Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor suggests these are likely to be occupied by middle-class families, commuters, leaving ghettos on the fringes of traditional villages</p>	<p>site and is not used as a buffer between less desirable aspects of the site and market housing.</p> <p>Core Policy 24 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures the development proposal delivers 35% affordable housing, with a specified proportion for rented and intermediate housing.</p> <p>This policy ensures that any affordable housing provide is of a size and type that meets the requirements of those in housing need.</p> <p>The Council is not seeking to ring fence allocations for the purposes to addressing the agreed quantum of Oxford's unmet need to be met within the Vale. The unmet need is met by a combination of Part 1 strategic allocations and the Part 2 additional allocations. The allocation to the east of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, along with a number of additional allocations located in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area will ensure the revised housing requirement is fully met. The revised housing requirement is increased to take account of the addition of the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to this Sub-Area.</p>
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Agricultural Land	<p>The NPPF states that the council should use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of high quality. Land at Kingston Bagpuize is shown as category 2 which is among the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a detailed approach to site selection as set out within the Sites Selection Topic Paper.</p>
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, relating to biodiversity and green infrastructure. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Environmental impacts on rare and endangered species have not been fully considered or assessed</p> <p>Fails to mention the site is agricultural land that is of good quality</p> <p>There are known priority species located on the site, including Slow Worm, Grass Snake and Brown Hare</p> <p>Open farmland forms part of the natural green infrastructure and serves as a corridor for migratory species</p> <p>Consideration is given to the SSSI sites at Frilford Heath and Appleton Lower Common, but the National Nature Reserve at Chimney Meadows located within 5km has not been acknowledged</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) to identify if any aspects of the Plan, including development sites, may have a likely significant effect on designated European sites. The HRA has concluded that the Part 2 plan will not lead to likely significant effects on European sites either alone, or in combination with other plans and projects.</p> <p>The Promoters of the development undertake detailed ecological assessments as part of the evidence they prepare.</p> <p>Core Policy 46 of the adopted Part 1 plan provides policy guidance to conserve and enhance biodiversity when considering development proposals. The Site Development Templates ensure ecological surveys are undertaken in accordance with national guidance and best practice.</p> <p>Core Policy 45 of the adopted Part 1 plan also ensures that development proposals provide adequate provision for Green Infrastructure in line with the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall				No				
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis				No				
1144305	Mrs Winifred Cox				No				
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					No	Climate Change	<p>One comment was received relating to the proposed allocation being inconsistent with national policy (The NPPF) and Strategic Objective 12 in the adopted Part 1 plan in minimising greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution. Recent evidence published by</p>	<p>Whilst the development falls within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney, the development adjoins the settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, which is classified as a larger village and is considered to be a sustainable location for</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Department for Communities and Local Government indicates that 46% of CO2 emissions are due to transport.</p> <p>Locating housing within an isolated settlement such as Fyfield will not reduce CO2 emissions.</p>	<p>development with comparatively good services and facilities and public transport. There were a number of sites allocated within the Part 1 plan which adjoin settlements such as Abingdon, Didcot, Faringdon and Wantage, yet fall within neighbouring parishes. It is accepted that any residents of development to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would consider that they live at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and would use services and facilities for this settlement.</p> <p>Responding to climate change is one of the Council's Strategic Objectives as set out in the adopted Part 1 plan. Core Policy 40 encourages developers to incorporate climate change adaptation and design measures in all new development proposals. Core Policy 41 encourages renewable and low carbon energy generation and Core Policy 43 encourages developers to make provision for the effective use of natural resources including maximising passive solar heating and water and energy efficiency.</p> <p>Locating development with good access to public transport helps to maximise opportunities for public transport use and to improve the viability of the services, for example increasing frequency, which in turn makes the services more attractive. Locating development where public transport is already good helps to ensure that residents of new housing can access these services early during the phasing of development.</p>
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)				No	Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation	The Defence Infrastructure Organisation has commented that the proposed allocation falls within the statutory 91.4m aerodrome height safeguarding consultation zone surrounding RAF Brize Norton and statutory birdstrike safeguarding consultation zones. DIO will need to be consulted on any Sustainable Drainage Systems schemes or development, including the creation of balancing ponds.	Noted.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Comments from Historic England	Historic England were broadly supportive of the requirements set out in the Site Development Templates to ensure development proposals consider the sensitive approach to Kingston Bagpuize House and Kingston Bagpuize Park and to respect the eastern edge of the site by Aelfrith's Dyke.	Noted. Support from Historic England is welcomed and acknowledged.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No	Comments from Oxfordshire County Council - Education	Oxfordshire County Council has commented that the proposed allocation will require a new primary school. Oxfordshire County Council has commented that further work is required in relation to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Regulation 123 List in relation to the provision for new and expanding schools. Oxfordshire County Council would currently seek the costs of providing a new primary school from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), including the additional land sufficient for a two form entry school.	<p>Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates includes a requirement for the developer to deliver a new one form entry primary school, including nursery provision, on site.</p> <p>The Council continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other key infrastructure providers to identify the provision of infrastructure which is necessary to support growth proposed in the Part 2 plan. The updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments from Oxfordshire County Council - Infrastructure	Oxfordshire County Council raised concerns in securing the necessary infrastructure for the site, including two new roundabouts and a new one form entry primary school on a parcel of land large enough for future expansion. Oxfordshire County Council has commented that the current Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not recognise the amount and costings of the required infrastructure.	Noted. The Council continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other key infrastructure providers to refine the requirements and costing for infrastructure which is necessary to support growth proposed in the Part 2 plan. The updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan. This matter is also explored within a Statement of Common Ground between VOWH and OCC.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments from Oxfordshire County Council - Site Development Templates	Oxfordshire County Council has commented that the requirement in the Site Development Template should be refined to ensure that the developer will not only consider potential options to alleviate current traffic flows through the centre of Kingston Bagpuize, but also undertake the necessary works further to a Section 278 agreement with the County Council. Text in Site Development Template in relation to Access and Highways should be amended as follows: Consider potential options PROVIDE MEASURES to alleviate traffic flows through the centre of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Contribute towards infrastructure improvement on the A420, A415 (INCLUDING AT FRILFORD LIGHTS) and any necessary mitigation measures identified through the site Transport Assessment.'	Noted. The Council consider Oxfordshire County Council's suggested amendments to the Site Development Templates, in relation to access and highways, will provide further clarity and to ensure that the developer undertakes the necessary works further to a Section 278 agreement with the County Council. This change to the Site Development Template it reflected in the Schedule of Proposed Changes that supports the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford				Office use only - blank	Comments from Stagecoach	Stagecoach support the diversion of the No.66 bus service to ensure the proposed allocation can be directly served, as well as the existing No.15 service between Witney and Abingdon. Stagecoach is also examining the potential to provide a park and change facility within the proposed allocation. Service could be developed further to provide a 15 minute frequency between Swindon and Oxford via the allocation within the first 5 years of the plan period. Stagecoach consider the proposed allocation is in an exceptional location to meet Oxford's unmet need in a sustainable location, where bus use is likely to be high for journeys into the city. No.15 bus service currently provides a limited service between Kingston Bagpuize and Abingdon. However, growth along the corridor may help to reinstate hourly frequency. Stagecoach confirm that the site is already well-served by public transport.	Support from Stagecoach is welcomed and acknowledged. Appendix A: Site Development Templates include requirements to ensure developers contribute towards increasing the existing frequency of bus services and to provide for buses to travel through the site. The Council acknowledge Stagecoach's comments in relation to the larger village of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor being a sustainable location. However, the Council would like to highlight that it is not seeking to ring fence specific allocations to meet the agreed quantum of Oxford's unmet housing need. This is to be met through a combination of Part 1 strategic allocations and Part 2 additional allocations.
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills		Comments from Thames Water - Water and Wastewater Infrastructure	Thames Water has commented that the water and wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand from the proposed development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure may be required. Strategic water supply infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required.	Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that the development proposal upgrades the sewer network and are required to liaise with Thames Water to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity and/or wastewater capacity to serve the development.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No	Community services and facilities	One comment was received in relation to existing community services and facilities unable to cope with additional growth.	<p>Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is classified as a larger village within the settlement hierarchy, in accordance with Core Policy 3 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The plan, including Core Policy 3 was scrutinised by an independent Planning Inspector at examination.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>Locating development at sustainable locations, such as adjoining Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, maximises opportunities for new residents to make use of existing services and facilities, whilst ensuring that any new facilities are accessible to existing residents as well as those who will live within the proposed development. This provides for a more sustainable approach to supporting development than, for example, supporting smaller scale development at smaller settlements; in such locations, there will be fewer services and facilities available and fewer opportunities to provide new facilities.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out the required infrastructure that is necessary to ensure the development planned is sustainable.</p> <p>Developers will be required to contribute towards improvements to the existing healthcare and other community facilities in the area.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates include a requirement to ensure that developers contribute towards increasing the frequency of existing bus service provision.</p>
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Consultation	There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to publicity and public consultation. Key comments included the following:	<p>The Council has undertaken an extensive consultation programme in accordance with national legislation, national policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2016). The Preferred Options (Regulation 18) consultation was also extended to eight weeks.</p> <p>Further details of the Council's consultation programme are available in the Consultation Statement that supported the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan and the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement that supports the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>The Council considers all responses to each stage of consultation and takes these into account in preparing the plan. Notwithstanding the objections from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, the Council considers that the site is sustainable and appropriate.</p> <p>The Council has acknowledged the petition submitted by Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council to the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan. All representations made on the Publication Version</p>
1094354	Keith Budgen				No				
1095325	Mr Brian Buchan				No		No feedback was presented by the Council to the objections to the proposed allocation at previous stages of consultation		
1097547	Sarah Daley				No		Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council are strongly opposed, along with local residents as evidence in a signed petition by 310 signatories out of 313		
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall				No		Council has not used previous representations submitted by Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council and other residents to inform the site selection process		
1098023	Janine Elton				No		Lack of engagement and inadequate responses to major issues raised by the local community		
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis				No		Descriptions in the Part 2 plan and supporting technical evidence contain inaccurate or misleading analysis		
1142765	Mr Claire Cable-Alexander				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1143110	Dr Stephen Fraser					No		<p>Part 2 plan has not been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and Customer Service Standards</p> <p>Site is located within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney</p> <p>Publicity period was not long enough to review material, including supporting technical evidence and documents</p> <p>Public exhibition was poorly advertised within the parish</p> <p>The previous consultation statements fails to accurately represent how the responses have been considered and helped to inform the publication version of the part 2 plan.</p> <p>Site is not consistent with national policy and guidance – The site selection topic paper states that concerns raised through previous consultation responses have been sufficiently addressed through Appendix A site development templates. This is incorrect.</p>	<p>(Regulation 19) of the Part 2 plan are submitted alongside the Plan to the Secretary of State for Examination.</p> <p>A Planning Inspector will have the opportunity to examine and consider all representations, including the petition submitted by Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council.</p> <p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The technical evidence has been prepared by professional consultants, independent to the Council in accordance with national guidance and current best practice.</p> <p>Whilst the development falls within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney, the development adjoins the settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, which is classified as a larger village and is considered to be a sustainable location for development with comparatively good services and facilities and public transport. There were a number of sites allocated within the Part 1 plan which adjoin settlements such as Abingdon, Didcot, Faringdon and Wantage, yet fall within neighbouring parishes. It is accepted that any residents of development to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would consider that they live at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and would use services and facilities for this settlement.</p>
1144044	Mr Geoff Prichard								
1144069	Mr Matthew Bowman				No				
1144305	Mrs Winifred Cox				No				
1144596	Mr William Martin				No				
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis					No	Design	<p>One comment was received in relation to the design of the dwellings respecting the local character of the existing village.</p>	<p>Noted. Core Policy 37 and Core Policy 38 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensure development proposals are of a high-quality design that conserves and enhances historic character and reinforces local identity or establishes a distinct identity.</p> <p>Developers will be required to submit a Design and Access Statement to demonstrate how the design of the development takes into account local context to create or reinforce local distinctiveness to achieve a positive sense of place and identity, in accordance with the principles as set out in the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>Core Policy 44 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures development proposals respond to landscape character through appropriate design and management.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates includes additional requirements in relation to urban design principles to ensure the development proposal is carefully masterplanned.</p>
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Employment	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to local employment opportunities. Key comments included:</p>	<p>The Council is content that the proposed allocation is well related to a wide range of employment opportunities, both locally, and across the Sub-Area, with good public transport connectivity, particularly between Swindon and Oxford.</p>
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					No		<p>Limited opportunities for local employment that are within pedestrian/cycling access. Major centres of employment are between 10 and 20 miles away and will encourage travel by car</p> <p>Site is relatively distant from Science Vale area and will be a dormitory for commuters adding to congestion on the A420</p> <p>No alternative forms of public transport to access Harwell, Didcot and site makes no contribution to local economy</p> <p>Planned improvements to public transport in sufficient to accommodate commuters accessing employment growth centres</p> <p>Council provides no firm indication of where the 23,000 additional jobs by 2031 will be and who will fill them</p> <p>Selection of this site is inconsistent with Strategic Objective 6 in the adopted Part 1 plan</p> <p>Community services and facilities inadequate to accommodate proposed and committed growth</p>	<p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out specific requirements, in relation to access and highways, to ensure developers contribute towards increasing the frequency of bus services within the area.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council as the leading Highways Authority, who have advised where policy requirements are needed for individual sites relating to access and highways.</p> <p>Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs was subject to scrutiny through the Local Plan Part 1 Examination and is set out within the adopted plan. The proposals for economic growth are consistent with the Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan.</p>
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall				No				
1098086	Mrs SM Collins				No				
1144189	Mrs Charlotte Reaney				No				
1144431	Mr George Reaney				No				
1145275	Dr Judy Bradley				No				
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Environmental Health	<p>There were a few comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to environmental health. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Increase in traffic will impact on noise, air and light pollution and health of existing local residents</p> <p>Limited assessment of the health impacts associated with the proposed allocation</p> <p>Decrease in air quality and noise pollution, the loss of green space and damage to local heritage are not conducive to improving health</p> <p>Local health care facilities are above capacity to accommodate growth</p> <p>Proposed roundabout will add to noise and light pollution and have a disproportionate effect on traffic, noise and air pollution in Fyfield</p>	<p>Preparation of the plan includes engagement with the Site Promoter and other consultees, including Infrastructure Providers; the Site Promoters prepare detailed site specific evidence demonstrating how any constraints can be overcome and how the site would comply with the policy requirements. This detail is published at each stage of the plan making process (e.g. Preferred Options - Regulation 18 and Publication - Regulation 19).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Site Development Templates (Appendix A) sets out site specific requirements to ensure the developer investigates potential noise and air pollution impacts from the A420 and A415 and to identify any necessary mitigation.</p> <p>In relation to light pollution, Development Policy 21: External Lighting in the Part 2 plan ensures that development proposals involving external lighting are appropriately designed and located. The policy ensures that developers prepare a lighting strategy to demonstrate that external lighting is appropriately considered in the design of the scheme taking into account the Design Guide SPD and other relevant policies in the Part 1 plan.</p> <p>In relation to health care provision, Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures developer contribute towards improvements to existing community facilities and health care facilities in the area.</p> <p>The Council continues to work proactively and collaboratively with the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and the Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust to consider the necessary health care facilities to support the planned growth for the District, as set out in the Local Plan. In light of this, the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to</p>
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall				No				
1096719	Alastair Lambie				No				
1098086	Mrs SM Collins					No		<p>Furthermore, the Site Development Templates (Appendix A) sets out site specific requirements to ensure the developer investigates potential noise and air pollution impacts from the A420 and A415 and to identify any necessary mitigation.</p> <p>In relation to light pollution, Development Policy 21: External Lighting in the Part 2 plan ensures that development proposals involving external lighting are appropriately designed and located. The policy ensures that developers prepare a lighting strategy to demonstrate that external lighting is appropriately considered in the design of the scheme taking into account the Design Guide SPD and other relevant policies in the Part 1 plan.</p> <p>In relation to health care provision, Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures developer contribute towards improvements to existing community facilities and health care facilities in the area.</p> <p>The Council continues to work proactively and collaboratively with the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and the Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust to consider the necessary health care facilities to support the planned growth for the District, as set out in the Local Plan. In light of this, the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to</p>	
1143352	Mr Gavin Newman					No			
1144189	Mrs Charlotte Reaney					No			
1144305	Mrs Winifred Cox					No			
1144431	Mr George Reaney					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan sets out the necessary health care provision needed to support the growth proposed in the plan.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Evaluation of Transport Impact (ETI)	<p>There were a few comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council, in relation to the Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI) study. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Traffic impact model relies on out-of-date baseline. Atkins study published in 2017 relies on traffic data for 2013</p> <p>Earlier reports prepared for Oxfordshire County Council identified some problems. Evidence base presented in Topic Paper ignores transport impacts A420 is currently running at capacity and will continue to should the proposed allocation proceed</p> <p>Recent traffic surveys undertaken by Fyfield residents indicate that current traffic-flow is under-estimated</p> <p>RAG analysis of traffic impact in Part 2 plan is out of date and misleading</p> <p>Evaluation of Transport Impact indicates the site will have an impact on A420</p> <p>Improvement to public transport will not be enough to enable commuters to access new employment growth centres outside of Oxford</p> <p>Traffic between site and the Science Vale and retail facilities at Abingdon-on-Thames would have adverse impact on the Marcham AQMA</p>	<p>The Council has worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council is content that the proposed development to the east of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor will not lead to any significant highway impacts and that the site has access to relatively good public transport. It is notable that the site proposal is supported by Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, who consider that development will help to improve bus frequency.</p> <p>The Council continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that appropriate site access can be achieved and both parties are informing the emerging masterplan for this site.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates set out requirements to ensure that appropriate access is provided to the site. Developers will also be required to contribute towards infrastructure improvements on the A420, A415 and any necessary mitigation measures identified through the site Transport Assessment and investigate noise and air pollution impacts from the A420 and A415 and mitigate to offset any adverse impacts.</p>
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall				No				
1144172	Mrs Jean Potter				No				
1145347	Dr Dimitrios Hatzis				No				
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Flood risk and drainage	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council, in relation to flood risk and drainage. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Known historic flooding at Fyfield Wick to the east of the site</p> <p>Wastewater infrastructure at capacity and unable to accommodate proposed growth</p> <p>Potential for flood risk to occur at this site based on previous experiences in Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield village</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, informed by technical evidence and collaborative working with key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) that which has informed the site selection process. Neither Oxfordshire Council or the Environment Agency have raised any concerns over this site in the context of flood risk.</p> <p>The Site Development Template requires developers to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment/surface water drainage strategy based on information contained in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and liaison with Oxfordshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency to support a planning application.</p> <p>In relation to wastewater infrastructure, the requirement set out in the Site Development Template ensures that developers upgrade the sewer network and are required to liaise with Thames Water to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity and/or wastewater capacity to serve the development.</p>
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No			
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									The Council have agreed statements of Common ground with Thames Water and the Environment Agency to set out a working approach between the organisations
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Fyfield and Tubney Petition	<p>A petition was received by the Council from local residents from the parish of Fyfield and Tubney that consisted of 301 signatories. 90% of residents that were approached, representing 92% of the households at Fyfield, Netherton and Tubney objected to the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in respect of sustainability, heritage or land use</p> <p>Not justified as the evidence base for the site is flawed and biased and conflicts with the Council's policies and objectives, including Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy in the adopted Part 1 plan</p> <p>Not positively prepared as it is not sustainable due to social and environmental harm caused to the villages of Fyfield and Tubney</p> <p>Not effective because the allocation will not be financially viable to support required infrastructure and mitigation</p> <p>Not legally compliant as the Council has failed to follow national policy</p>	<p>The Council acknowledge the petition and give consideration to all responses received at each stage of consultation.</p> <p>Whilst the development falls within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney, the development adjoins the settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, which is classified as a larger village and is considered to be a sustainable location for development with comparatively good services and facilities and public transport. There were a number of sites allocated within the Part 1 plan which adjoin settlements such as Abingdon, Didcot, Faringdon and Wantage, yet fall within neighbouring parishes. It is accepted that any residents of development to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would consider that they live at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and would use services and facilities for this settlement.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out site specific requirements to ensure that the development proposal delivers a high quality and sustainable extension to Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (Fyfield and Tubney Parish) which is integrated with the adjoining settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and respects the local character and distinctiveness of the existing village.</p> <p>Furthermore, Development Policy 29 in the Part 2 plan seeks to protect against the loss of physical or visual separation between settlements, taking into account Core Policy 44 in the Part 1 plan and the Landscape Character Assessment.</p>
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	General objection	There were a number of general objections received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council. Key comments included the following:	The Council acknowledge these responses and have given them consideration however consider that separate responses relating to particular points adequately address the substance of the points being made. These are set out within the remainder of this appendix.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England			No		Site would form an inappropriate dormitory suburb to Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, encroach with the village of Fyfield and fails to address impacts on the Conservation Area and Grade II* listed buildings at Fyfield and Netherton		
1075935	Mr Tim Cruttenden				No		Site has no access to local employment opportunities		
1094354	Keith Budgen				No		Traffic congestion at peak hours		
1095180	Mr Mark Baker				No		Site was flagged by Oxfordshire Growth Board due to inadequacy of transport infrastructure		
1095325	Mr Brian Buchan				No		Support evidence by Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council and Fyfield Local Action Group that the A420 is operating at or near capacity		
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall					No		A420 is running at or near capacity, without taking into account committed growth in the Part 1 plan	
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis					No		Oxfordshire County Council has identified the A420/A415 as exceeding capacity, additional roundabout will cause bottleneck	
1142755	Miss Emma Wardall					No		Inconsistent with Council's local policy and strategic objectives	
1142760	Mr Fergus Cable-Alexander					No		Selection of the site by the Council is contrary to Strategic Objective 3 of the adopted Part 1 plan in directing growth to the most sustainable locations in the district and being supported by a sufficient range of services and facilities	
1143428	Miss Rosemary Roberts					No		Selection of the site by the Council is contrary to Strategic Objective 8 of the adopted Part 1 plan in reducing the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport	
1144029	Mrs Lisa Spurgeon					No		Selection of the site by the Council is contrary to Strategic Objective 9 of the adopted Part 1 plan in ensuring new development is supported by appropriate and timely infrastructure delivery to secure effective sustainable transport choices	
1144033	Mrs Joan Prichard					No		Site is incompatible with objective sets out in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal in terms of health and well-being, pollution, biodiversity, water and soil quality, cultural heritage and increasing resilience to climate change	
1144045	Mrs Jill Cobb					No		Council has changed their position in relation to the role and purpose of the Part 2 plan, which now identifies fewer, large sustainable sites rather than smaller sites	
1144189	Mrs Charlotte Reaney					No		Site is not justified as the evidence base is flawed, biased and conflicts with the Council's own policies, objectives and spatial strategy	
1144305	Mrs Winifred Cox					No		Site is not positively prepared as it is unsustainable and will cause social and environmental harm to the villages of Fyfield and Tubney	
1144431	Mr George Reaney					No		Site will significantly increase traffic along the A420 and will add to air, noise and light pollution at Fyfield	
1144558	Mrs Deborah Martin					Yes		Proposal does not respect the character of the countryside, recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, support local economies and is not sustainable	
1144592	Miss Isabel Martin					No		Site is not effective as the development is not viable due to policy and infrastructure requirements and mitigation	
1145103	Mr David Scopes					No		Site has been dropped by the Council in making a substantial contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs	
1145265	Miss Alyson Grove					No		Recent government consultation 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' indicates that the quantum of housing need according to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is open to challenge	
1153355	Mrs Cris Leduq-Jones					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Limited consultation with the Parish Council and local community. Consultation has not been undertaken in compliance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)</p> <p>Preparation of the Part 2 plan has not been legally compliant, in particular in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Consultation Statement makes false representation of how the responses have informed the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>Consultation Statement to support Publication Version of the Part 2 plan makes false representation of how responses informed the Part 2 plan. Publication Version of the Part 2 plan has not adequately considered or used to inform the preparation of the Part 2 plan</p> <p>Remove this allocation from the plan and review calculations for the district's housing need; allocate housing in more appropriate sites that meet local and national policies</p> <p>Parish of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor has witnessed substantial housing development over the past five years</p> <p>Parish located along the North Vale Corallian Ridge and is classed as open countryside</p> <p>Parish has limited community services and facilities to accommodate growth</p> <p>Parish Council has run campaigns about congestion and pollution levels associated with A420 and overuse of local roads e.g. Abingdon Road and Digging Lane as rat-runs</p> <p>Site is distant from 'Knowledge Spine' and economic growth sites at Didcot, Harwell, Grove and Culham</p> <p>Conflicts of interest through the site selection process</p> <p>Concerns raised by local residents in relation to the selection of the site to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor have been ignored by the Council</p>	
828535	Mr John Watts	Fyfield and Tubney PC				Yes	Health care provision	<p>One comment was received in relation to limited local health care facilities, nearest is at Abingdon and Faringdon. Clinical Commissioning Group are at capacity to maintain services to accommodate growth.</p>	<p>The Council understands that the Clinical Commissioning Group's preference is to increase catchment sizes for health care provision, as this offers a viable and sustainable approach to delivering health care facilities. Within a rural area, it is not realistic, nor financially viable to expect health care to be provided at every larger village. This does not preclude appropriate development at larger village, both to support rural areas and help to maintain their vitality. This is in conformity with the Spatial Strategy set out within the Part 1 plan that includes a key strand to 'promote thriving villages and rural communities whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character'.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates set out a specific requirement to ensure developers contribute to improvements towards existing community services and health care facilities in the area.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									The Council continues to work proactively and collaboratively with the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and the Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust to consider the necessary health care facilities to support the planned growth for the District, as set out in the Local Plan. In light of this, the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan sets out the necessary health care provision needed to support the growth proposed in the plan.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Historic character	There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to historic character. Key comments included:	Core Policy 39 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures that new development proposals conserve, and where possible enhance designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national guidance and legislation. The Site Development Templates set out policy requirements and include urban design principles. The proposals will also need to be consistent with Core Policies 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness and 38: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites. The Council is content that these provide sufficient guidance to achieve high quality design standards and to protect the local distinctiveness of the areas. Furthermore, Appendix A: Site Development Templates set out specific requirements, in relation to historic environment and cultural heritage, to ensure that development proposals conserve and enhance heritage assets where appropriate. For example development proposals should retain and respect the eastern edge of the site marked by Aelfryth's Dyke. In relation to landscape considerations, Core Policy 44 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures that key landscape features are conserved and enhanced and that development proposals demonstrate that they have responded to landscape character through appropriate design and management, taking into account the Council's Landscape Character Assessment. Furthermore, Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that the development proposal is designed to avoid being visually intrusive to sensitive views from the surrounding countryside and the North Vale Corallian Ridge. The Council have agreed a statement of common ground with Historic England to ensure a working approach to protect and enhance the historic character of the settlement.
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall				No		Scale of development inappropriate and disproportionate to the existing rural character of the village, including setting of the Conservation Area		
1097547	Sarah Daley				No		Inconsistent with paragraph 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in identifying and assessing the significance of a heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal		
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis				No		Increase in road use and air pollution will have a negative impact on listed buildings		
1142760	Mr Fergus Cable-Alexander				No		Insufficient assessment of archaeological impacts associated with the development		
1142765	Mr Claire Cable-Alexander				No		Fyfield's status as a village reflects its character as a rural community located in open countryside along the North Vale Corallian Ridge, a key landscape feature of the district, running from Cumnor to Faringdon		
1143428	Miss Rosemary Roberts				No		Parish boundary with Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor follows the line of an Anglo-Saxon feature, Aelfryth's Ditch		
1144044	Mr Geoff Prichard				No		Strategic gap between Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor that maintains the village's separate and distinct rural character and nature of the Corallian Ridge		
1144178	Ms Linda McKendrick				No				
1145281	Mr Michael Worwood				No				
730184	Councillor Yvonne Constance	Vale of White Horse District Council					Housing Needs	There were a few comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to housing needs. Key comments included the following:	The Council is not seeking to ring fence allocations for the purposes of addressing the agreed quantum of Oxford's unmet need to be met within the Vale. The unmet need is met by a combination of Part 1 strategic allocations and the Part 2 additional allocations. The allocation to the east of Kingston
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					No		<p>Publication Version of the Part 2 plan does not include the site among those that are close and accessible to Oxford; Council does not regard the site as making a contribution to Oxford's unmet housing need</p> <p>Figures for March 2016 published by CPRE, based upon 2011 census show that in Oxfordshire, 3% of homes are over-crowded, 4% are empty and 73% are under-occupied</p> <p>No council-owned properties on the site, no controls placed upon rents charged and the Council does not control who buys housing on the open market</p> <p>Proportion of affordable housing located adjacent to A420, where pollution rates will be higher</p> <p>Creation of a dormitory-estate for middle income families is not responding to the housing crisis</p> <p>Site promoter/agent has not offered a robust assessment of the traffic issues and environmental impacts</p> <p>Selection of this site is inconsistent with the adopted Part 1 plan Strategic Objectives 5, 10 and 11</p>	<p>Bagpuize with Southmoor, along with a number of additional allocations located in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area will ensure the revised housing requirement is fully met. The revised housing requirement is increased to take account of the addition of the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to this Sub-Area.</p> <p>The Housing Requirement has been subject to scrutiny at the VOWH Local Plan Part 1 Examination and found to be soundly based. Furthermore, the Oxfordshire SHMA has been scrutinised at other Oxfordshire local plan examinations, including for Cherwell District Council, and found to be soundly based.</p> <p>Unmet housing need for Oxfordshire has been dealt with by the Oxfordshire Growth Board and a Memorandum of Cooperation has been agreed that confirms the apportionment of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale.</p>
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall				No				
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall				No				
1142760	Mr Fergus Cable-Alexander				No				
730184	Councillor Yvonne Constance	Vale of White Horse District Council					Infrastructure	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to infrastructure concerns. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Suggested costs set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan need to be revised to take into consideration the technical work and introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in November 2017</p> <p>Existing infrastructure at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield is inadequate to accommodate existing and proposed growth</p> <p>Lack of cooperation demonstrated between the Council, Oxfordshire County Council and Clinical Commissioning Group in relation to delivery of critical infrastructure such as health care and education provision; White Horse Medical Practice and Faringdon Community College are close to capacity</p> <p>Site makes no contribution to the known infrastructure needs of the Vale. There are alternative sites that would deliver infrastructure to meet existing needs and to contribute to encourage re-opening a station at Wantage/Grove</p> <p>The infrastructure and service provision of the village cannot take any more expansion without major investment in infrastructure such as a medical centre, schools and sewage treatment works.</p>	<p>The Council is content the site is deliverable and viable and makes appropriate contributions to infrastructure to ensure the site is sustainable and consistent with the requirements of national policy. The Council has worked closely with OCC and a range of other infrastructure providers and is satisfied that appropriate consideration has been given to this matter. The Development Site Templates set out the policy requirements that any proposals on the site would need to comply with and the plan is accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Viability Assessment.</p> <p>More detailed comments are provided in response to other consultation responses that concern specific infrastructure requirements, such as for highways, waste water, health care etc. These are set out elsewhere within the appendix.</p> <p>The selection of sites for development should consider a wide range of factors, not simply how much a site may contribute towards wider strategic infrastructure. The Local Plan should constitute a sustainable strategy overall and when considered against reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence.</p>
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No			
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No			
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited		724828	Mr Roger Smith	Savills L and P Ltd, Mr R Smith, Director	No			
1097839	Nick Tucker					No			
1142768	Mr David Grant					No			
1143359	Dr John Guy Morgan					Yes			
1143428	Miss Rosemary Roberts					No			
1144134	Mrs Louise Willden					No			
1144592	Miss Isabel Martin					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					No			
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Landscape character	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to landscape character. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Site is located within open countryside with view across the North Vale Corallian Ridge to the Downs to the south</p> <p>Fyfield is a small village under Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy in the adopted Part 1 plan</p> <p>Inconsistent with national policy (the National Planning Policy Framework)</p> <p>Coalescence between the villages of Fyfield and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and will have an impact on the local character and distinctiveness of the existing villages</p> <p>The landscape of Fyfield consists of intrinsically dark landscape, artificial light associated with the development, including proposed new roundabouts, would impact on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation</p> <p>Limited mitigation of the effects of light pollution associated with the site in the Part 2 plan</p> <p>Landscape Capacity Study ignores the site's location in the heart of the North Vale Corallian Ridge</p> <p>Council has not demonstrated adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence in support of the allocation to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, in relation to landscape impacts</p> <p>Selection of the site by the Council contradicts, Development Policy 28: Settlement Character and Gaps in the emerging Part 2 plan, Saved Policy NE10 in the Local Plan 2011 and the Strategic Objective set out in the adopted Part 1 plan</p>	<p>The proposed allocation is located within Fyfield and Tubney Parish, adjoining the settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor. Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is classified as a larger village within the settlement hierarchy in accordance with Core Policy 3 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The Plan, including Core Policy 3 was scrutinised by a Planning Inspector at Examination.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates set out specific requirements to ensure the masterplanning of the site respects the setting of the site's current rural setting and ensures the development proposal is designed to avoid being visually intrusive to sensitive views from the surrounding countryside, including the North Vale Corallian Ridge.</p> <p>The Council has prepared a district-wide Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) that identifies the key features, including Landscape Character Types and Landscape Character Areas to inform an understanding of the character and local distinctiveness of the Vale's landscape.</p> <p>Core Policy 44 of the adopted Part 1 plan ensures development proposals protect, conserve and enhance the Vale's key landscape features. Development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they have responded to landscape character in their proposals through appropriate design and management, taking into account up to date evidence, including the Council's Landscape Character Assessment.</p>
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No			
828535	Mr John Watts	Fyfield and Tubney PC				Yes			
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					No			
1143428	Miss Rosemary Roberts					No			
1144135	Mrs Louise Willden					No			
1145281	Mr Michael Worwood					No			
1149396	Ms B Tink					No			
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Local character	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to local character and distinctiveness. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Site is of a scale that is disproportionate to the existing village and will impact on the local character of the village and the surrounding countryside</p> <p>Limited engagement with the parish council during the preparation of the Part 2 plan</p> <p>Proposal will reduce the strategic gap between Fyfield village and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and would have an impact on the conservation area and rural setting</p>	<p>Whilst the development falls within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney, the development adjoins the settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, which is classified as a larger village and is considered to be a sustainable location for development with comparatively good services and facilities and public transport. There were a number of sites allocated within the Part 1 plan which adjoin settlements such as Abingdon, Didcot, Faringdon and Wantage, yet fall within neighbouring parishes. It is accepted that any residents of development to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would consider that they live at Kingston Bagpuize with</p>
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No			
1095325	Mr Brian Buchan					No			
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall					No			
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1143359 1144178	Dr John Guy Morgan Ms Linda McKendrick					No		<p>Proposed new roundabout on the A420 will increase noise, air and light pollution</p> <p>Proposal offers no social, economic or environmental sustainability benefits the local residents of Fyfield, but undermines the environmental and social sustainability of Fyfield, Tubney and neighbouring villages</p> <p>Selection of the site by the Council is contrary to the adopted Part 1 plan's Spatial Strategy in promoting thriving villages and rural communities and safeguarding the countryside and village character</p> <p>Focus should be on small infill developments to ensure consistency with the rural nature and local community</p>	<p>Southmoor and would use services and facilities for this settlement.</p> <p>The development proposed to the east of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, is of a scale appropriate to a settlement the size of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and is to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement.</p> <p>The Council considers that the proposed development is both consistent with the Part 1 plan, including the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy and with national policy. Seeking to protect rural areas does not preclude all development, indeed, some development will assist with maintaining the vitality of settlements.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates set out policy requirements and include urban design principles. The proposals will also need to be consistent with Core Policies 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness and 38: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites. The Council is content that these provide sufficient guidance to achieve high quality design standards and to protect the local distinctiveness of the area.</p> <p>Additional requirements is set out in the Site Development Template, in relation to landscape, to ensure the development proposal is designed to avoid being visually intrusive to sensitive views from the surrounding countryside, including the North Vale Corallian Ridge, and considers the sensitive approach to Kingston Bagpuize House and Kingston Bagpuize Park which forms part of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Council has prepared a district-wide Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) that identifies the key features, including Landscape Character Types and Landscape Character Areas to inform an understanding of the character and local distinctiveness of the Vale's landscape. Core Policy 44 of the adopted Part 1 plan ensures development proposals demonstrate that the design of their scheme has been informed by the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA).</p>
730255 1075935 1144189 1145347	Dr Stephen Fraser Mr Tim Cruttenden Mrs Charlotte Reaney Dr Dimitrios Hatzis	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No No No No	Marcham Air Quality Management Area	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to the impact on the Marcham Air Quality Management Area. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Proposed mitigation will have little or no impact on traffic congestion on the A420</p> <p>Traffic between the site, the Science Vale area and at Abingdon would have an adverse impact on the Marcham AQMA</p> <p>Housing growth at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor will lead to substantially increased car movements</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council and the Council's Air Quality Officer. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) published alongside the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan does acknowledge the potential impact on the Marcham Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) associated with housing growth at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor. The report recognises that the Plan's strategy in maximising opportunities for public transport connectivity, and improvements to existing</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>through the Marcham AQMA in the absence of a southern Marcham Bypass</p> <p>Negative impact on air quality in Marcham associated with the proposed allocation does not seem to have been considered in the Sustainability Appraisal</p>	<p>bus services in this area will serve to limit car dependency and car movements.</p> <p>Furthermore, land is safeguarded for the possible future provision of a Southern Marcham Bypass. The SA Report concludes that there are in-combination benefits with the Part 1 plan which safeguards land for the delivery of future transport schemes within the Abingdon-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates set out specific requirements to ensure development proposals investigate noise and air pollution impacts from the A420 and A415 and identify appropriate mitigation to offset any adverse impacts.</p> <p>An Air Quality Technical note has been developed by the site promoters which highlight that the impact would be well below the annual mean objectives and the impact would be negligible, and therefore there is potential for increased development flows from the development without leading to significant air quality impacts.</p>
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Public transport	There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in relation to the public transport. Key comments included the following:	<p>Locating development at sustainable locations, such as adjoining Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, maximises opportunities for new residents to make use of existing services and facilities, whilst ensuring that any new facilities are accessible to existing residents as well as those who will live within the proposed development. This provides for a more sustainable approach to supporting development than, for example, supporting smaller scale development at smaller settlements; in such locations, there will be fewer services and facilities available and fewer opportunities to provide new facilities.</p> <p>The Council has worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council is content that the proposed development to the east of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor will not lead to any significant highway impacts. It is notable that the site proposal is supported by Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, who consider that development will help to improve bus frequency.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates set out specific requirements in relation to access and highways. Developers will be required to contribute towards increasing the frequency of bus services in the area. The Council continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators to ensure that planned improvements to public transport are delivered. Both parties are informing the emerging masterplan for this site.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) to assess the positive and negative impacts of developing the additional site allocations in the Part 2 plan, including an assessment of the cumulative impact of sites.</p>
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No		Planned public transport improvements inadequate to accommodate growth, particularly the No.66 service	
1144299	Mr Gerald Cox					No		No.66 bus service connects Swindon and central Oxford, further journeys required to reach employment centres to the east of Oxford, Didcot, Abingdon or further	
1145347	Dr Dimitrios Hatzis					No		Limited public transport connectivity to Science Vale or Harwell, journey times are longer	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Settlement Hierarchy	There are a number of comments in regards to the settlement hierarchy. This are:	Whilst the development falls within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney, the development adjoins the settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, which is classified as a larger village and is considered to be a sustainable location for development with comparatively good services and facilities and public transport. There were a number of sites allocated within the Part 1 plan which adjoin settlements such as Abingdon, Didcot, Faringdon and Wantage, yet fall within neighbouring parishes. It is accepted that any residents of development to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would consider that they live at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and would use services and facilities for this settlement.
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No	<p>Fyfield is listed as being in the open countryside in accordance with Core Policy 3 of LPP1</p> <p>Development within the open countryside will not be appropriate unless there are relevant policies within the development plan and national policy to support development.</p> <p>The site proposed at Kingston Bagpuize is within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney and should therefore be considered as open countryside. By proposing the site, this is in conflict with Core Policy 3.</p> <p>The District Council are not in the process of reviewing parish boundaries and so the proposed development is not within Kingston Bagpuize as previously stated.</p> <p>The labelling of the site is still misleading</p> <p>The proposed site did not become linked to Kingston Bagpuize until the development along the old A420 and A415 began this autumn.</p>		
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Site Selection	There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council and Ashbury Parish Council in relation to the site selection process. Key comments included the following:	Whilst the development falls within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney, the development adjoins the settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, which is classified as a larger village and is considered to be a sustainable location for development with comparatively good services and facilities and public transport. There were a number of sites allocated within the Part 1 plan which adjoin settlements such as Abingdon, Didcot, Faringdon and Wantage, yet fall within neighbouring parishes. It is accepted that any residents of development to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor would consider that they live at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and would use services and facilities for this settlement.
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No			
879120	Gow Family						Plan and supporting documents, including the Consultation Statement, Sustainability Appraisal indicate what must be done in relation to mitigation, but should be actioned/delivered before preparation of the Part 2 plan		
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning		Evidence base to support the proposed allocation is biased and conflicts with the Council's policies and objectives		
1075935	Mr Tim Cruttenden					No	There are other alternative locations in the district that are more suitable and sustainable for development that have not been considered		
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					Yes	Scale of proposed allocation is considered as strategic in the adopted Part 1 plan, not the purpose of the Part 2 plan		
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					No	Site is located on Grade 2 agricultural land and is contrary to national policy and local policy e.g. Strategic Objective 10 of the adopted Part 1 plan in maintaining and improving the natural environment		
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					No	Limited consultation and engagement with the local community and parish councils		
1096719	Alastair Lambie						Site would be a car dependent, urban commuter dormitory with limited connectivity to neighbouring villages.		
1096915		Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No	Site is remote from accessible jobs and key employment centres		
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall					No		Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out site specific requirements to ensure that the development proposal delivers a high quality and	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley			Site is located in open countryside at Fyfield, not Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, contrary to local policy e.g. Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy in the adopted Part 1 plan	sustainable extension to Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (Fyfield and Tubney Parish) which is integrated with the adjoining settlement of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and respects the local character and distinctiveness of the existing village. A number of the specific points raised in relation to this response are addressed in response to a range of other consultation comments set out elsewhere within this appendix.
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis					No	Biased site selection process and lack of consideration of 'reasonable alternatives'		
1142755	Miss Emma Wardall					No	Selection of the site by the Council is contrary to Strategic Objective 3 of the adopted Part 1 plan in directing growth to the most sustainable locations in the district and being supported by a sufficient range of services and facilities		
1142760	Mr Fergus Cable-Alexander					No	Selection of the site by the Council is contrary to Strategic Objective 8 of the adopted Part 1 plan in reducing the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport		
1143428	Miss Rosemary Roberts					No	Selection of the site by the Council is contrary to Strategic Objective 9 of the adopted Part 1 plan in ensuring new development is supported by appropriate and timely infrastructure delivery to secure effective sustainable transport choices		
1144046	Professor Jeffery Burley					Yes	Site is disproportionate in scale when compared to higher order settlements		
1144134	Mrs Louise Willden					No	No housebuilder on the site which may affect the deliverability		
1144189	Mrs Charlotte Reaney					No	Heritage impacts would invoke statutory duties with regard to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and National Planning Policy Framework. This is not recognised in the Council's evidence base		
1144299	Mr Gerald Cox					No			
1144431	Mr George Reaney					No			
1145280	Mrs Sandra Humphreys					No			
1145281	Mr Michael Worwood					No			
1145347	Dr Dimitrios Hatzis					No			
1145537	Ms Clare Arnold	Ashbury Parish Council							
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd							
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited		724828	Mr Roger Smith	Savills L and P Ltd, Mr R Smith, Director	No	Support from Agent/Site Promoter	There were a number of comments of support received from the site promoter/agent in relation to the proposed allocation to the East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor. Specific comments included the following: Phasing Plan submitted as part of representation. Site promoter is satisfied that the proposal can deliver the infrastructure requirements in accordance with Council's housing delivery trajectory No in principle environmental or technical constraints that would prevent residential development of the site within the plan period	Noted and support welcomed.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Support for the site-specific requirements set out in the Site Development Template, but template should be amended to state up to 700 dwellings</p> <p>Site promoter has submitted a number of technical documents as part of representation including flood risk and drainage, noise, air quality and ecology. Development Framework Plan and Phasing Plan also submitted as part of representation</p> <p>Initial consultation and community engagement with Parishes and local community, including Kingston Colts Football Club and Kingston Bagpuize Millennium Green Trust</p> <p>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping report submitted to the Council in September 2017</p>	
730263	Mr David Groves	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council				No	Unsound evidence	<p>One comment questions the outcomes of the detailed testing in regards to the proposed allocation at Kingston Bagpuize, as stated in Appendix B of the Site Selection Topic Paper. The concerns include:</p> <p>The Historic Environment section fails to discuss the damage to Fyfield's conservation area and the significance in preserving a small rural community</p> <p>The section regarding landscape fails to recognise the location in Corallian Ridge or harm to open views to South Oxfordshire downs.</p> <p>The public service section fails to provide for suitable sustainable access to public services</p> <p>There are a number of concerns in relation to the transport aspect of the site. These include:</p> <p>It fails to make reference to the SA's acknowledgement that the site is distant from employment centres and the Oxford Growth Board's opinion that the site is too far from Oxford.</p> <p>It fails to acknowledge that access to the A420 will add to congestion on stretch of road identified in Transport and Accessibility study as a congestion hotspot.</p> <p>It ignores the fact of increased congestion on A420 and A415</p> <p>These comments also apply equally to access issues. The recommendation claims that the site is close to the historic core of Kingston Bagpuize but ignores the fact that the site is remote from the centre where most amenities are located. It is more remote than other sites not taken forward for proposed allocation</p>	<p>The Council have conducted detail testing relating to the landscaping of the sites proposed for allocation within the Local Plan. Details of the findings can be found within the Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>The Evaluation of Transport Impact has tested the implications of developing the site at Kingston Bagpuize and concluded that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Appendix A of the Local Plan sets out the appropriate infrastructure required to ensure the development is suitable and sustainable and takes into account the landscaping, transport and infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The Council feel that the site will be well connected to Kingston Bagpuize and necessary services.</p>
730184	Councillor Yvonne Constance	Vale of White Horse District Council					Viability and Deliverability	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, in</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Viability Study, working closely with landowners and developers to ensure that the additional development sites are deliverable.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No		relation to the proposed allocation's deliverability and viability. Key comments included the following:	<p>A Local Plan Viability Study was published alongside the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>The Viability Study concluded that the proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is viable having delivered infrastructure and affordable housing requirements.</p> <p>The Council has prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan, working closely with key infrastructure providers, including Oxfordshire County Council as the lead Highway Authority. The IDP identifies the infrastructure requirements for the site. The IDP has been updated following Regulation 19 Publication and further consultation has been undertaken with OCC and other Infrastructure Providers. This matter is also considered through the SOCG between OCC and VOWH.</p> <p>The Council remains content the site is deliverable and viable and can provide appropriate contributions to necessary infrastructure.</p>
1094354	Keith Budgen					No		Proposed development would not be financially viable given the additional infrastructure and mitigation required, e.g. education provision, community services and facilities and affordable housing	
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					No		Estimated cost of the proposed link road has not been specified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), viability would become a significant factor if unexpected technical or environmental constraints are discovered	
1095527	Mr John Bradley					No		Further infrastructure should be added such as a health centre and village hall	
1096329		Blanchard Enterprises	1096331	Mr Simon Handy	Strutt & Parker LLP	No			
1096719	Alastair Lambie					No			
1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis					No			
1142760	Mr Fergus Cable-Alexander					No			
1144267	Mr Tobias Daley					No			
1144545	Mr Paul Newton					No			
1145265	Miss Alyson Grove					No			
1145278	Mrs Sherry Howard					No			

North of East Hanney

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
829424	Mr Clive Manvell	East Hanney Parish Council				No	Access and highways - A338	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to access and highways, particularly the A338. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>A338 is a busy road and currently at capacity at peak hours.</p> <p>Limited bus service to travel from east to west and to access services and facilities through the village.</p> <p>Limited bus service to Oxford, Abingdon and Wantage, and no direct access to Swindon, Didcot, Milton or Harwell employment areas.</p> <p>School children have to cross the A338 to access primary school at East Hanney or the bus to access King Alfred's Academy.</p> <p>East Hanney has limited employment opportunities, so people would need to travel by car.</p> <p>Consented schemes at East Hanney, Grove and Wantage have contributed to higher traffic flows onto the A338.</p> <p>Site would generate 160 cars that will seek to exit onto the A338 turning left to access Oxford or cross the face of traffic to access Wantage or Didcot or to travel east to west.</p> <p>Increased noise pollution.</p> <p>Access to development north of Ashfields Lane will be on the A338.</p> <p>Risk to motorists and pedestrians joining or crossing the A338.</p> <p>Site is a mile from the centre of the village, school children will have to travel by car, increasing traffic through the village.</p> <p>A338 is grid-locked when A34 is closed to traffic and diverted.</p> <p>Council should consider a bypass at the Hanneys. A338/Steventon Road junction is at capacity at peak hours.</p> <p>Traffic lights at Frilford Heath have not been delivered.</p> <p>Numerous accidents and casualties recorded on the A338 in 2015 and 2016.</p> <p>30mph speed limit will need to be moved to counter drivers accelerating before the 50mph speed limit.</p> <p>Land should be safeguarded for the delivery of road improvements at East Hanney, similar to that at Marcham and Frilford</p>	<p>The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council is content that the proposed development at East Hanney will not lead to any significant highway impacts and that the site has access to relatively good public transport. It is notable that the site proposal is supported by both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, who consider that development will help to improve bus frequency.</p> <p>The Council considers that suitable access can be provided to the site.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out requirements to ensure the development proposal contributes towards infrastructure improvements along the A338.</p> <p>Development proposals will be required to contribute towards further enhancement of bus services in the area.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority, Highways England, and key infrastructure providers, who have advised where policy requirements are needed for individual sites relating to access and highways.</p>
861678	Mr Guy Langton		No						
865961	Mr David Kirk		No						
1095766	Andrew and Camilla Symes		No						
1098065	Mr M.J Rolfe		No						
1142784	Mr Brian Cooper		No						
1143055	Mr Steven Moss		No						
1143313	Dr JAMES TRIFFITT		No						
1144158	Mr Matthew Stephenson		No						
1144356	Ms Barbara Burke		No						
1144528	Mr & Mrs R J Taylor		No						
1144538	SM and RF Powell		No						
1144997	Ms Diana Smith		No						
1145236	Mrs Penelope McCall		No						
829424	Mr Clive Manvell		East Hanney Parish Council						
861678	Mr Guy Langton	No							

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1142868	DR JOHN CRAIG	Lagan Homes Limited	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is in an isolated location distant from community services and facilities at East Hanney Proposal is not within reasonable walking distance of village facilities, including the primary school and village shop East Hanney does not have a commercially viable shop, small community shop and a small part-time post office Classification of East Hanney as a larger village is incorrect due to loss of library service – facilities are only sufficient to support a smaller village Local infrastructure, including community services and facilities are at capacity Proposal does not integrate with the existing village due to limited pedestrian or vehicular access • Previous allocation in the Part 1 plan to the South of East Hanney was removed by the Inspector as it did not relate to the existing village 	<p>including Core Policy 3 was scrutinised by an independent Planning Inspector at examination.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. Details regarding the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates of the Part 2 plan sets out the required infrastructure needed to ensure the development planned is sustainable.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates set out requirements to ensure the development proposal delivers a high quality and sustainable extension, through master planning and urban design principles, which integrates with the centre of the village so residents can access existing facilities.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Site Development Templates ensure that a pedestrian link is provided to Ashfields Lane to ensure safe access to the existing bus stops and community services and facilities.</p> <p>The Site Development Template have been prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council as the Highways Authority who advised where policy requirements are needed to individual sites in relation to access and highway matters.</p>
1143288	Mr and Mrs Kauert								
1143289									
1144186	Mrs Judy Long								
1144356	Ms Barbara Burke								
1144883	Mr Clive Fewins								
1144997	Ms Diana Smith								
1095766	Andrew and Camilla Symes					No	Accessibility of Primary School	There was one comment received in relation to accessibility to the Primary School at West Hanney, families would need to travel by car.	Please refer to responses outlined above.
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes		No	Amenity provision	There was one comment received from East Hanney Parish Council that questioned the amount of amenity space to be provided given the site's relationship to the existing village.	<p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that development provides public open space and recreational facilities in accordance with the requirements set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The provision of public open space will be secured for major development proposals in accordance with Development Policy 33: Open Space that is safe, accessible and high quality in accordance with local and national standards.</p> <p>The requirements set out in the Site Development Template ensures that the site seeks to maximise connectivity with the existing settlement to the south and integrates with the centre of the village.</p>
829424	Mr Clive Manvell	East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes		No	Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>There were a few comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to biodiversity and green infrastructure. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Site is currently used for horses, other local wildlife observations include owls, bats, hares, deer, hedgehog and foxes.</p> <p>Site is an important part of the character and setting of East Hanney; loss of open fields would have impact on ecology, character and setting of the village.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection. Further details are set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation with key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council and the District Council's Ecologist who have advised where policy requirements are needed to individual sites relating to ecology and biodiversity.</p> <p>Core Policy 46 of the adopted Part 1 plan provides policy guidance to conserve and enhance biodiversity when considering development proposals. The Site</p>
861678	Mr Guy Langton								
861678	Mr Guy Langton								

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								No ecology assessment has been undertaken on the site. Development on the site would increase light pollution and have an impact on nocturnal species such as barn owls, birds and bats. Selection of this site is contrary to Core Policy 46 in the adopted Part 1 plan.	Development Templates ensure ecological surveys are undertaken in accordance with national guidance and best practice. Development Policy 21 of the Part 2 plan ensures that development proposals involving external lighting are appropriately designed and located.
861678 1144158 1144491 1144528 1144997	Mr Guy Langton Mr Matthew Stephenson Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke Mr & Mrs R J Taylor Ms Diana Smith	East Hanney Parish Council				No No No	Capacity of Primary School	There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to the capacity of the existing primary school at East Hanney. Key comments included the following: Existing primary school at East Hanney is already at capacity and is located on a small site where extensive expansion is not feasible. Existing proposals for the expansion of the primary school are currently unfunded and the plan makes no suggestion as to how this will be funded. Extension of primary school on the site risks displacement of pre-school provision; no alternative suitable premises are available. Limited secondary school provision. Residential development in advance of supporting infrastructure is unsustainable. Car parking used for school drop-off is located at the village hall which is at capacity at peak times. Due to current expansion of the primary school, the existing school playground is now occupied by temporary classrooms, rather than limited staff parking. Uncertainty as to whether the planned expansion of the primary school will accommodate the proposed growth at East Hanney .	Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensure that the development proposal contributes towards the expansion of the existing St James Primary School and any necessary additional nursery provision. The Site Development Template also requires contributions towards the expansion of existing secondary school places in the area. The requirements set out in the Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council as the leading education authority. The Council is satisfied that appropriate contributions will be made to facilitate expansion of the primary school and it is notable that the development is supported by Oxfordshire County Council. The village falls within the catchment of secondary schools at Wantage and Grove. Within a rural area, it is typical for surrounding villages to make use of secondary schools at nearby larger settlements.
1144186 1144997 1145011	Mrs Judy Long Ms Diana Smith Mr and Mrs RJ Taylor					No	Car Parking	There were a few comments received in relation to car parking. Key comments included the following: Village hall car park is also the car park for East Hanney Primary School which cannot cope with the capacity at present. Traffic outside the school is dangerous. Parking is a problem within the village of East Hanney.	Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking in the adopted Part 1 plan ensures that new development proposals provide adequate parking in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council's published guidance.
861678 861678 868060 1098065	Mr Guy Langton Mr Guy Langton Mr Paul Aram Mr M.J Rolfe	East Hanney Parish Council East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes		No No No	Character of East Hanney	There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to the character of East Hanney village. Key comments included the following: Proposal inconsistent with national policy, local policy and emerging neighbourhood development plan for East Hanney.	The Council considers that the proposed development is both consistent with the Part 1 plan, including the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy and with national policy. The Site Development Templates set out policy requirements and include urban design principles. The proposals will also need to be consistent with Core Policies 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness and 38: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144158	Mr Matthew Stephenson					No		<p>Site would extend the village envelope in a linear fashion and place development pressure on adjacent land.</p> <p>Concern the greens, orchards and fields in the village of East Hanney will be lost as a result of development.</p> <p>Site is located adjacent to the Conservation Area and would impact on the local character and views to the countryside.</p> <p>Inspectors at recent appeals assigned weight to the relationship of the development to the existing village. Site is not functionally part of the village.</p> <p>Relationship of the site to the A338 would lead to different approach into the village.</p> <p>Inappropriate to refer to the site as an urban extension, as East Hanney is a rural village.</p> <p>Proposed allocation at East Hanney does not spatially relate well to Oxford City. Quantum should be added to Dalton Barracks which is more sensible, practical and a suitable option.</p>	<p>Development Sites. The Council is content that these provide sufficient guidance to achieve high quality design standards and to protect the local distinctiveness of the local area.</p> <p>Development will be required to comply with Core Policies 37 and 38 of the adopted Part 1 plan. The Site Development Template includes criteria to ensure the character of the site will be in keeping with the existing settlement.</p> <p>The Council has prepared a Landscape Character Assessment that identifies the key features, including Landscape Character Types and Landscape Character Areas to inform an understanding of the character and local distinctiveness of the Vale's landscape.</p>
1144186	Mrs Judy Long				No				
1144871	Mr William Hailey								
1145011	Mr and Mrs RJ Taylor								
1145236	Mrs Penelope McCall				No				
1144989	Mrs Cathy Harrison	Environment Agency					Comments from Environment Agency - Flooding	<p>Environment Agency has commented that the site area does not appear to be hydraulically linked to a watercourse and that the area of Flood Zone 2 is a result of a low point on the site in the hydraulic modelling.</p>	<p>Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Template shows that part of area within the red line boundary located within Flood Zone 2 although not related to a watercourse and not proposed for development.</p> <p>The Council have signed a Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency which agrees to a small number of proposed Additional Modifications.</p>
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments from Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Oxfordshire County Council broadly support the allocations at East Hanney as they are relatively well located for public transport and the planned expansion for the primary school can accommodate growth.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council broadly support the requirements set out in the Site Development Template, but raised concerns related to inconsistencies set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p>	<p>Noted. Support from Oxfordshire County Council is welcomed.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been updated to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan and reflects comments made by Oxfordshire County Council in relation to infrastructure requirements. This matter is also addressed in a Statement of Common Ground between OCC and VOWH.</p>
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments from Stagecoach	<p>Stagecoach support the allocations due to direct links to Oxford, Abingdon, Wantage and Grove through existing bus services (S8 and S9). Scheduled journey times to Central Oxford are equal or better to those that are achieving from potential sites on the fringe of the City's built-up area.</p>	<p>Support acknowledged and welcomed.</p>
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills	Office use only - blank	Comments from Thames Water - Water and Wastewater Network	<p>Thames Water has commented that the water and waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development.</p> <p>Local upgrades to the existing infrastructure may be required and developers are encouraged to work with Thames Water early on in the planning process to understand what infrastructure is required.</p>	<p>Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that the development proposal upgrades the sewer network and are required to liaise with Thames Water to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity and/or wastewater capacity to serve the development.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				No	Community engagement	A couple of comments are made by East Hanney Parish Council that there has been little community involvement when preparing site master plans. There is no community support for this site (with a community objection rate of 99%) and this has not been addressed. As a result, the comment states that the some of the core planning considerations and key policies of the NPPF have not been complied with.	The Council has engaged with East Hanney Parish Council alongside all necessary statutory bodies in relation to this site throughout the preparation of the Part 2 plan. This has included statutory consultation in accordance with the Councils published Statement of Community Involvement.
829424	Mr Clive Manvell					No	Community services and facilities	There were a number of comment received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to community services and facilities. Key comments included the following: Existing community services and facilities are inadequate to support growth in East Hanney and West Hanney. East Hanney's status as a larger village should be reclassified due to the loss of the mobile library service, part-time opening hours for the post office. Other community services at Grove, Wantage, Abingdon, Didcot or Oxford and Swindon, for example health care provision, secondary school provision, libraries, sports facilities etc will not be adequate to support an increase in population by existing housing developments at East Hanney, Wantage, Grove and other villages in the Vale. The village hall at East Hanney is often unavailable due to it being fully booked. Lack of cycling infrastructure to access employment sites at Grove (Williams) and Harwell Campus. Recent permissions at East Hanney have not reflected the parish's local need.	The Council consider that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular, as well as to Oxford. The development proposed at East Hanney is of a scale appropriate to a settlement the size of East Hanney and is considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement. In accordance with the Site Development Templates, developers will be required to contribute towards improvements to the existing healthcare and other community facilities in the area and towards the expansion of the existing primary school and expansion of existing secondary school places in the area. Development within East Hanney can help to maintain the vitality of the village, improve the viability of services and facilities and contribute to enhance services and facilities.
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell				No				
874616	Dr Susan Tyack								
1098052	MS Hazel Abraham				No				
1098065	Mr M.J Rolfe								
1142784	Mr Brian Cooper				No				
1144042	Mr Derek Bowland								
1144186	Mrs Judy Long				No				
1144538	SM and RF Powell								
1144997	Ms Diana Smith								
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				No	Connectivity	There were a few comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to connectivity with other neighbouring sites, including the need for the proposal to integrate and connect with adjacent sites and master planned in the context of adjacent sites.	In accordance with Core Policy 38, allocations will be required to undertake a masterplan approach to ensure good design principles are incorporated into the development. The masterplan will be prepared in consultation between the Council, the community and key stakeholders and will be prepared in accordance with the Site Development Templates to ensure the proposal achieves a cohesive development that integrates with the existing settlement. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that the development proposal delivers a high quality extension to the village which is in keeping with the rural setting and character of the area and integrates with the centre of the village. Development proposals should seek to maximise connectivity with the existing settlement to the south in accordance with Core Policies 37 and 38 of the adopted Part 1 plan.
1144883	Mr Clive Fewins								

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes		No	Conservation Area	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to the Conservation Area adjacent to the site. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Site Selection Topic Paper does not provide an assessment of the impact of the allocation on the setting of the Conservation Area. Limited evidence to demonstrate that the Council has undertaken a specific heritage appraisal to assess the impact on the setting of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Recent appeals in East Hanney have been dismissed due to the need to demonstrate that proposals seek to protect the area and character of the village.</p> <p>Low density homes should be located with a sufficient buffer from the conservation area.</p> <p>Land to the east of East Hanney is a more sustainable location for development than the proposed allocation North of East Hanney. HELAA, Site Selection process and Sustainability Appraisal should be revisited to include Land East of the A338 as a reasonable alternative. Land East of the A338, East Hanney should be allocated for around 90 dwellings.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, informed by technical evidence and working with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The requirements set out in Appendix A: Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council, Historic England and the District Council's Conservation Officer who have advised where policy requirements are needed for individual sites relating to historic environment and cultural heritage.</p> <p>A requirement is set out in the Site Development Template to ensure development seeks to conserve and where possible, enhance the adjacent Conservation Area through appropriate design and landscaping.</p> <p>Development will be required to comply with Core Policies 37 and 38 of the adopted Part 1 plan. The Site Development Template includes criteria to ensure the character of the site will be in keeping with the existing settlement.</p>
865961	Mr David Kirk				No				
1143288	Mr and Mrs Kauert		872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No			
1143289		Lagan Homes Limited	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No			
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes	Edgars Limited	No	Constraints	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to constraints associated with the site to the North of East Hanney. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Site is adjacent to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Medical facilities at Wantage are at capacity.</p> <p>Increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>Concerns over suitable access to the site.</p> <p>Community services and facilities inadequate to accommodate current and proposed growth at East Hanney e.g. permissions at Dews Meadow, Summertown and Steventon Road.</p> <p>Site is in a location reserved for the Upper Thames Strategic Storage Reservoir.</p> <p>Limited connectivity and accessibility to adjacent sites and to community services and facilities in the village.</p> <p>Water and wastewater infrastructure in this area is at capacity.</p> <p>Selection of this site is inconsistent with national and local policy.</p> <p>Remove this allocation and add to quantum to Dalton Barracks which is able to accommodate urban development and is not subject to flooding.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, informed by technical evidence and working with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied the site is suitable for development, that any site level constraints can be adequately overcome and that the site is deliverable. The Council is also content that appropriate infrastructure can be delivered. The site is not within an area safeguarded for a future possible reservoir. The Council has prepared Statements of Common Ground with a number of key stakeholders including statutory consultees and infrastructure providers.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with developers and key stakeholders to ensure the constraints are managed and appropriate infrastructure is provided. Appendix A: Site Development Templates of the Part 2 plan sets out the infrastructure needed to overcome the constraints.</p>
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				No			
874616	Dr Susan Tyack					No			
1142784	Mr Brian Cooper					No			
1143288	Mr and Mrs Kauert					No			
1143313	Dr JAMES TRIFFITT					No			
1144042	Mr Derek Bowland					No			
1144186	Mrs Judy Long					No			
1144883	Mr Clive Fewins					No			
865961	Mr David Kirk					No			
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				No	Deliverability	<p>East Hanney Parish Council raise the following concerns in relation to deliverability for the proposed allocation North of East Hanney:</p>	<p>The Council consider that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular, as well as to Oxford. The</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>The number of dwellings cannot realistically be achieved given the policy constraints and policy requirements associated with the site.</p> <p>The village has limited community services and facilities to accommodate the proposed growth at East Hanney.</p> <p>Site Development Template should be amended as follows:</p> <p>To deliver a high quality and sustainable urban extension OF A RURAL VILLAGE NATURE, to the north of East Hanney village AT THIS EDGE OF VILLAGE LOCATION which is in keeping with the rural setting and character of the area and integrates with the centre of the village so residents can access existing facilities.</p> <p>Site Development Template should acknowledge that the site is not integrated with the centre of the village so residents are not able to easily access existing facilities.</p> <p>Site Development Template in relation to Urban Design Principles should remove the word urban and include additional bullet points as follows:</p> <p>Urban Design Principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RETENTION OF VILLAGE CHARACTER • RETENTION OF VERGES AND GREEN OPEN SPACES • PROTECTION OF THE GREEN AND SOFT EDGE OF THE VILLAGE WITH LOWER DENSITIES • EAST HANNEY IS A CLEAR SKIES VILLAGE WITH NO STREET LIGHTING <p>Urban design principles: Remove the statement that dwellings closest to Ashfields lane should have a frontage onto the Lane as follows:</p> <p>Lower densities should be located towards the southern boundary of the development. Dwellings closest to Ashfields Lane should have a frontage onto the lane, reflecting the existing pattern of development.</p> <p>The Site Development Template in relation to Access and highways should consider the lack of East West transport, and include provision for East West services and consider the impact of the reservoir as stated in the plan Part 2.</p> <p>The Site Development Template should include provision to take into consideration a requirement to meet Aging population and community needs. This is currently not accommodated within the template. Any development needs to meet the requirements of the local community.</p>	<p>developments proposed at East Hanney are of a scale appropriate to a settlement the size of East Hanney and are considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement.</p> <p>Development within East Hanney can help to maintain the vitality of the village, improve the viability of services and facilities and contribute to enhanced services and facilities.</p> <p>The Council has conducted a detailed, robust sites selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper. Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out the infrastructure needed to overcome known constraints associated with the site.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates set out site specific requirements to ensure the site delivers a high quality and sustainable extension to the north of East Hanney which is in keeping with the rural setting and character of the area.</p> <p>Development Policy 21 ensures that development proposals involving external lighting are appropriately designed and located. Applicants will be required to demonstrate through the preparation of a lighting strategy, that they have considered the design of their scheme, taking into account character of the area, amenity of neighbouring uses or local biodiversity.</p>
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery				No	Development in East Hanney	A number of comments, including those made by East Hanney Parish Council, questioned the need for	The Council considers that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
861678	Mr Guy Langton	(Oxford Diocese) East Hanney Parish Council				No		further development in East Hanney; a number of windfall sites have come through in previous years and alongside the additional proposed allocations, result in the community rapidly growing. Concern is raised over the impact on the environment and village, alongside the provision of social and physical infrastructure to support these communities. Comments state that the necessary amendment is the removal of the two proposed allocations at East Hanney from the Plan.	village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular, as well as to Oxford. The development proposed at East Hanney is of a scale appropriate to the size of East Hanney and is considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement. The Council is required to make provision for sufficient housing to meet the identified needs of the district and to contribute to the unmet housing need of Oxford City within the plan period up to 2031. The Council has undertaken a comprehensive approach to site selection, including the consideration of alternatives. These details are set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper. It is important the plan makes provision for a range of sites of different size, type and geography to assist in providing appropriate choice, meeting different housing needs, and giving consideration to housing delivery.
868060	Mr Paul Aram				No				
1144528	Mr & Mrs R J Taylor								
1144777	Mr Bill Orson				No				
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes		No	East Hanney Neighbourhood Development Plan	There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to the site allocations not being included within the emerging East Hanney Neighbourhood Development Plan. East Hanney Parish Council commented that the proposed allocation North of East Hanney is the second smallest site by volume and makes little contribution to delivering homes when compared to Dalton Barracks. Council should be focusing on intensifying brownfield locations. East Hanney Parish Council has included a number of policies in the emerging neighbourhood plan to shape and inform development needs inside the village boundary in terms of small scale infill and back land development. Decision to proceed with a village boundary is informed by recent appeal decisions which highlight the need to for development to respect the character of the village. Additional allocations at East Hanney would prejudice the process of preparing a neighbourhood development plan for the Parish. The Council has disregarded the views of those living within the village as set out within the approved neighbourhood plan. The residents would like specific sites for small integrated developments as highlighted through the consultation within the neighbourhood plan process. These sites would allow the village to retain its character and community spirit. The Council have failed to listen to the views of the villagers and therefore fails the duty to cooperate requirement.	Whilst the Council is keen to work positively with local communities, decisions on making allocations to meet the overall housing need for the district needs to be taken at a strategic level and represent an appropriate strategy for the district as whole. The Council is required to make provision for sufficient housing to meet the identified needs of the district and to contribute to the unmet housing need of Oxford City within the plan period up to 2031. The Council has undertaken a comprehensive approach to site selection, including the consideration of alternatives. These details are set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper. It is important the plan makes provision for a range of sites of different size, type and geography to assist in providing appropriate choice, meeting different housing needs, and giving consideration to housing delivery. Neighbourhood Plan policies must meet the requirements of the Basic Conditions test which include general conformity with strategic policies of the Local Plan Parts 1 and 2; this would include any strategic allocations, for example set out in Core Policies 4a or Core Policy 8a.
1098065	Mr M.J Rolfe					No			
1143228	Mrs Gillian Parry					No			
1144186	Mrs Judy Long					No			
1144491	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke					No	Employment	There was one comment received in relation to limited employment opportunities at East and West Hanney and a limited bus service to access employment centres at Didcot and Harwell.	Please refer to responses outlined above.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
829424	Mr Clive Manvell	East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes		No	Flooding	There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to risk of flooding in East Hanney. Key comments included the following: Site is located within an area of flood risk. Site is known for historic flooding in 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2014, particularly on Ashfields Lane, Ebbs Lane and the A338. Evidence was submitted to show events of historic flooding at East Hanney. Additional homes off Alfred's Place would be susceptible to flooding. Water table is high making the use of localised SUDS impractical. Failure to recognise within the Part 2 plan the impact of surface water flooding – limited mention in the Site Development Templates. Part 2 plan does not recognise that East Hanney is subject to flooding. Site is important as a floodplain to absorb water to protect East Hanney from flooding. The Council should apply a sequential approach to site selection so that development is located where the risk of flooding from all sources is the lowest, taking into account climate change and vulnerability of future users to flood risk.	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, informed by technical evidence and collaborative working with key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper. The Site Development Templates require developers to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment/surface water drainage strategy based on information contained in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and liaison with Oxfordshire County Council and Environment Agency support a planning application. The Council has undertaken an SFRA of the preferred sites which has informed the site selection process. Neither Oxfordshire County Council or the Environment Agency has raised any concerns over this site in the context of flood risk. The Council have signed a Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency.
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell					No			
861678	Mr Guy Langton					No			
861678	Mr Guy Langton					No			
865961	Mr David Kirk					No			
874616	Dr Susan Tyack					No			
1095766	Andrew and Camilla Symes					No			
1098052	MS Hazel Abraham					No			
1142863	MRS EDITH CRAIG					No			
1142868	DR JOHN CRAIG					No			
1143288	Mr and Mrs Kauert	Lagan Homes Limited	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No	A part of the site to the north of East Hanney is at medium risk of surface water flooding. Existing drainage is inadequate as ditches have been filled in, which could increase risk of flooding.. Evidence from Environment Agency shows that majority of the site is flood zone 2 for surface water flooding and susceptible to groundwater flooding. Parish have provided the Council with evidence of the site as being part of a flood plain, but this does not appear to influence the decision making process. There are alternative sites located in the district that are wholly within Flood Zone 1. Frontage onto Ashfields Lane has recently been subject of approval for development of 4 dwellings. The area that remains is subject to flooding. Delegated report associated with P16/V1778/FUL and attributed to Local Plan Policy DC9 of Saved Local Plan 2011 and NPPF stated that a development should not result in flood risk being increased elsewhere. Gas main installation at Ashfields Lane has/will make the implementation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) difficult		
1143289						No			
1143313	Dr JAMES TRIFFITT					No			
1144186	Mrs Judy Long					No			
1144356	Ms Barbara Burke					No			
1144491	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke					No			
1144528	Mr & Mrs R J Taylor					No			
1144538	SM and RF Powell					No			
1144883	Mr Clive Fewins					No			
1144997	Ms Diana Smith					No			
1145011	Mr and Mrs RJ Taylor	No							

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1145236	Mrs Penelope McCall					No			
1144871	Mr William Hailey								
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes		No	General objection	<p>There were a number of general objections received in relation to the proposed allocation North of East Hanney. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Proposal is contrary to recent appeal decisions at East Hanney.</p> <p>Site is not included within the emerging East Hanney Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>East Hanney Parish Council engagement with local residents indicates that 99% were against the inclusion of the site in the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>There are a number of constraints associated with this site, most notably flooding, drainage and lack of community services and facilities.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council is keen to work positively with local communities, decisions on making allocations to meet the overall housing need for the district needs to be taken at a strategic level and represent an appropriate strategy for the district as whole.</p> <p>The Council is required to make provision for sufficient housing to meet the identified needs of the district and to contribute to the unmet housing need of Oxford City within the plan period up to 2031. The Council has undertaken a comprehensive approach to site selection, including the consideration of alternatives. These details are set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper. It is important the plan makes provision for a range of sites of different size, type and geography to assist in providing appropriate choice, meeting different housing needs, and giving consideration to housing delivery. The provision of smaller site allocations within the plan is also important and necessary to ensure housing is delivered throughout the plan period.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan policies must meet the requirements of the Basic Conditions test which include general conformity with strategic policies of the Local Plan Parts 1 and 2; this would include any strategic allocations, for example set out in Core Policies 4a or Core Policy 8a.</p> <p>The Council would like to highlight that the outcomes of the appeal decisions to the south of Summertown, East Hanney and south of Steventon Road, East Hanney found the principle of development at East Hanney acceptable, but was dismissed on other grounds.</p>
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council			No				
1098065	Mr M.J Rolfe								
1142868	DR JOHN CRAIG				No				
1144159	Mr Keith Chisholm								
1144491	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke					No	Healthcare provision	<p>There were a number of comments received in relation to accessibility to health care provision. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Medical facilities are at capacity with long waiting times for appointments.</p> <p>Nearest medical facilities for East and West Hanney residents is at Wantage. No suitable footpath or cycle path for this journey.</p> <p>No evidence has been produced to demonstrate that the selection of this site promotes Core Policy 35 in the adopted Part 1 plan.</p>	<p>The Council consider that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular, as well as to Oxford. The developments proposed at East Hanney are of a scale appropriate to a settlement the size of East Hanney and are considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement.</p> <p>The Council understands that the Clinical Commissioning Groups preference is to increase catchment sizes for health care provision, as this offers a more viable and sustainable approach to delivering health care facilities. Within a rural area, it is not realistic, nor financially viable to expect health care to be provided at every larger village. This does not preclude appropriate development at larger village, both to support rural areas and help to</p>
1144538	SM and RF Powell								
1144997	Ms Diana Smith								

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									maintain their vitality. This is in conformity with the Spatial Strategy set out within the Part 1 plan that includes a key strand to 'promote thriving villages and rural communities whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character'. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensure that developers contribute towards improvements to the existing healthcare facilities in the area.
861678 1096915 1143288 1144186 1144356 1144528	Mr Guy Langton Mr and Mrs Kauert Mrs Judy Long Ms Barbara Burke Mr & Mrs R J Taylor	East Hanney Parish Council Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452 872479	Mr Fenwick Mr Paul Slater	WYG Planning & Environment Edgars Limited	No No No No	Historic character	There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to the historic character of East Hanney. Key comments included the following: The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. Development would impact on the character of the area. Conservation Areas and listed buildings are afforded protection under national and local policy. Recent appeal decision for land to the East of East Hanney made specific reference to the impact on the conservation area. Site Development Templates makes reference to an urban extension, but East Hanney is an historic rural village. National policy recognises the conservation of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside as a core planning principle. Heritage impacts would invoke the statutory duties as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This is not recognised in the Council's evidence. Land to south of Causeway is clearly preferable on the basis of the evidence of heritage impact and it is noted should carry greater significance in the site selection process in the context of NPPF paragraph 132.	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, informed by technical evidence and working with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper. The requirements set out in Appendix A: Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council, Historic England and the District Council's Conservation Officer who have advised where policy requirements are needed for individual sites relating to historic environment and cultural heritage. A requirement is set out in the Site Development Template to ensure development seeks to conserve and where possible, enhance the adjacent Conservation Area through appropriate design and landscaping. Development will be required to comply with Core Policies 37 and 38 of the adopted Part 1 plan. The Site Development Template includes criteria to ensure the character of the site will be in keeping with the existing settlement.
1142467 874560	Mr Philip Pickles Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No No	Housing Density	One comment questioned the density of the proposed allocation in comparison with adjacent sites that have received planning permission or completed. Comment questioned that the proposed density is too crowded. Comment has suggested lowering the maximum number of houses to the north-east of East Hanney to 35 rather than 50. Comment has suggested including an additional requirement in the Site Development Template to ensure developers contribute to improvement of the A338 and Steventon Road junction e.g. a mini roundabout. Comment also suggests that none of the houses should be three storey as this does not reflect character of the village. Comment also suggests that	Please refer to responses relating to masterplanning and design considerations.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								homes should be mainly 4 bed detached to reflect character of the village.	
861678 1137748	Mr Guy Langton Dr Saul Myerson	East Hanney Parish Council				No No	Housing Requirement	<p>One comments questioned the Council's housing requirement and the proposed allocations at East Hanney. This comment raised the following concerns:</p> <p>Over provision would result in areas of open countryside, village fringes or site within villages becoming subject to unnecessary changes of use, causing consequences to local economy, communities and the environment.</p> <p>No reasonable explanation for allocations at East Hanney given the Part 2 plan over provides for 2000 dwellings.</p> <p>Dalton Barracks can accommodate further development and is a potential buffer within the plan to deliver the housing required.</p> <p>Not sound to overprovide. housing requirement in the Part 2 plan should be reduced to 22,760 and Council should remove the additional sites at East Hanney from the plan.</p>	The Councils Housing Requirement is discussed in more detail in relation to Core Policy 4a.
829424 861678 861678 865961 1095766 1142868 1143228 1143313 1144158 1144186 1144491 1144528	Mr Clive Manvell Mr Guy Langton Mr Guy Langton Mr David Kirk Andrew and Camilla Symes DR JOHN CRAIG Mrs Gillian Parry Dr JAMES TRIFFITT Mr Matthew Stephenson Mrs Judy Long Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke Mr & Mrs R J Taylor	East Hanney Parish Council East Hanney Parish Council	1145140	Mr Mark Doodes		No No No No No No No No No No No	Landscape character	<p>There were a few comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to landscape character. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>A recent applications were refused by the Council as the proposals would extend the built form beyond the established village boundary.</p> <p>Location of the site to the north of East Hanney is the first view of East Hanney when approaching from the north of the A338 and provides views to Oxford.</p> <p>Proposal is contrary to Core Policy 44: Landscape in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 in protecting important landscape settings of settlements.</p> <p>Proposal is contrary to local policy, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Council's Design Guide SPD by extending development into the open countryside.</p> <p>Site comprises open fields on the western side of the A338.</p> <p>Proposal would harm the character of the Conservation Area adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Site should provide a low density village extension in keeping with character of East Hanney and design of housing on Ashfields Lane.</p> <p>Proposal is contrary to recent appeal decisions at East Hanney e.g. P15/V1846/O which concluded that proposal would detract from landscape qualities of the Lowland Vale and rural setting of East Hanney.</p> <p>Proposal is contrary to recent appeal decisions at East Hanney e.g. App/VB120/W/17/3169694 Ebbs</p>	<p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out requirements to ensure development proposals undertake and Landscape an Visual Impact Assessment to inform the site design, layout, capacity and mitigation requirements.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates set out specific requirements to ensure the master planning of the site introduce a more positive and sensitive edge to the development, in relation to the existing settlement.</p> <p>The Site Development Template sets out an additional requirement to ensure development conserve and where possible, enhances the adjacent conservation area through appropriate design and landscaping.</p> <p>The Council has prepared a district wide Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) that identifies the key features, including Landscape Character Types and Landscape Character Areas to inform an understanding of the character and local distinctiveness of the Vale's landscape.</p> <p>The Council would like to highlight that the outcomes of the appeal decisions to the south of Summertown, East Hanney and south of Steventon Road, East Hanney found the principle of development at East Hanney acceptable, but was dismissed on other grounds.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144871	Mr William Hailey							<p>Lane App/VB120/W/16/3163560 – P16.VO364/O The Causeway P15/V1616/FUL Summertown P15/V1846/O.</p> <p>Harm to the rural character of East Hanney, lane opposite the allocation is used for recreation and pedestrian access along Letcome Brook.</p> <p>Site Development Templates should recognise the need to ensure that the soft edge of the village is retained, with lower densities to reflect the character of the area, including the Conservation Area.</p> <p>A few comments stated that the proposed allocations at East Hanney should be removed from the plan and for East Hanney to be re-classified as a Smaller Village.</p> <p>One comment stated that the site should include provision to ensure that the soft edge of the village is retained, with lower densities, and any densities not exceeding the surrounding and neighbouring properties in the conservation area and for the approach to the village to have a soft edge. Site Development Template in relation to Landscape considerations should include additional bullet point as follows:</p> <p>TO RETAIN THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE</p>	
1144186 1144528	Mrs Judy Long Mr & Mrs R J Taylor					No	Light pollution	<p>There were a few comments received in relation to light pollution. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>East Hanney is a dark village, 80 dwellings would increase light pollution.</p>	Development Policy 21: External Lighting in the Part 2 plan ensures that development proposals involving external lighting are appropriately designed and located. Applicants will be required to demonstrate through the preparation of a lighting strategy, that they have considered the design of their scheme, taking into account character of the area, amenity of neighbouring uses or local biodiversity.
861678 1144883	Mr Guy Langton Mr Clive Fewins	East Hanney Parish Council				No No	Noise pollution	<p>There were a few comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to noise pollution and vibration. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Developments in East Hanney and further large developments in Wantage and Grove will generate more noise pollution along the A338, affecting the health and amenity of residents of East Hanney.</p> <p>Noise impact assessments are available that indicate noise along the A338 is a problem. Any development would need to be located away from the road.</p> <p>Letters of complaints received by Oxfordshire County Council and the District Council from local residents.</p>	<p>Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that the development proposals demonstrate that the site is suitable for the existing acoustic environment.</p> <p>Development Policy 25: Noise Pollution in the Part 2 plan ensures that development proposals take into account the Council's noise planning guidance to ensure noise is adequately addressed and mitigated.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
861678 1143228 1144997	Mr Guy Langton Mrs Gillian Parry Ms Diana Smith	East Hanney Parish Council				No No	Public transport	There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to limited public transport. Key comments include: There is no direct public transport links to either Didcot, Milton Park and Harwell Campus and no footpath or cycleways to connect with the existing village.	The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council is content that the proposed development at East Hanney will not lead to any significant highway impacts and that the site has access to relatively good public transport. It is notable that the site proposal is supported by both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, who consider that development will help to improve bus frequency. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that development proposals contribute towards further enhancements to bus services in the area. The Council continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that appropriate site access can be achieved and OCC are informing the emerging masterplans for the site. The Site Development Templates sets out additional requirements so ensure the developer contributes towards infrastructure improvements along the A338 and elsewhere if required and provides a pedestrian link to Ashfields Lane to ensure safe and convenient access to the bus stop and community services and facilities.
725553	Mr Chris Gaskell	Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE)					Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE) - Utilities	Comments from Scottish Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE) indicate that there may be sufficient capacity available to supply this site from Grove primary substation and the existing distribution network.	Noted. The Site Development Templates ensure that developers liaise with infrastructure and service providers to ensure that appropriate works are carried out if needed
861678 861678 879508 1144042 1144491	Mr Guy Langton Mr Guy Langton Mr Derek Bowland Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke	East Hanney Parish Council East Hanney Parish Council Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	1145140 879505	Mr Mark Doodes Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning	No No No	Site Selection	There were a few comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to the site selection process. Key comments included the following: No sequential test has been undertaken by the Council and so inclusion of this allocation is not justified. Council has failed to identify housing in sustainable locations, both in terms of distance and linkage and breach planning policy. There are other alternative sites in the Vale that are suitable and deliverable. East Hanney is not well related to Oxford in terms of accessibility by rail or public transport. Wantage waste water treatment works are above capacity and raises concerns over the deliverability and viability of the site.	Please refer to responses stated above.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Support from Historic England	Historic England welcome and support the requirement in the Site Development Template that development should seek to conserve and, where possible, enhance the adjacent conservation area through appropriate design and careful landscaping.	Noted. Support from Historic England acknowledged and welcomed.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095766	Andrew and Camilla Symes					No	Water and Wastewater infrastructure	There were a number of comments received in relation to wastewater infrastructure and flooding. Key comments included the following:	<p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation with key stakeholders and infrastructure providers, including Thames Water.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates ensure developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed.</p> <p>The 'General Requirements' ensures development proposals demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or wastewater capacity to serve the development.</p> <p>Developers will be expected to enter into discussions with Thames Water as early as possible to agree a way forward. The Council understand that, following discussions with Thames Water, upgrades will be possible and so does not present a barrier to development.</p> <p>The Council has worked collaboratively with Environment Agency and Thames Water to produce a Water Cycle Study to assess the impact of the site allocation on the existing network. The Water Cycle Study accompanies the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>The Council has signed Statement of Common Ground with both the Environment Agency and Thames Water.</p>
1098065	Mr M.J Rolfe					No		Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2013) states that the sewage treatment plant has no holding system for treated water, increased volume of sewerage for treatment will result in increased flow of treated water into Letcombe Brook.	
1142784	Mr Brian Cooper					No		Proposed allocations in East Hanney will have a detrimental impact on local waste water capacity and on local flood run off.	
1143228	Mrs Gillian Parry					No		Thames Water has identified that the mains water and sewerage provision is at capacity.	
1144356	Ms Barbara Burke					No		Site should not be progressed until Thames Water has upgraded the main sewer serving East Hanney.	
1144491	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke					No		Drainage system to Wantage water treatment works is already above capacity and is unlikely to cope with increased demand.	
1144528	Mr & Mrs R J Taylor					No			
1144491	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke					No	Watercourse	<p>There were a few of comments received in relation to biodiversity and green infrastructure, particularly watercourses. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Proposed allocation is inconsistent with Development Policy 30: Watercourses. A 10m buffer zone should be required.</p> <p>Noise mitigation related to the proposal should be sensitive to the proximity of the watercourse and its requirements.</p> <p>The Site Development Template in relation to Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure should include an additional bullet point as follows to reflect wording in Development Policy 30:</p> <p>WATERCOURSES SHOULD BE DESIGNED INTO THE DEVELOPMENT TO CREATE A SAFE SPACE, OVERLOOKED BY, AND WHERE POSSIBLE, FRONTED BY, DWELLINGS OR OTHER BUILDINGS, AND FORMING AN ATTRACTIVE PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT WITH A POSITIVE IMPACT ON THE VISUAL AMENITY AND CHARACTER OF THE SETTLEMENT.</p>	<p>Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures the development proposal provides a sufficient buffer zone for the existing watercourse which runs along the eastern boundary of the site.</p> <p>Development proposals will be required to provide a sufficient buffer zone in accordance with Development Policy 30: Watercourses in the Part 2 plan. The policy ensures that development proposals do not have a detrimental impact on the function or setting of the watercourse or its biodiversity.</p>

North-East of East Hanney

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1142868 861678	DR JOHN CRAIG Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				No No	Access and highways	<p>There were a few comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to general access and highways. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Access to community services and facilities is limited Main Street is narrow and hazardous due to on street parking. Lack of connectivity from east to west of the village. Consideration should be given to the impact of the proposed reservoir on access and highways, due to loss/diversion of Steventon Road. Consideration should be given to meeting needs of an ageing population</p>	<p>The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council is content that the proposed development at East Hanney will not lead to any significant highway impacts and that the site has access to relatively good public transport. It is notable that the site proposal is supported by both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, who consider that development will help to improve bus frequency.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out requirements to ensure development proposal deliver a high quality and sustainable extension, through master planning and urban design principles, which integrates with the centre of the village so residents can access existing facilities. These also ensure that appropriate access is provided to the sites. The Council continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that appropriate site access can be achieved and OCC are informing the emerging masterplans for the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, developers are required to contribute towards improvements to other community facilities in the area.</p> <p>Core Policy 14 of the adopted Part 1 plan ensures that any proposal for a reservoir includes a new route for the diverted Hanney to Steventon Road, to include provision for an off-road cycle path. The proposed reservoir if included as a preferred option in Thames Water's Water Resources Management Plan, must be brought forward through a masterplan, development brief and design statement in consultation with the community, the local authority and Oxfordshire County Council as the local highway authority.</p>
829463 874616 1142467 1142863 1143055 1143313 1144356	Mrs Philippa Manvell Dr Susan Tyack Mr Philip Pickles MRS EDITH CRAIG Mr Steven Moss Dr JAMES TRIFFITT Ms Barbara Burke					No No No No No	Access and highways - A338	<p>Current evidence indicates that the A338 is at capacity, particularly the A338/Steventon Road junction.</p> <p>Proposals would increase capacity at the A338/Steventon Road junction – a bypass at East Hanney should be considered.</p> <p>Traffic movement through the Hanneys to/from the West, bypassing Wantage and Grove has increased.</p> <p>Lorries and traffic movement on the A338 cause noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Development would add to congestion when approaching the village.</p> <p>Access to community services and facilities, such as the primary school is distant, will increase school traffic adding to congestion on existing roads.</p>	<p>The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council is content that the proposed development at East Hanney will not lead to any significant highway impacts and that the site has access to relatively good public transport. It is notable that the site proposal is supported by both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, who consider that development will help to improve bus frequency.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates set out infrastructure requirements that are necessary to ensure the planned development is sustainable. Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation between the Council, Oxfordshire County Council as the lead highways authority and Highways England. These also ensure that appropriate access is provided to the sites. The Council continue to work</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144538	SM and RF Powell							<p>Access to community services and facilities via Ashfields Lane and Main Street is difficult due to single lanes.</p> <p>Site has no connectivity and integration with the existing village due to limited pedestrian or vehicular access.</p> <p>Increase in car journeys as the site is distant from community services and facilities, for example shop, school, village hall or church.</p> <p>Limited bus service to Oxford, Abingdon and Wantage, but no access to employment at Didcot, Milton or Harwell.</p> <p>Routes in East Hanney used for commuter links to Oxford and Didcot/Harwell.</p> <p>Numerous accidents and casualties on the A338, notably to the north of the site in 2016.</p> <p>Crossing the A338 safely is difficult, particularly for children crossing to/from Hanney school and for bus passengers.</p> <p>30mph speed restriction would need to be moved north.</p> <p>Increase in traffic will extend to local roads causing increased congestion and causing hazards for cyclists</p>	<p>with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that appropriate site access can be achieved and OCC are informing the emerging masterplans for the site.</p> <p>The 'General Requirements' supporting the Site Development Templates requires developers to submit a Transport Statement to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for any harmful transport impacts.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates also ensure that the site seeks to maximise connectivity through adjacent sites and with the existing core of the village to the west, through appropriate master planning and urban design principles.</p>
1143228	Mrs Gillian Parry					No	Access and highways - sustainable transport	<p>One comment stated that there was no public transport link to Didcot or Milton Park and no footpath or cycleway to connect to the village. Development would have an impact on local traffic to the village and other local villages and towns.</p>	Please refer to response stated above.
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				No	Access to employment	<p>A few comments stated that there are good bus routes to Oxford, Abingdon and Wantage, but no bus services to access employment centres at Didcot, Milton Park and Harwell Campus</p>	Please refer to response stated above.
1144491	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke				No				
114471	Mr William Hailey								
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				No	<p>Accessibility to East Hanney village</p>	<p>There were a number of comments received, including comments by East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to accessibility to the existing village of East Hanney. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Site should be removed or reconsidered in the context of a masterplan with the surrounding sites. Site is currently isolated which would result in an unsustainable community.</p> <p>Local objection to this site. Development limited to this site only, provided it is considered in the context of a masterplan with the surrounding sites</p> <p>The site is bounded on the West by existing developments that have not been designed or built to provide vehicular access, cycling or pedestrian routes.</p>	<p>The Council consider that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular as well as to Oxford. The developments proposed at East Hanney are of a scale appropriate to a settlement the size of East Hanney and are considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensure that through appropriate master planning and urban design principles, the site delivers a high quality and sustainable extension which integrates with the centre of the village to the west.</p> <p>A requirement is included in the Site Development Template to ensure that the site seeks to maximise</p>
868060	Mr Paul Aram				No				
1142784	Mr Brian Cooper				No				
1144356	Ms Barbara Burke								
1144871	Mr William Hailey								
1145034	Mrs Elizabeth Cornish								

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Site immediately to the south that has planning permission shows no connection/integration with the allocation.</p> <p>Site can only be accessed by a narrow corridor of land.</p> <p>Site is located on the east of the A338 with limited access to the facilities to the West.</p> <p>Difficult to cross the A338 due to high speeding traffic, particularly for younger children, parents with pushchairs and older people.</p> <p>No footpath exists from developments along the Steventon Road to Main Street.</p> <p>Increased traffic congestion on the A338 and on local roads through the village, for example Ashfields Lane.</p> <p>No provision for improved facilities within the village, for example leisure and sports facilities.</p> <p>Limited access to local employment at Harwell and Oxford.</p>	<p>connectivity with adjacent sites and to the existing village.</p> <p>The masterplan of the site will be prepared in accordance with Core Policy 38 of the Part 1 plan, in consultation with the Council, local community and key stakeholders.</p>
1144491 1144538	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke SM and RF Powell					No	Accessibility to health care provision	<p>There were a few comments received in relation to accessibility to health care provision at Wantage. No footpath or cycle route to access medical facilities at Wantage. Not in accordance with Core Policy 35 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</p>	<p>The Council consider that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular, as well as to Oxford. The developments proposed at East Hanney are of a scale appropriate to a settlement the size of East Hanney and are considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement. The distances to services and facilities in East Hanney do not differ to the proximity to services and facilities within many larger settlements.</p> <p>The Council understands that the Clinical Commissioning Groups preference is to increase catchment sizes for health care provision, as this offers a more viable and sustainable approach to delivering health care facilities. Within a rural area, it is not realistic, nor financially viable to expect health care to be provided at every larger village. This does not preclude appropriate development at larger village, both to support rural areas and help to maintain their vitality. This is in conformity with the Spatial Strategy set out within the Part 1 plan that includes a key strand to 'promote thriving villages and rural communities whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character'.</p>
861678 1142784	Mr Guy Langton Mr Brian Cooper	East Hanney Parish Council				No No	Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</p> <p>There were a few comments received in relation to biodiversity and green infrastructure. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Site would harm local biodiversity, including roosting of common bats and their flight paths</p> <p>Difficult to see how mitigation can be successfully integrated into the scheme</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection. Further details are set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation with key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council and the District Council's Ecologist who have advised where policy requirements are needed to individual sites relating to ecology and biodiversity.</p> <p>Core Policy 46 of the adopted Part 1 plan provides policy guidance to conserve and enhance biodiversity</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Site is known locally as 'Rosie Bees' that supports a large bee population Substantial loss of ecologically important land which is not being replaced	when considering development proposals. The Site Development Templates ensure ecological surveys are undertaken in accordance with national guidance and best practice.
861678 1144491	Mr Guy Langton Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke	East Hanney Parish Council				No No	Capacity of Primary School	There were a number of comments received in relation to the capacity of the existing primary school at East Hanney. Key comments included the following: Primary school is already at capacity. No suggestion of additional funding for its expansion. Extension of primary age provision risks the displacement of pre-school provision. No secondary school provision within the village Residential development in advance of supporting infrastructure is not sustainable. Limited accessibility to schools in other settlements. No drop off or parking provision at the primary school at peak times, as expansion of the existing school playground which has limited staff parking is now occupied by temporary classrooms. It is unclear whether the planned expansion of the existing primary school will accommodate the capacity of growth through consented schemes and the additional site allocations.	The Council consider that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular, as well as to Oxford. The developments proposed at East Hanney are of a scale appropriate to a settlement the size of East Hanney and are considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement. The Council is satisfied that appropriate contributions will be made to facilitate expansion of the primary school and it is notable that the development is supported by Oxfordshire County Council. The village falls within the catchment of Secondary Schools at Wantage and Grove. Within a rural area, it is typical for surrounding villages to make use of secondary schools at nearby larger settlements. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensure that the development proposal contributes towards the expansion of the existing St James Primary School and any necessary additional nursery provision. The Site Development Template also requires contributions towards the expansion of existing secondary school places in the area. The requirements set out in the Site Development Templates have been prepared in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council as the leading education authority. The Council is satisfied that appropriate provision can be provided. The Council has prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that has identified the necessary infrastructure requirements to support the development, including education and school provision.
829463 861678 1142863 1143228 1144883	Mrs Philippa Manvell Mr Guy Langton MRS EDITH CRAIG Mrs Gillian Parry Mr Clive Fewins	East Hanney Parish Council				No No No No	Character of East Hanney	There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council in relation to the existing character of East Hanney. Key comments included the following: Site extends the village into the countryside. Site is not included East Hanney's emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan. Site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and will not respect the historic character of East Hanney village. An extension to East Hanney should respect the rural nature in keeping with the setting and character of the village. Proposal is inconsistent with national policy with the desire to retain rural character through growth.	The Council consider that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular, as well as to Oxford. The developments proposed at East Hanney are of a scale appropriate to a settlement the size of East Hanney and are considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement. The Council considers that the proposed development is both consistent with the Part 1 plan, including the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy and with national policy. Seeking to protect rural areas does not preclude all development, indeed, some development will assist with maintaining the vitality of settlements.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Loss of identity through recent developments on the edge of the village.</p> <p>Development would detract from the visual amenity and character of the village, particularly approaching the village from the north and east.</p> <p>Housing density is higher than neighbouring developments of the existing village.</p> <p>Number of dwellings should be reduced as a result of the constraints of development at this location.</p> <p>Site represents the frontage to the village when approaching from Frilford.</p> <p>Site Development Template should be amended to ensure development is an extension of a rural village nature.</p> <p>Site Development Template should be amended to remove reference to urban. Design principles amended to reflect the following: retention of village character, retention of verges and green spaces, protection of the green and soft edge of the village with lower densities, recognition that East Hanney is a clear skies village.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council is keen to work positively with local communities, decisions on making allocations to meet the overall housing need for the district needs to be taken at a strategic level and represent an appropriate strategy for the district as a whole.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates set out policy requirements and include urban design principles. The proposals will also need to be consistent with Core Policies 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness and 38: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites. The Council is content that these provide sufficient guidance to achieve high quality design standards and to protect the local distinctiveness of the local area.</p>
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments from Oxfordshire County Council – Infrastructure	Oxfordshire County Council broadly support this site as it relates well for public transport and expansion of primary school could accommodate growth.	Noted. Support from Oxfordshire County Council acknowledged and welcomed.
725553	Mr Chris Gaskell	Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE)				No	Comments from Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE)	Scottish and Southern Energy (SSE) has commented that there may be sufficient capacity to supply the site from the Grove primary substation and existing distribution network.	Noted.
776299	Tom Smailes	Linden Homes				Yes	Comments from Site Promoter	<p>Several comments were made by the Site Promoter, Linden Homes, for the proposed allocation at North-East of East Hanney. Comments state that East Hanney is a suitable and sustainable location for additional housing growth due to its designation as a larger village.</p> <p>The site itself is situated at a sustainable location within the village with good links to existing services and facilities, benefitting from proposed new transport connections (footpaths and bus stops), enabling excellent access to public transport links. Existing access to the site can be upgraded to provide suitable access.</p> <p>The site is not affected by any statutory designations and as such is not subject to any local policy or physical constraints. It's location alongside other new residential developments forms a logical rounding off of development in this part of the village and will not give rise to any wider impacts. Linden Homes is committed to delivering a high quality and sustainable extension to East Hanney.</p>	The Council acknowledge the comments made by the Site Promoter and will continue to work with them on the proposed allocation at North-East of East Hanney.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Linden Homes understand the landscape considerations identified in the development template and will ensure that these are retained and enhanced as part of the sites development. The development will also include a number of POS/Landscape buffers to assist in the assimilation of the development into its context.</p> <p>A draft masterplan is appended to Linden Homes' representation.</p> <p>Linden can confirm that they controls the entirety of the allocation and there are no ownership constraints to development and therefore the site is fully deliverable. Linden fully support the allocation of land to the east of East Hanney and commit to working together with the Council to ensure its timely delivery.</p>	
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments from Stagecoach - Public transport	<p>Stagecoach support the allocation in relation to proximity to S8 and S9 bus services to Oxford, Abingdon, Wantage and Grove. Further development in this location would be likely to increase frequency of existing bus services.</p>	Noted. Support from Stagecoach acknowledged and welcomed. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures development proposals contribute towards further enhancements of bus services in the area.
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills		Comments from Thames Water - Water and Wastewater Network	<p>Thames Water has no infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</p> <p>Thames Water has commented that the water network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development.</p> <p>Local upgrades to the existing water network infrastructure may be required.</p>	Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures that the development proposal upgrades the sewer network and are required to liaise with Thames Water to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity and/or wastewater capacity to serve the development.
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council				No	Community services and facilities	<p>A few comments were received in relation to limited community services and facilities in the village of East Hanney, for example local shop and primary school and accessibility to health care provision.</p> <p>Additional growth at East Hanney would impact on the local infrastructure and existing community services and facilities.</p>	Please refer to responses stated above.
1098052	MS Hazel Abraham					No			
1144538	SM and RF Powell								
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Development in East Hanney	<p>A number of comments, including those made by East Hanney Parish Council, questioned the need for further development in East Hanney; a number of windfall sites have come through in previous years and alongside the additional proposed allocations, result in the community rapidly growing. Concern is raised over the impact on the environment and village, alongside the provision of social and physical infrastructure to support these communities.</p> <p>Comments state that the necessary amendment is the removal of the two proposed allocations at East Hanney from the Plan.</p>	<p>The Council considers that East Hanney is a relatively sustainable location for development, being a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good access to Abingdon-on-Thames and Wantage, in particular, as well as to Oxford. The development proposed at East Hanney is of a scale appropriate to the size of East Hanney and is considered to be well related to the existing built form of the settlement.</p> <p>The Council is required to make provision for sufficient housing to meet the identified needs of the district and to contribute to the unmet housing need of Oxford City within the plan period up to 2031. The Council has undertaken a comprehensive approach to site selection, including the consideration of alternatives. These details are set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper. It is important the plan makes provision for a range of sites of different size, type</p>
868060	Mr Paul Aram					No			
1144777	Mr Bill Orson					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									and geography to assist in providing appropriate choice, meeting different housing needs, and giving consideration to housing delivery.
829463	Mrs Philippa Manvell					No	East Hanney Neighbourhood Development Plan	A number of comments identified that the site not being in accordance with East Hanney's emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan and not in line with community views.	Whilst the Council is keen to work positively with local communities, decisions on making allocations to meet the overall housing need for the district needs to be taken at a strategic level and represent an appropriate strategy for the district as a whole.
1143228	Mrs Gillian Parry					No			
861678	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No	Flooding	<p>Flooding</p> <p>There were a number of comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to flood risk and drainage. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>The Council has not followed a robust approach to site selection, including sequential test and the assessment of reasonable alternatives as mandated by the NPPF and the plan is therefore unsound.</p> <p>Flooding area according to Environment Agency used to be at 60m which is above the site level.</p> <p>Incidents of flooding in 2007, 008, 2011 and 2014, particularly at Ebbs Lane and Ashfields Lane.</p> <p>Properties and roads in Ashfields Lane, the A338 and Steventon Road were affected by flooding.</p> <p>Proposed development is in an area of flood risk.</p> <p>The prevention of flooding on new sites can have a major impact on existing properties.</p> <p>Proposed development is located in Flood Zone 1, but in a lower area of flood risk.</p> <p>Site lies within Flood Zone 2 with important ditches which drain neighbouring developments.</p> <p>Tests on other sites in East Hanney show high water tables and poor permeability – Sustainable Drainage Systems are not possible.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and collaborative working with key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates require developers to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment/surface water drainage strategy based on information contained in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and liaison with Oxfordshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency to support a planning application.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken a SFRA of the preferred sites which has informed the site selection process. Neither Oxfordshire County Council or the Environment Agency have raised any concerns over this site in the context of flood risk.</p>
1096915		Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd				No			
1142467	Mr Philip Pickles					No			
1142784	Mr Brian Cooper					No			
1144356	Ms Barbara Burke					No			
1144491	Mr & Mrs Amanda & Stephen Clarke					No			
1144538	SM and RF Powell					No			
1144883	Mr Clive Fewins					No			
1145034	Mrs Elizabeth Cornish					No			
1143228	Mrs Gillian Parry					No	Flooding and Wastewater Infrastructure	This comment raised concern that the site would have an impact on the local waste water capacity on surface run-off, increasing flood risk for other parts of East Hanney village	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and collaborative working with key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates require developers to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment/surface water drainage strategy based on information contained in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and liaison with Oxfordshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency to support a planning application.</p> <p>Thames Water have confirmed that they have no infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</p> <p>The Council has signed a Statement of Common Ground with Thames Water and the Environment Agency who confirm they have no objections to the site allocation.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1142467	Mr Philip Pickles					No	Housing Density	<p>There were a few comments received in relation to housing density. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Site allocation includes the area for access and a tree protection zone which will not accommodate the number of dwellings specified.</p> <p>Site should reflect the density of other consented schemes, for example the site adjacent promoted by Lagan Homes</p> <p>Residential development should be kept to maximum of two storey to reflect character of the village</p> <p>Homes should be 4 bed detached dwellings to reflect the current housing mix in the village</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied the site is available and deliverable within the plan period.</p> <p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensure the development proposal delivers a high quality and sustainable extension which is in keeping with the rural setting and character of the area.</p> <p>Through master planning and urban design principles, the site should seek to maximise connectivity through adjacent sites and with the existing core of the village to the west.</p> <p>Further the Site Development Template sets out a requirement to ensure that the design of properties is no higher than two storeys, in keeping with the rural character and setting of the existing settlement.</p> <p>Core Policy 22 of the adopted Part 1 plan ensures a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of current and future households in accordance with local evidence set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).</p>
861678 1143228 1144883	Mr Guy Langton Mrs Gillian Parry Mr Clive Fewins	East Hanney Parish Council				No No	Landscape character	<p>There were a few comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to landscape character. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Recent appeal decision was dismissed for 200 homes on the southern edge of the village due to scale and not reflecting the character of the village of East Hanney</p> <p>Proposal is contrary to Core Policy 44: Landscape in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1</p> <p>Scale and density of proposal would give a visual impact contrary to the rural nature of East Hanney</p> <p>The approach to East Hanney from the north is an attractive rural setting to the built form of the village</p> <p>Proposal should ensure that a soft edge of the village is retained with lower densities and retain the character of the village</p>	<p>Appendix A: Site Development Templates sets out requirements to ensure development proposals undertake and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to inform the site design, layout, capacity and mitigation requirements.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates set out specific requirements to ensure the master planning of the site introduce a more positive and sensitive edge to the development, in relation to the existing settlement.</p> <p>The Site Development Template sets out an additional requirement to ensure development conserve and where possible, enhances the adjacent conservation area through appropriate design and landscaping.</p> <p>The Council has prepared a district wide Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) that identifies the key features, including Landscape Character Types and Landscape Character Areas to inform an understanding of the character and local distinctiveness of the Vale's landscape.</p> <p>The Council would like to highlight that the outcomes of the appeal decisions to the south of Summertown, East Hanney and south of Steventon Road, East Hanney found the principle of development at East Hanney acceptable, but was dismissed on other grounds.</p>
861678 879508	Mr Guy Langton	East Hanney Parish Council Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning	No	Site Selection	<p>There were a few comments received, including from East Hanney Parish Council, in relation to site selection. Key comments included the following:</p> <p>Council should have demonstrated that they have reviewed the concerns of the community and evidenced that they have followed the sequential test.</p>	<p>Please refer to response stated above.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Council has failed to place housing in areas where it is better located, not only in terms of distance and linkage, but does not breach core planning policies.</p> <p>Council should take a sequential approach to site selection, taking into account vulnerability of future users to flood risk and climate change.</p> <p>There are other alternative sites in the Vale which are more suitable for need and deliverability, without being contrary to policy.</p> <p>North-East of East Hanney site should be subject to a further review of its suitability.</p> <p>Site should have been rejected at Stage 2 of the site selection process due to limited capacity to accommodate at least 50 dwellings.</p> <p>East Hanney is an unsustainable location for development, site has limited connectivity to Oxford</p> <p>Uncertainty about the deliverability and viability due to constraints such as water and waste water capacity.</p> <p>East Hanney Parish Council suggest the removal of the allocation at East Hanney and apply it to the site at Dalton Barracks, which has sufficient capacity to accommodate urban development and is not subject to flooding.</p>	

South-East Marcham

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd,					Air Quality/ Pollution	A number of comments raise concern over the impact of development on air quality and pollution. These include:	<p>The VOWH have, and continue to work in partnership, with Oxfordshire County Council and have prepared joint evidence assessing highway impact associated with the Part 2 plan. Following an objection from Oxfordshire County Council to the Preferred Options consultation to the scale of development at Marcham, the Council have significantly reduced the scale of proposed development from 520 dwellings to 90. It is considered that the majority of additional traffic will travel towards Oxford, Abingdon-on-Thames or Science Vale and so travel to the east, rather than through Marcham, however the significant reduction in growth will also help to reduce any cumulative impact.</p> <p>Development Policy 26: Air Quality ensures that development proposals of a large scale or likely to significantly impact on air quality, including where located in or near an AQMA will require an Air Quality Assessment to be undertaken in line with best practice and guidance.</p> <p>Applicants will also be required to take into account the Council's emerging Air Quality Developers Guidance.</p> <p>Work has been undertaken, and will be ongoing, to ensure that potential for sustainable public transport connectivity with the site can be maximised.</p>
828782	Mrs Emily Smith							No analysis undertaken relating to air pollution in Marcham. A by-pass is required.	
879120	Gow Family							Insufficient evidence base to demonstrate that the impact on existing air pollution levels will be minimal.	
1093046	Mrs Claire Flint					No		Question as to whether the evidence base is robust and credible in relation to air quality.	
1095408	Mr Jonathan Flint					No		In addition to the SE Marcham allocation, the other proposed allocations for surrounding settlements will also add to traffic and therefore air pollution in Marcham.	
1144467	Mrs Judith Rudham					No		Further development in Marcham should be suspended until the bypass is constructed to alleviate air quality and traffic issues.	
755329	Mr Peter Evans	Hinton Waldrist Parish Council						Concerns over any development which adds to the air pollution in Marcham. Proposals are unsustainable and contrary to national policy in NPPF.	
730227	Councillor Richard Webber	Vale of White Horse District Council				No	Comment from District/ County Councillor	A number of comments were made relating to:	<p>The VOWH have, and continue to work in partnership, with Oxfordshire County Council and have prepared joint evidence assessing highway impact associated with the Part 2 plan. Following an objection from Oxfordshire County Council to the Preferred Options consultation to the scale of development at Marcham, the Council have significantly reduced the scale of proposed development from 520 dwellings to 90. It is considered that the majority of additional traffic will travel towards Oxford, Abingdon-on-Thames or Science Vale and so travel to the east, rather than through Marcham, however the significant reduction in growth will also help to reduce any cumulative impact.</p> <p>Development Policy 26: Air Quality ensures that development proposals of a large scale or likely to significantly impact on air quality, including where located in or near an AQMA will require an Air Quality Assessment to be undertaken in line with best practice and guidance.</p> <p>Applicants will also be required to take into account the Council's emerging Air Quality Developers Guidance.</p> <p>Work has been undertaken, and will be ongoing, to ensure that potential for sustainable public transport connectivity with the site can be maximised.</p>
								Support for the Marcham AQMA	
								Support for the removal of the Preferred Options allocation for 430 dwellings to the east of Marcham due to traffic generation and impact on air quality.	
								The proposed allocation for 90 dwellings to the SE of Marcham should also be removed for the same reason	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. In light of this, The Council have taken prudent steps for safeguarding land for key infrastructure schemes required to support development in the Local Plan, and beyond.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comment from Oxfordshire County Council	<p>A number of comments were made by Oxfordshire County Council including:</p> <p>Support the and reduction in the number of houses allocated following their objections to the Preferred Options allocations on Air Quality grounds</p> <p>That the site allocation for SE Marcham will have less of an impact on the AQMA compared to the Preferred Options allocation</p> <p>That the site is not well located for growth due to the lack of frequent bus services to key employment locations, in addition to existing road congestion.</p> <p>Concern that any contributions to support infrastructure will be limited (due to small scale nature of development).</p> <p>There is no prospect for funding of a Marcham by-pass during the Plan period and therefore this cannot be requested from the site allocation.</p> <p>Improvements to the Frilford lights junction are likely to be required during Plan period, but it is not clear at this stage how this is to be funded.</p> <p>A robust transport assessment is required for any application on this site.</p> <p>The IDP does not identify all the costs associated with site infrastructure and therefore needs to be amended.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges and welcomes the County's support for the reduced impact on the AQMA and the revised housing allocation.</p> <p>The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. Work is ongoing to plan for infrastructure delivery in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council and will include more detailed feasibility work. This work is ongoing. A Statement of Common Ground has been agreed between VOWH and OCC to re-confirm this ongoing commitment and to clarify a number of more specific points.</p> <p>The route for the bypass is safeguarded to ensure its longer term delivery is not prejudiced.</p> <p>The Council considers the development of the allocation site as a major development and as such, will be required to submit a Transport Assessment or Statement and Travel Plan, as detailed in Development Policy 17, before any development can commence. These will be developed in accordance with County Council guidance.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been be updated with relevant information, working in partnership with OCC for publication alongside the submission plan.</p>
1144989	Mrs Cathy Harrison	Environment Agency				No	Comments from Environment Agency	<p>The Environment Agency states that the Water Cycle Study has not set out clearly which site will be served by which treatment works.</p> <p>The SE of Marcham site is within the Appleton works catchment, but no assessment has been made to determine if growth at Appleton STW will result in non-compliance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. This could make the site undeliverable.</p>	Comment noted. The Council has held further discussions with EA on this matter to demonstrate how these matters have been addressed through the Water Cycle Study. This matter has been delete with through a Statement of Common Ground between VOWH and EA.
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England					Comments from Highways England	Highways England notes that the number of homes proposed at Marcham has reduced since the Regulation 18 consultation, and as such no longer have any comments on the site.	Noted

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1100261		Catesby Property Group	1096086	Taylor Cherrett	Turley		Comments from Site Promoter	<p>Comments were made by the site promoter for South-East of Marcham on the following:</p> <p><u>Air pollution</u></p> <p>This response acknowledges that the site is partially located within a designated AQMA.</p> <p>The Site Promoter has undertaken an Air Quality Assessment to accompany the proposed allocation, which considers the air quality impacts from the construction phase and once the proposed development is fully operational.</p> <p>The summary of the findings of this assessment state: The operational impact of the Proposed Development on existing receptors is predicted to be 'negligible' taking into account the changes in pollutant concentrations and absolute levels. Using the criteria adopted for this assessment together with professional judgement, the operational air quality effects are considered to be 'not significant' overall. The development site does not, in air quality terms, conflict with national or local policies; or with measures set out in the VWHDC's Air Quality Action Plan. There are no constraints to the development in the context of air quality, which would prevent the sites allocation through the emerging LPP2.</p> <p><u>Community Services and Facilities</u></p> <p>Comments state that the site is in a sustainable location for development with close proximity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail - Railway Station at Radley • Education - Marcham C of E Primary, Larkmead School (Secondary)and Pre-School. Further primary schools and Denman College are also found within 5km of the site • Health – GP at Marcham Rd Family Health Centre • Local Services - Post Office, local shop, public house, Church, Community centre and sports facilities and garden centre. • Public Transport – a number of bus services within Marcham with a bus stop located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. • Strategic Road Network – within 1.7km of A34 • Site to be developed to provide opportunity to make full use of public transport, cycling and walking as set out in NPPF paragraph 47. <p><u>Deliverability</u></p> <p>Provides support the deliverability of the site within the Plan period.</p> <p>Notes that the site can be delivered within short to medium term and can deliver up to 90 dwellings including the safeguarding of land for proposed by-pass. This would include the provision of affordable</p>	<p>The Council notes the comments made by the site promoter.</p> <p>The Council have prepared a comprehensive suite of evidence base studies to underpin the plan and conducted a detailed, robust site selection process which is consistent with national policy and guidance. Further details are set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>housing in accordance with adopted policy requirements, as well as open space and landscaping.</p> <p>States that a number of technical documents have been prepared to demonstrate to the Council and other stakeholders that there are no known constraints at this time to delivering development on the site.</p> <p><u>Ecology</u> Comments were made in relation to Ecology, stating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific proposals for the avoidance, mitigation and compensation of any predicted impacts are considered in an Ecological Appraisal submitted by the agent. • Submitted surveys identify habitat features and protected species that will need to be protected in any planning applications. • The Ecological Appraisal concludes there to be no overriding ecological constraints which would jeopardise the delivery of housing on the site. <p><u>Flood Risk/Drainage</u> The site promoter states that the site is within Flood Zone 1 and therefore has a low risk of flooding. Submitted FRA highlights that this site is not affected by flooding from any source and will not increase flood risk elsewhere. Details of surface and waste water proposals are set out within the comment.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u> Comments identify that the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment submitted by agent shows that there is moderate potential for archaeological remains of local or regional significance. Further investigations could be secured by condition. Despite this, there are no overriding archaeology or heritage constraints which would restrict development at the site.</p> <p><u>Highways</u> The Transport Statement submitted by the site promoter states that a review of personal injury data for the area confirms that no significant road safety issues would be affected by traffic from the site, which would have modest vehicular movement and would not materially affect the highway network. Therefore, there are no highway grounds for not allocating the site.</p> <p><u>Landscape</u> The LVIA submitted by the site promoter sets out that the site allocation would have a minor and localised</p>	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>effect which would not constitute an unacceptable impact on landscape fabric or character. The proposed residential development would be small-scale, visually discrete and in keeping with the landscape character of the Lowland Village Farmlands LT. As such, it would not result in any material landscape or visual effects and would not be contrary to policy.</p> <p><u>Masterplanning/Density</u> The site promoter has submitted a masterplan proposing a net density of 25 dwellings per ha which reflects urban to rural transition and is broadly compliant with Core Policy 23.</p> <p><u>Pollution/Contamination</u> The Geo-environmental Assessment submitted by the site promoter sets out the site has a low risk of ground contamination and low risk of ground gas. As such the site is considered to be suitable for development.</p> <p><u>Sustainability and Economic Growth</u> The site is defined as one of the larger villages and is therefore a sustainable location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of 90 additional dwellings will accord with paragraph 28 of NPPF which supports economic growth in rural areas in addition to paragraph 55 which supports housing where it enhances and maintains viability of rural communities. The additional 90 dwellings will support the local community. <p><u>General support</u> A number of comments were received in support of the site were received on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no overriding constraints which would prevent delivery of the development It is well linked to Abingdon and Oxford and is situated adjacent to existing development. The site was identified as suitable for further consideration in the SHLAA of October 2017 The site is a realistic candidate for development and should be maintained as an allocation in Local Plan 2031 part 2. There are planning permissions for various developments around the site, and as such the agent considers that site to be contiguous with the settlement boundaries and suitable for development. Support for the site as it is in an accessible locality and free from constraints which would restrict development. 	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The allocation supports the vitality of the centre One comment supports the site allocation but questions the robustness of the evidence base for the spatial strategy of LPP2 as a whole. 	
725553	Mr Chris Gaskell	Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE)					Comments from SSE	SSE anticipate that capacity is sufficient within existing High Voltage distribution network to supply the allocation site.	Noted
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments from Stagecoach	<p>Comments from Stagecoach state that the S9 bus service currently serves the site, linking it to Abingdon and Oxford as well as Wantage and Grove. This service currently operates hourly, and services operating 7 days a week and during the evening are also offered. This service could sustain a higher frequency, half hourly service in the longer term, subject to funding--The S9 bus service which currently operates an hourly service could be upgraded to a half hourly frequency subject to funding.</p> <p>Stagecoach broadly support this allocation as being relatively sustainable (given its limited size) and also add that it will add resilience to the housing trajectory.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Council welcome Stagecoach's support for this site and will continue to look at ways in which to maximise its connectivity to the public transport network during the application process.</p>
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills		Comments from Thames Water	<p>Comments from Thames Water state that the water capacity network may not be able to meet the demand from this site. As such, local upgrades to the water network infrastructure may be required. They encourage the developer to work with them to identify what is required, where, when and how it will be delivered.</p> <p>Thames Water believe that waste water proposals at the site are not considered to be of concern, provided that foul water is discharged to the public sewer by gravity flow and not pumped, and provided no surface water run-off is connected to the public sewer.</p> <p>General concerns are raised with regard to the cumulative impact of development in this area.</p>	Noted. Appendix A: Site Development Templates ensures developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed. The 'General Requirements' ensures development proposals demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or waste water capacity to serve the development. A Statement of Common Ground has been signed between VOWH and Thames Water who confirm they do not have any objection to the proposed development.
1095989	Mr and Mr J and W Duffield and Cumber	Mr J Duffield and W Cumber and Son (Theale) Limited	1142270	Mr Jon Alsop	Savills	No	Evaluation of Transport Impacts	One comment states that the ETI modelling of 1,000 units at Marcham does not appear to show a material impact upon the A415 corridor; if anything, Cluster 3, of which Marcham is part, appears to show a positive impact upon the AQMA corridor. Development at Marcham should therefore not be ruled out. The comment further questions how Dalton Barracks can be retained in the plan considering it's vicinity to the AQMA.	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council did previously propose a site allocation to the north-east of Marcham in the Preferred Options Version of the Part 2 plan. However, there were a number of objections received, including from Oxfordshire County Council on the grounds of future growth proposed in Marcham due to the proximity of the AQMA and because the site partly overlaps with the proposed route of the South Marcham Bypass. On this basis, this site was no longer recommended as an allocation in the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan.</p>
1093046	Mrs Claire Flint					No	Heritage	Site is opposite a Grade II Listed building and no account has been taken to protecting the environment	Comments noted. Historic assets are considered as part of the site selection process. Any development

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095408	Mr Jonathan Flint					No		and access of the building. Evidence should be provided to show that the effects of the proposed housing development on the curtilage of the two-star listed building have been considered and are not detrimental. If they are, the 90 houses proposed for Marcham should not be built	would need to abide by Development Policies 36, 37 and 38 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, in addition to CP39 (LPP1), which sets a framework to ensure proposals conserve and enhance heritage assets in accordance with national policy and legislation. The Site Development Templates (General Requirements) also includes a series of policy requirements relating to the Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage.
1093046 1095408 1096915 1141575	Mrs Claire Flint Mr Jonathan Flint Mrs Jean Creasey	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No No No No	Highways	Comments were made in relation to the impact of the site allocation on highways, stating that: The site would increase traffic on the A415. The Council's assumption that traffic will travel away from Marcham is incorrect. The site would aggravate access to Marcham. There is a lack of evidence to support the necessary mitigation in relation to air quality (generated by traffic). The IDP to date does not have costs. The number to houses proposed would create illegal levels of air pollution A traffic plan regarding traffic flow from the site across the wider Vale and the effects on the AQMA must be made.	The Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council, the Highways Agency and other stakeholders to plan for future highway infrastructure improvements and to support the delivery of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. The Council considers the development of the allocation site as a major development and as such, will be required to submit a Transport Assessment or Statement and Travel Plan, as detailed in Development Policy 17, before any development can commence. These will be developed in accordance with County Council guidance. The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded this site is suitable and deliverable. The SA Report explains the Council's reasons for supporting the preferred option, in light of other alternatives. Development Policy 26: Air Quality ensures that development proposals of a large scale or likely to significantly impact on air quality, including where located in or near an AQMA will require an Air Quality Assessment to be undertaken in line with best practice and guidance. Applicants will be required to take into account the Council's emerging Air Quality Developers Guidance. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been updated with relevant information for publication alongside plan submission.
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning		Sustainability	The assessment undertaken in Topic Paper 2, Appendix 2b with a high number of 'amber' results, highlighting that the site is not sustainable. In particular, these relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape • Ecology • Water and Wastewater • Public Services (Marcham is not served by a rail station) • Transport Impact, and • Environmental Health. 	The proposed development site at Marcham is considered to represent a sustainable location for development. The Council has followed a comprehensive process of assessing potential development sites and the site at Marcham is comparatively sustainable when compared against alternatives. The detail of the process is set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1093046	Mrs Claire Flint					No	Utilities - Water and Waste Water	A couple of comments raise concerns regarding the water system at Marcham on the grounds that:	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council has worked closely with Thames Water and prepared evidence, including a Water Cycle Study and Infrastructure Delivery Plan, to support the plan process. The IDP is a live document and will continue to be updated. An updated version is published alongside the submission plan. Whilst upgrades will be needed to the network to support development, the Council is not aware of any barriers to development.</p> <p>The Site Development Template (Appendix A) ensures developers liaise with Thames Water to ensure that appropriate works are carried out, if needed. The 'General Requirements' ensures development proposals demonstrate adequate water supply capacity and/or waste water capacity to serve the development.</p> <p>A Statement of Common Ground has been signed between VOWH and Thames Water who confirm they do not have any objection to the proposed development.</p>
1095408	Mr Jonathan Flint					No		<p>The proposed development should take into account the required infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Thames Water has questioned the capacity of the network to support the additional housing proposed. This infrastructure has broken down in the past and therefore any addition to the system represents a threat to human health.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation measures are questioned, in particular the pumping station, which is accessed via Hyde Farm. This requires access maintenance to enable remedial or improvement work.</p> <p>Appleton Waste Water treatment is working above capacity and is unlikely to cope with increased demand. Upgrades to water pumping should be made before building and should maintain access to Hyde Farmhouse and nursery.</p> <p>Further detailed modelling of the network would be required to determine whether reinforcement work would be necessary as indicated by a response from Thames Water. A feasible solution can be delivered to ensure the necessary drainage infrastructure is in place.</p>	

Core Policy 8b: Dalton Barracks Comprehensive Development Framework

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1022242 1144189 1073312	Dr David Illingworth Mrs Charlotte Reaney Mr & Mrs Burton	North Abingdon Local Plan Group				No No	Access	<p>There were a number of comments received relating to access. Specific comments included:</p> <p>Insufficient access routes e.g. to the west, Wootton Road that connects Cumnor, the A420 and Oxford; towards Oxford through Sunningwell and Boars Hill to Hinksey junction with A34; Marcham Road to the A34, Marcham, Grove, Wantage and on towards Kingston Bagpuize. To the east from the allocation along Wootton Road into Abingdon, through Shippon and over A34 into Abingdon</p> <p>The plan fails to describe how these access issues might be resolved</p> <p>It was suggested that possible solutions could include:</p> <p>Door to door bus routes providing access to key workplaces</p> <p>The provision of cycle tracks to access Abingdon</p> <p>The provision of employment on the site to reduce the need for commuting</p> <p>Clearer provision for a link to the Marcham junction, directly onto the roundabout and not following the low-quality Barrow Road, Faringdon Road or Marcham Road</p>	<p>The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development.</p> <p>The partnership working includes preparing a sustainable transport study for the area that focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford, focusing on bus/cycle/walking access to/from Dalton Barracks. Other evidence includes the Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study and in partnership with OCC, proposals are made for a north bound bus lane on the A34 connecting Lodge Hill and Hinksey Junctions; a new Park and Ride is proposed at Lodge Hill by the County Council along with a Rapid Transit Route connecting to Oxford. Discussions and work is ongoing to ensure bus services are improved along with improved pedestrian and cycle connections. The Development Site Template includes a comprehensive package of requirements relating to access and highways. This includes improving access to the A34 at Marcham. Core Policy 8b includes a commitment to plan for the site comprehensively with the preparation of a Comprehensive Masterplan to be adopted as SPD.</p>
729283 828782 879120 1095853 1142673 1144874	Mrs Victoria Talbot Mrs Emily Smith Gow Family Dr Janet Banfield Mr Neil Porter Ms Pearl Givinichi-Lewis	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee Abingdon Air & County Show				No No No	Clarification on site area	<p>There were a few comments received relating to the site area needing to be clarified. Specific comments included:</p> <p>No clear answer provided by the Council that houses owned by the MoD, outside the site fence line are to be included within the proposed allocation</p> <p>Referring to the site as Dalton Barracks, whereas the MOD refer to the site as Dalton Barracks including Abingdon Airfield; concerns raised as to which parts of the site are to be developed</p> <p>Proposal for a Garden Village development is welcomed, but lack of clarity and uncertainty regarding the availability of the barracks, behind the wire which makes it difficult to comprehend how masterplanning can be undertaken for the whole site</p>	<p>The Council consider that the maps set out within the Part 2 plan provide clarity on which areas are considered available for development and which areas will remain Green Belt. The Statement of Common Ground between the VOWH and the DIO make clear that development can come forward from 2024 and sets out an indicative masterplan and trajectory for the site. The Council have been clear that housing owned by the MOD outside the red line boundary does not form part of the development boundary.</p>
1095853 1096052	Dr Janet Banfield Mr Geoff Fitzgerald	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No Yes	Coalescence of existing settlements	<p>There were a number of comments received relating to the impact of coalescence with existing settlements. Specific comments included:</p>	<p>Garden Town/ or Village proposals do not preclude existing settlements being expanded and developed as Garden Towns, or Garden Villages. Didcot has been classified as a Garden Town and will involve supporting substantial (c. 15,000 homes) at and adjoining the existing</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097479 1143225	David Hutchinson Mr Graham Sloper					No No		<p>Garden Village principles seek to protect coalescence between settlements, but the historic village of Shippon would be subject to coalescence</p> <p>Resident survey by St Helen Without Parish Council showed that 88% of the 120 residents did not want coalescence between Shippon and the proposed allocation</p> <p>Garden Village developments should have their own footprint and identity and the land between the proposed Garden Village and Shippon should be protected</p> <p>The amount of Green Belt land to be removed needs reducing to safeguard the separate identifies of Wootton and Shippon</p> <p>Selection of this site is contrary to Development Policy 29: Settlement Character and Gaps in the Part 2 plan due to the coalescence between the historic village of Shippon and the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks</p> <p>Some comments suggest that the policy on Settlement Character and Gaps is inconsistent with the proposed site allocations and the policies on Meeting Our Housing Needs and Didcot Garden Town</p>	settlement of Didcot. Shippon currently adjoins the built form of the Dalton Barracks site. The size of the site will facilitate the inclusion of substantial areas of Green Infrastructure and the relationship and connections to Shippon can be explored further through the master planning work.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Comments from CPRE	<p>There were a number of comments from CPRE in relation to legal compliance for the removal of land from the Green Belt. Specific comments included the following:</p> <p>It is unclear what is proposed. Need clarity as to what is to be removed from Green Belt and what is to remain. It must be clarified beyond equivocation for the Plan to be sound. It is noted that these anomalies have been brought to the Council's attention in previous consultations.</p> <p>The plan at Fig.3 in the Plan Review differs from the plan at page 13 of the appendices.</p> <p>The Country Park located on the Western part of the site that should be planned for as part of the comprehensive development framework</p> <p>There are no exceptional circumstances in Green Belt terms as the proposed housing could be accommodated without releasing land from the Green Belt. The fact that the land has become unexpectedly available does not constitute exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Proximity to Oxford is not an exceptional circumstance and in any case the site is ten miles from the City.</p> <p>Oxfordshire is a single housing market area, and there is no more merit in provision within the Green Belt that surrounds the City than beyond it.</p>	The Council considers that the maps provided within the plan clearly set out what the proposed site boundary area is and what areas are proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. The Council has published the Exceptional Circumstances Report to set out its case for removing Dalton Barracks from the Green Belt. The Council considers that its proposals are consistent with national policy and that overall, the plan represents an appropriate strategy for the district up to 2031.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>The site contains a large area of brownfield. This is not an exceptional circumstance to release it from the Green Belt. On the contrary, it reinforces the point that the proposed housing can be built within it without affecting its Green Belt status.</p> <p>The Policy is not in accordance with the NPPF in that there is no necessity to release any of the land from the Green Belt to accommodate the level of housing proposed,</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances exist for release of Green Belt land.</p> <p>The Inspector dismissed a series of Green Belt releases which were not required for housing in Part 1. Paragraph 89 allows for the redevelopment of previously developed sites within the Green Belt, providing the impact on openness is not (disproportionately) greater.</p> <p>The Dalton Policy is silent on density of development proposed, the Housing White Paper of March 2017 states that it is necessary to make efficient use of land and avoid building homes at low densities where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing requirements. Previously PPG3 required the avoidance of inefficient use of land and encouraged density of between 30 and 50dph. Density; and encouraged greater intensity in sustainable locations. (Dalton is close to the A34 and to Abingdon).</p> <p>CPRE's view that higher densities should be targeted to reduce land-take, provide the "genuinely affordable" housing the Vale seeks, and to balance the housing stock.</p> <p>Presently desirable Victorian Terraces were typically built at densities of 75 to the hectare. A green village concept can be achieved without a waste of space, or the provision of unnecessarily expensive houses.</p> <p>If taking the mid-case of PPG3 density figures would equate to 40dph, potentially 5,200 dwellings within the Council's shaded area in Figure 2.3, or 4,560 within the smaller area CPRE considers to be truly "previously developed" The capacity of the shaded "previously developed" part of the site would be 7,800 houses or higher As the previously developed part of the site is several multiples greater than the houses intended to be built, there can be no justification for its removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>The intention to remove a large area of Green Belt in case a need for it later emerges, is exactly the basis on which the reviews proposed in Part 1 were dismissed by the Inspector.</p> <p>Allowing development of the shaded area to "sprawl" out over it would be totally inappropriate as</p>	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								it would risk merging settlements contrary to the key purposes of designating land as Green Belt	
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Access	Support was received from the agent/site promoter in relation to access and site status as previously developed land	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Accessibility to Oxford, Abingdon and Science Vale	Support was received from the agent/site promoter in relation to the site benefits setting out the potential to provide 1200 homes within the Plan period and approximately 4500 homes in the longer term. Supporting comments received from the agent/site promoter highlighting the site as a sustainable location for development.	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	DIO commits to working with Natural England and the Local Planning Authority to ensure that all parties are satisfied that the site is deliverable, without adverse impacts on sites of ecological value. The existing character of the site, and of the surrounding villages has been fully accounted for to ensure that proposals for buildings and structures do not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The character of the new development will make efficient use of the land in a Garden Village context, with a higher density core, and lower density uses on the edges of the settlement, giving way to generous areas of open space provision.	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Comprehensive Development Framework	Comments from site promoter/agent state that the proposals will comply with the four criteria as set out in Core Policy 8b relating to the requirements of: a travel plan, landscape plan, impact on Cothill Fen SAC and the nearby SSSI, and impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Supporting comments setting out that Dalton Barracks constitutes previously developed land. It is anticipated that the majority of the existing built form on the site will be demolished and redeveloped in accordance with Garden Village principles, incorporating areas of green space and green infrastructure. The DIO welcomes the opportunity to work with the Council and other to prepare a comprehensive development framework for the site to be prepared in conjunction with key stakeholders, anticipated to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document ("SPD"). Will enable the local community to be involved in the masterplanning and planning processes.	Noted

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Country Park	<p>Support was received from the agent/site promoter in relation to the provision of a country park, including:</p> <p>Pedestrian accessibility would be improved via a country park with a network of paths and potentially a bridleway connecting into the site.</p> <p>Contributions will be made towards improved healthcare facility to mitigate the impacts of the development, subject to viability.</p> <p>The proposed masterplan for the site includes the provision of up to 3 x 2FE primary schools and reserves land for a secondary school of 10.55ha in order to accommodate educational requirements beyond 2031.</p>	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Deliverability	<p>General comments supporting the site allocation and the capacity of the site in housing terms within the plan period and beyond</p>	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Ecological Assessment	<p>Comments received from the site promoter/agent in relation to biodiversity and green infrastructure. Comments included the following:</p> <p>The Ecological Assessment sets out that the majority of protected and/or notable species can be fully mitigated for and their habitats enhanced. Habitats currently proposed include wetland, new ponds, woodland/ wood pasture, orchard, scrub areas, species rich hedgerows and grasslands. The provision of the country park will be critical to ensuring that impacts identified below on ecological receptors are mitigated and that net gain for biodiversity can be provided</p> <p>A future planning application for the Site would include an Ecology Mitigation Strategy and overarching habitat management plan for the country park in addition to monitoring of key species impacted by the redevelopment of the Site</p>	
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Garden Village Principles	<p>Site promoter/agent commented that the proposed development will following Garden Village principles as set out in paragraph 2.58.</p> <p>Site promoter/agent commented that a Garden Village on this site can be designed as a discrete settlement;</p> <p>it will make use of public owned previously developed land;</p> <p>it will contribute to meeting local housing needs; and</p> <p>It will deliver "integrated and accessible transport systems" to support the new homes.</p>	Noted

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)	Yes	Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Housing Need	Support for the site allocation from the site promoter/ agent.	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Infrastructure Provision	Supporting comments from the site promoter/agent setting out that the allocation will utilise PDL and reduce the pressure on Greenfield sites. Relevant infrastructure to be provided.	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Site Context	General comments supporting the site allocation from the site promoter/agent. The information submitted demonstrates that the Site is capable of delivering a mixed use, residential led, community that reflects Garden Village principles, and which can deliver at least 1,200 new homes by 2031 and approximately 4,500 new homes in the longer term.	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Site Development Templates	General support for the Site Development Templates from the site promoter/agent. The DIO broadly supports the site-specific requirements set out in Appendix A to the Plan.	
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Site Development Templates - Access and Highways	Site promoter/agent commented that contributions will be considered where viable towards enhancing public transport corridors in the area. The proposal to create a park and ride and enhance cycle and footpath network will be explored.	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Site Development Templates - Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Comments were received from the site promoter/agent in relation to biodiversity and green infrastructure. Specific comments included the following: The development is planned to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on Cothill Fen SAC or Dry Sandford Pits, SSSI. Recreational impacts on Cothill Fen SAC has been assessed and used to inform on-site mitigation through the provision of significant alternative natural greenspace (in the form of a Country Park). This mitigation will be considered alongside potential infrastructure improvements within the SAC. The development is planned to ensure that there are no adverse effects in relation to two nearby	Noted.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								sites, situated along Sandford Brook (downstream): Barrow Farm Fen SSSI; and Gozzards Ford Fen Local Wildlife Site. Mitigation against any adverse effects on other priority habitat species, as identified through survey work to inform a future planning application, will be applied, as appropriate.	
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Site Development Templates - Environmental Health	Comments were received from the site promoter/agent in relation to environmental health. Specific comments included the following: Detailed studies will be undertaken to investigate any potential ground contamination issues arising from the existing use of the site and appropriate mitigation where appropriate. Work has already been undertaken which demonstrates that there is no hydrological connection between the site and Cothill Fen, and the site and Sandford Brook.	
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Site Development Templates - Landscape	Comments were received from the site promoter/agent in relation to landscape. Specific comments included the following: The development will accord with and make necessary contributions to a comprehensive landscape plan for the whole site, informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Noted.
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Site Development Templates - Urban Design Principles	Comments were received from the site promoter/agent in relation to urban design principles. Specific comments included the following: Support that the development should be brought forward in the context of a comprehensive development framework. Proposals for buildings and structures will not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, taking into account their location, scale, bulk and height.	Noted.
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Site Development Templates - Utilities	Comments were received from the site promoter/agent in relation to utilities. Specific comments included the following: The DIO will work with the relevant statutory undertakers to ensure that suitable services and utility infrastructure (including water, sewage, gas, electricity and telecom services) is in place to support new development.	Noted.
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure	Supporting comments from the site promoter/agent to confirm that site within sole MOD control and to be released on an earlier timescale than previously	Noted. The Council understands that development can commence from 2022 as confirmed by the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and DIO.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							Organisation - Site Ownership	confirmed, with development commencement of 2025.	
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Sustainable Development	General comments supporting the site allocation. Development at Dalton Barracks will be based on Garden Village principles, as set out in the Government's Garden Village prospectus and taking into account the Town and Country Planning Association's guidance. The development will be planned comprehensively, consistent with the requirements of Core Policy 8b. The proposed development at Dalton Barracks offers a range of opportunities to provide a highly sustainable development which is connected by regular and frequent bus services to Abingdon-on-Thames, Oxford and Science Vale, and which provides excellent cycle and footpath connections to Abingdon-on-Thames and its shops, services, education and employment opportunities. There are few constraints associated with planned development at Dalton Barracks. The main constraints identified are highways capacity and the proximity of the site to Cothill Fen SAC. DIO will work with the District Council, Oxfordshire County Council, Natural England and other organisations to ensure that appropriate improvements can be made to the highway network, and that there will be no adverse impact on Cothill Fen SAC	Noted
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments from Defence Infrastructure Organisation - Sustainable Transport and Landscape	Comments were received from the site promoter/agent in relation to sustainable transport and landscape. Specific comments included the following: The necessary contributions (subject to viability) will be made to sustainable transport initiatives to give priority to non-car modes of transport and to ensure the necessary degree of integration and connectivity between the site and Abingdon-on-Thames. DIO will work relevant stakeholders to prepare and agree a comprehensive landscape plan for the site including the principle of a Country Park as shown	Noted
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company				Yes	Comments from Oxford Bus Company	Support from Oxford Bus Company for the requirement of a travel plan for the site. Concern remains over how improvements to public transport connectivity can be improved and come forward through master planning and a comprehensive development framework.	The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council understands that existing bus services can be improved to serve the site in the short term with more frequent services being provided for in the longer term. The Council will continue to work closely with both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, to enable the development to improve bus frequency and connectivity to adjacent settlements.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company				Yes	Comments from Oxford Bus Company	<p>Comments were received from Oxford Bus Company in relation to bus services. Specific comments included:</p> <p>Potential exists via developer's contribution specifically to divert bus service 4 via the site</p> <p>The policy wording at paragraph 2.62 suggests that at link between the City-Cumnor PnR- Dalton Barracks is already defined. This is not the case and therefore the development at Dalton Barracks coming forward predicated on this link is not assured and needs to be developed through the Comprehensive Development Framework.</p>	<p>Please see response above.</p> <p>The proposed link between Lodge Hill and Dalton Barracks is proposed to assist long term planning for the site. There is no expectation that such a link would be provided within the plan period up to 2031 or be required to support the development of 1,200 units. The Council accept that further and more detailed assessment is required to more fully define the longer-term planning for the site. This will be informed, in part, by preparing a Comprehensive Development Framework for the site to be adopted as SPD and ongoing partnership working with the County Council and other stakeholders.</p>
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company				Yes	Comments from Oxford Bus Company	<p>Comments were received from Oxford Bus Company in relation to bus services. Specific comments included:</p> <p>Concerns on how public transport connectively can be made.</p> <p>There could be scope for additional buses between Cumnor and Abingdon to be provided at the expense of other parts of the network which would be far from ideal.</p> <p>A refined service enhancement proposition for Dalton Barracks which is proportionate to the size of the proposed development and which could be translated into a Developer Contribution would be beneficial.</p> <p>Support for the development to be in accordance with and meets the requirements of a travel plan</p> <p>We would like to see this come forward through the master planning the site and Comprehensive Development Framework.</p>	<p>Noted. See responses outlined above.</p>
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company				Yes	Comments from Oxford Bus Company	<p>Comments were received from Oxford Bus Company in relation to Park and Ride site at Lodge Hill. Specific comments included:</p> <p>Proposals for improved Pedestrian access to Park & Ride at Lodge Hill and Cumnor in addition to contributions toward enhancing public transport corridors in the area are noted.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council is proposing the development of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) schemes to help buses get to the city centre more quickly. At this stage the plans are not mature enough to demonstrate how the highway will be used to facilitate this and therefore what journey time improvements can be made that would be a sufficient and deliverable alternative to what is currently provided.</p>	<p>Noted. See responses outlined above.</p>
1096872	Patsy Dell	Oxford City Council				No	Comments from Oxford City	<p>Oxford City Council has raised a concern in relation to the uncertainty as to whether the Plan could</p>	<p>The Council understands that the site will deliver housing from 2024 and that this is confirmed in</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							Council - Deliverability	<p>deliver the number of houses proposed by 2031, if the sire is not released by 2029.</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not provide any certainty that the necessary infrastructure can be funded and delivered at the appropriate time period to support the development.</p> <p>Oxford City Council suggested a modification to the Plan to confirm details about the timely delivery of this site and to be assured that infrastructure and housing can be provided.</p> <p>Oxford City Council consider that a formal agreement on the strategic approach to the delivery of sites for meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs, a trajectory for setting out the timely delivery to allow progress to be monitored and evidence of infrastructure necessary to be provided to achieve it.</p>	the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and DIO. This is reflected in the updated housing trajectory that accompanies the plan. The Development Site Template and IDP set out infrastructure requirements for the proposed allocation of 1200 units and provides sufficient policy criteria to ensure any longer-term planning meets appropriate infrastructure requirements. The longer-term requirements will be informed by ongoing work including the Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as SPD.
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No	Comments from Oxford Preservation Trust	<p>Oxford Preservation Trust commented on the planning and provision of the transport infrastructure necessary for the development proposed, the development of Dalton Barracks, the potential impact of the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway and the permanence of the Green Belt. Oxford Preservation Trust suggested an amendment to the supporting text at paragraph 2.58 of the Part 2 plan as follows:</p> <p>Garden Villages are ambitious and locally-led proposals for new communities that should have high quality and good design hard-wired in from the outset. The Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) have developed principles to help inform the creation of Garden Villages and the Council is COMMITTED TO FULLY INCORPORATING keen to explore how these principles can inform the opportunity for in the development at Dalton Barracks. The TCPA principles include:</p> <p>Oxford Preservation Trust has suggested that the proposed Park and Ride Site at Lodge Hill referred to in paragraphs 2.79 to 2.82 should be removed from the Plan and replaced with a Park and Ride at Marcham.</p> <p>Amendments should be made to the Proposals Map to reflect this. Changes are deemed necessary to remedy failings of the plan in relation to soundness and to comply with national planning policy.</p>	Whilst the Council is keen to support Garden Village principles at Dalton Barracks, the designation of a Garden Village is a matter for Central Government rather than the Local Planning Authority. The location of the proposed Park and Ride at Lodge Hill has been put forward by the Highways Authority who have responsibility for planning for highways as the Highways Authority and as set out with the adopted Local Transport Plan 4 and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy.
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments from Stagecoach Oxford - Comprehensive Development Framework	<p>Stagecoach Oxford has commented that Policy 8b is not sound. Concerned that aspects of the development strategy for Dalton Barracks are unrealistic, and that the supporting evidence is insufficiently robust or well-evidenced contrary to NPPF paragraph 77.</p> <p>It is important that the Policy Framework is realistic, rather than the site being subsequently prejudiced</p>	The proposals for a Park and Ride at Cumnor is made by the County Council, who as Highways Authority, have responsibility for planning for highways and as set out in the adopted Local Transport Plan 4 and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy. The Council welcomes the support from Stagecoach that acknowledges that existing services will be capable of improvements to serve

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>by a range of policy requirements that are likely to be either ineffective, or undeliverable, or both. We are not of the view that there is a sufficiently clearly deliverable strategy to provide a BRT-served Park and Ride at Cumnor in particular, to be able to rely upon this infrastructure.</p> <p>The site's relative remoteness from the main existing high frequency inter-urban radial bus corridors tends to significantly mitigate against the most competitive journey times by bus from this site compared with other options proposed in this Plan Stagecoach suggest the assumption is that improvements to the existing services are most likely to provide the public transport choices from the site.</p>	the proposed development in the short term. The Council considers that given the sites proximity to Oxford and the extent of substantial improvements being proposed to public transport provision around Oxfordshire in the coming years that the site has significant potential to be very well connected. The Council will continue to work closely with both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, to enable the development to improve bus frequency and connectivity to adjacent settlements.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Comments on behalf of BBOWT - Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>Comments were received from BBOWT in relation to biodiversity and Green Infrastructure. Specific comments raised the following:</p> <p>Concerned about Dry Sandford Pit SSSI & BBOWT nature reserve, which adjoins the allocation site to the northwest. It is believed that species believe use vegetation on the Dalton Barracks site.</p> <p>The ecological interest of Dry Sandford Pit includes amongst other things great crested newts and rare solitary bees and wasps, latter of which we as a nectar source.</p> <p>Development of the Dalton Barracks site could therefore potentially adversely affect the species interest of the SSSI and we consider it therefore important that the ecological interest of the Dalton Barracks site is adequately assessed for the policy to be found sound.</p> <p>Further concern regarding hydrological changes and potential leakage from the allocation site as the Dry Sandford Pit being a former quarry is lower lying than the Dalton Barracks site. An assessment of the potential hydrological impacts to the SSSI from this development is carried out</p> <p>Concern regarding visitor numbers and pressure on the sites. Potential for untenable management of the site and a decline in habitat conditions.</p> <p>Without further assessment it cannot be demonstrated that appropriate mitigation measures could be secured to enable the delivery of the allocation if impacts were to be identified at a later stage.</p>	The Council have prepared a Habitats Regulations Assessment for the site and worked with the promoters of the site who have prepared a detailed ecological impacts assessment for the proposed development. The HRA has been updated to comment on SSSI sites in addition to the SAC and other European designations.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Comments on behalf of BBOWT - Country Park	<p>Comments were received from BBOWT in relation to the provision of a Country Park. Specific comments raised the following:</p>	Noted. The location of the Country Park is not unspecified as it will be included in the area of the site that is proposed to remain within the Green Belt. It is considered that the County Park will actually be larger than 80 hectares and include opportunity for wildlife enhancement and provide

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Support for policy 8b seeks in relation mitigation through providing a substantial recreational open space in form of an 80+ ha country park.</p> <p>The level of impacts on the nearby SAC, SSSIs and LWS and in turn, mitigation will depend on its location, design and long-term management of the country park.</p> <p>The site allocation is unspecific on the location of this country park within the site but we consider it essential that it is located along the northern and western boundaries to provide a buffer of appropriate semi-natural habitats to Dry Sandford Pit SSSI and Cothill Fen SAC.</p> <p>Also consider a 10m buffer between the Sandford Brook and development as mentioned in the site allocation template in appendix A wholly inadequate. The Sandford Brook runs through Dry Sandford Pit SSSI and along the western boundary of the site. It is essential that the western and northern parts of the site remain free of development.</p>	a facility or wider benefit to just the proposed site itself.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Comments on behalf of BBOWT - Green Infrastructure Strategy	<p>Comments were received from BBOWT in relation to the Green Infrastructure Strategy. Specific comments raised the following:</p> <p>The proposal for an 80+ ha country park will not be sufficient in light of the Council's aspiration for 4,000 dwellings on this site and other development in the wider area.</p> <p>A country park of a minimum of a 100+ ha should be secured on this site to address existing deficiencies as outlined in the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy, to address existing open space deficiencies, to meet the needs of communities in the planned new development to the north and northwest of the town, and to proactively plan ahead to work towards meeting the demand of future communities.</p>	Noted. The potential for longer term development has not be defined and would need to provide all appropriate and necessary infrastructure requirements. It is thought the Country Park would be greater than 100 hectares.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Comments on behalf of BBOWT - Scale of proposed allocation	<p>Comments were received from BBOWT in relation to the scale of the proposed allocation. Specific comments raised the following:</p> <p>Concerned that any assessments including HRA only assess the proposed allocation of 1,200 dwellings and not the long-term aspiration for 4,000 dwellings, particularly in regard to the nearby SAC.</p> <p>We therefore consider in necessary that an adequate semi-natural space of a minimum of 100+ha is provided on the site at this point in time to work towards addressing some of the need of future communities. This is necessary not only for potential future development reasons but also to address existing open space deficiencies as</p>	Core Policy 8b and the Development Site Templates provide sufficient criteria to ensure that any longer-term growth on the site is informed by appropriate evidence and provides for appropriate infrastructure. Any development in the future above the 1,200 proposed up to 2031 would be subject to HRA. Any planning applications would need to meet the requirements of CP8b and the Development Plan taken as a whole.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								outlined in the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy Concern that any country park will attract people from further afield adding further pressure on open space resources and require necessary funds for long-term management.	
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Comments on behalf of BBOWT - Site Development Templates - Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Comments were received from BBOWT in relation to the Site Development Templates. Specific comments included the following: Support the requirements outlined in the Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure section of this proposed allocation. Concern that no evidence supports that this site allocation and its requirements are informed by ecological survey information.	Noted. The site promoters have undertaken a detailed ecological impacts assessment for the site, which has been reviewed by Council officers.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Comments on behalf of BBOWT - Site Development Templates - Flooding and Drainage	Comments were received from BBOWT in relation to the Site Development Templates. Specific comments included the following: A number of important aspects are not included although they are mentioned in other site allocations including sensitive Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) measures, the integration of green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancing measures within the development and the need for long-term management of all green infrastructure including the country park.	The Council considers that the Development Site Template provides appropriate guidance and that this will be complemented by the Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as SPD in due course.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Comments on behalf of BBOWT - Supplementary Planning Document	BBOWT would like to take part in consultation regarding Dry Sandford Pit SSSI and Cothill Fen SAC and associated designated sites during the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).	Noted. BBOWT will, along with other key stakeholders, continue to be involved in the process.
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England					Comments on behalf of Highways England	Highways England comments included the following: The potential to deliver in excess of 4,000 dwellings has increased from 3,000 dwellings noted in the last Local Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (October 2017) suggests that access to the A34 is investigated. We would therefore welcome the opportunity to work with the site developers/VoWHDC in order to mitigate any traffic impacts that could impact the SRN. Essential that they are supported by detailed transport modelling to understand and inform the level of growth that can be accommodated on the A34 and local roads in the vicinity of the site. Any impacts on the SRN will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible.	Noted. The Council has worked in partnership with the County Council to prepare evidence to support the Part 2 plan. More detailed evidence is ongoing to assess impacts around Abingdon, including giving consideration to planning for the longer term and for the potential for development beyond 1,200 units beyond 2031. It is noted that the existing use of the site by the MOD, that will cease during the plan period, will help to mitigate any impact associated with the 1,200 units proposed up to 2031.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>We will support proposals that consider sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Proposed new growth will need to be considered in the context of the cumulative impact from already proposed development.</p>	
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				No	Comments on behalf of Historic England	<p>Historic England has commented that according to their records, there are no designated heritage assets on the Dalton Barracks site.</p> <p>Historic England provided the following comments:</p> <p>Site is of possible historic interest (Abingdon Airfield). The historic centre of Shippon remains relatively intact and still survives as a historic village with a rural approach from the west.</p> <p>It would be preferable to avoid development on the southern part of the proposed site and to retain this rural approach</p> <p>Historic England suggested that criteria iv of this policy should be amended to provide adequate protection for the historic environment of Shippon as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment, as required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the NPPF, as follows:</p> <p>Proposals for buildings and structures (including their extensions) will not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, taking into account their location, scale, bulk and height. Development on the southern part of the site will be restricted to respect the historic character of Shippon and its rural approach from the west.</p>	<p>Noted. The site promoters have undertaken an historic impact assessment of the site and this detail, along with Historic England's advice will help to inform the comprehensive approach to planning for the site.</p> <p>An Additional Modification is proposed to the Development Site Template to provide clarity on the approach to protecting the historic environment at Dalton Barracks.</p>
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem	Natural England					Comments on behalf of Natural England - Comprehensive Development Framework	<p>Natural England welcome the commitment to produce a comprehensive development framework for Dalton Barracks and the opportunity to buffer the SAC with high quality habitats.</p> <p>Natural England has commented that there is potential to provide an extension to the adjacent nature reserves and this should be investigated.</p> <p>Natural England commented that opportunities to restore acid grassland, heathland and fen habitats should be taken in accordance with West Oxford Heights Conservation Target Area.</p> <p>Measures will need to be put in place to ensure the ongoing management of the Country Park.</p>	<p>Noted. The Site Development Template ensures developers consider methods to enhance biodiversity value of the site for the environment and future occupants. Developers will be required to undertake habitat and species surveys in line with relevant best practice and retain important ecological assets or undertaken appropriate mitigation or compensation measures if loss is unavoidable.</p> <p>Furthermore, Core Policies 45 and 46 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensure the appropriate provision of Green Infrastructure through new development and the need to protect and enhance biodiversity.</p>
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem	Natural England					Comments on behalf of Natural England - Habitats Regulation Assessment	<p>Natural England comments in relation to the HRA include:</p> <p>Evidence to show that there will not be a hydrological impact from development at Dalton Barracks either on Cothill Fen SAC, Dry Sandford</p>	<p>Noted. The HRA has been updated to reflect Natural England's comments. The Council have also signed a Statement of Common Ground with Natural England and look forward to continue to work with Natural England to ensure all matters are appropriately addressed.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Pit SSSI or Barrow Farm Fen SSSI is needed to accompany the Local Plan. Potential cumulative effects with development at Marcham also needs be considered in relation to hydrological impacts on Barrow Farm Fen SSSI.	
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments on behalf of OCC - Community Infrastructure Levy	<p>Comments were received from Oxfordshire County Council in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and education provision. Specific comments included:</p> <p>The comprehensive development framework will set out education requirements. It is anticipated that three primary schools and one secondary school will be needed for some 4,500 houses. This should identify how these are to be funded and set out how each different phase contributes proportionately.</p> <p>The current CIL Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 list does not provide for schools to be funded through S106, apart from the land on which they will be located.</p> <p>CIL receipts may not cover the full costs of schools. We consider that it is likely to be viable here for the developer to provide the schools and that the Regulation 123 list should be amended.</p> <p>Further work is also required on the IDP to make the requirements clear</p>	Noted. The Council has updated the IDP to accompany the submission plan working in partnership with OCC. The Council is updating its approach to CIL to reflect the Part 2 sites and working in partnership with the County Council.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments on behalf of OCC - Comprehensive Development Framework / Supplementary Planning Document	<p>Oxfordshire County Council commented that the wording of Core Policy 8b should be amended to demonstrate how they contribute towards a comprehensive approach to development comply with the Comprehensive Development Framework SPD and contribute to infrastructure in the manner set out in that Framework including transport, education, open space and other infrastructure.</p> <p>'proposals for development at Dalton Barracks must demonstrate how they contribute towards a comprehensive approach to development COMPLY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SPD AND CONTRIBUTE TO INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE MANNER SET OUT IN THAT FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL REQUIRE ALL PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT TO CONTRIBUTE FAIRLY TOWARDS THE JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TRANSPORT, EDUCATION, OPEN SPACE AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE .</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council have proposed an Additional Modification to amend Paragraph 2.64 to improve clarity as follows:</p> <p>'It is therefore essential that development is brought forward in line with a comprehensive development framework in accordance with Core Policy 8b AND CONTRIBUTE TO INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE MANNER SET OUT IN THAT FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL REQUIRE ALL PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT TO CONTRIBUTE FAIRLY TOWARDS THE JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TRANSPORT, EDUCATION, OPEN SPACE AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE'.</p>
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No	Comments on behalf of OCC - Education provision	<p>Comments were received from Oxfordshire County Council in relation to education provision. Specific comments included:</p> <p>Pupil numbers at both primary and secondary level are forecast to increase and new schools are</p>	The Development Site Template sets out the requirements for Infrastructure, including for education that are also included within the IDP. Developer contributions will be consistent with national policy requirements and Core Policy 7,

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>required together with extensions to existing schools. The size of the allocations at Dalton Barracks, means that they create a need for new primary schools. At least one new primary school is expected on Dalton Barracks within the plan period (ultimately it may be three).</p> <p>A key concern is how to fund these required additional pupil places, a matter also discussed in the Pupil Place Plan.</p> <p>Unless funding can be assured, it may be that the Local Plan is not effective – that is it may not be deliverable as the identified school places may not be forthcoming.</p> <p>Additional secondary school capacity will also be needed in the District.</p> <p>There is some existing capacity in Abingdon, but in the longer term there is an opportunity to create a new secondary school at Dalton Barracks.</p>	Core Policy 8b (for Dalton Barracks) and the Development Plan taken as a whole.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments on behalf of OCC - Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI)	Oxfordshire County Council commented that there is the potential for significant transport effects from development at this site. The current Evaluation of Transport Impacts is based solely on a plan period development of 1,200 houses and therefore additional capacity of 4500 dwellings. Further work evaluating transport impacts is required particularly in the Abingdon area, along the A15 (west) and the A338.	The Council recognise the importance of continuing to plan for the longer term and this will be assisted by the development of a Comprehensive Development Framework for the site and joint working to plan up to 2050 and the preparation of a Statutory Spatial Plan for Oxfordshire. The Council is content the evidence prepared to support the Part 2 plan is proportionate to the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 158.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments on behalf of OCC - Green Belt exceptional circumstances	Oxfordshire County Council support the removal of the Dalton Barracks site from the Green Belt and its allocation for development and note the exceptional circumstances. The full capacity for the site should be identified and tested in additional evidence unless there is some mechanism to restrict applications to 1200 dwellings	Noted. The Policy provides sufficient criteria and flexibility to inform any proposals for planning beyond 2031. The Council will continue to work with the County Council to plan for the longer term. This will be assisted by the development of a Comprehensive Development Framework for the site and joint working to plan up to 2050 and the preparation of a Statutory Spatial Plan for Oxfordshire
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments on behalf of OCC - Health and Wellbeing	Oxfordshire County Council support the additional text in relation to health and wellbeing set out in paragraph 3.136	Noted
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments on behalf of OCC - Sustainable Transport and Accessibility	Oxfordshire County Council commented that any improvements to bus services must be commercially viable after initial priming, the existing MOD use and that during relocation the may cause issues with the siting of bus stops at appropriate distance.	Noted.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments on behalf of OCC - Sustainable Transport Study	Oxfordshire County Council commented that the phasing of development may cause issues with the siting of bus stops at appropriate distances. The lack of spine road connectivity between the proposal parcels would make provision of an appropriate bus service problematic. It is also	Noted. The progression of the Comprehensive Development Framework provides an opportunity to investigate masterplanning in more detail. It is understood that this work has already (as at Feb 2018) informed the proposals for the 1200 units proposed up to 2031 to come forward as a single

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								considered that 1200 houses are not sufficient to sustain the frequency of bus service proposed. This will need to be addressed beyond the Plan period.	development scheme, i.e. not being split, which is consistent with the County Council wishes.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments on behalf of OCC - Sustainable Transport Study - Public Transport	Oxfordshire County Council commented that the extent of buffer showing catchment areas around site allocations is unrealistic. Some areas may be falsely considered within the 400m optimal walking distance as a result. Further clarification is required as to the nature of the proposals at the Frilford lights junction. The bus services listed are no longer current. Further information is also required in relation to the provision of a bus lane through the junction.	Noted. The Sustainable Transport Study provides an initial look at this matter and the Council will continue to work with the County Council to develop more detailed evidence to support the longer-term planning for the site and as part of developing a Comprehensive Development Framework. It is understood that the need for upgrades to Frilford Lights was identified through the preparation of the Part 1 plan and that this forms part of the Local Transport Plan 4. On this basis, wider and strategic infrastructure will continue to be planned at a more strategic and county wide basis and funded through joint working that also relates to the Oxfordshire Growth Deal. This matter is discussed in more detail within the Statement of Common Ground between the County Council and VOWH.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments on behalf of OCC - Walking and Cycling	Comments were received from Oxfordshire County Council in relation to walking and cycling. Specific comments included: Extent of buffer showing catchment areas around site allocations is unrealistic. Some areas may be falsely considered within the 400m optimal walking distance as a result. Further clarification is required as to the nature of the proposals at the Frilford lights junction. The bus services listed are no longer current. Further information is also required in relation to the provision of a bus lane through the junction.	Noted. The Sustainable Transport Study provides an initial look at this matter and the Council will continue to work with the County Council to develop more detailed evidence to support the longer-term planning for the site and as part of developing a Comprehensive Development Framework. It is understood that the need for upgrades to Frilford Lights was identified through the preparation of the Part 1 plan and that this forms part of the Local Transport Plan 4. On this basis, wider and strategic infrastructure will continue to be planned at a more strategic and county wide basis and funded through joint working that also relates to the Oxfordshire Growth Deal. This matter is discussed in more detail within the Statement of Common Ground between the County Council and VOWH.
1096872	Patsy Dell	Oxford City Council				No	Comments on behalf of Oxford City Council	Oxford City Council raised the following concerns in relation to the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. Specific comments included the following: Concerns about the timely delivery of this site and wish to be assured by an infrastructure and housing delivery plan. A commitment to undertake the Master Planning of this site within agreed timescales would represent a positive measure to help to bring this site forward at the earliest opportunity. Concerned that the necessary infrastructure, while costed in the Infrastructure Development Plan	The Council understands that the site will deliver housing from 2024 and that this is confirmed in the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and DIO. This is reflected in the updated housing trajectory that accompanies the plan. The Development Site Template and IDP set out infrastructure requirements for the proposed allocation of 1200 units and provides sufficient policy criteria to ensure any longer-term planning meets appropriate infrastructure requirements. The longer-term requirements will be informed by ongoing work including the Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as SPD.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								(IDP), gives no indication of when in the plan period it would be likely to be provided. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan needs to be sufficiently robust to ensure delivery of the essential transport improvements. There should be further clarity on the delivery rates at Dalton Barracks and infrastructure to address the relatively poor connectivity to Oxford.	The Council have updated the IDP alongside the submission of the plan in partnership with the County Council.
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No	Comments on behalf of Oxford Preservation Trust	We consider that the wording of paragraph 2.58 should be amended from: "...the Council is keen to explore how these principles can inform the opportunity for development at Dalton Barracks" to: "...the Council is committed to fully incorporating these principles in the development at Dalton Barracks." We consider that the proposed Park and Ride site at Lodge Hill referred to in paragraphs 2.79 – 2.82 should be removed from the plan and replaced with a Park and Ride at Marcham. Consequential amendments to the Proposals Map would then be necessary. We also consider that Vale of the White Horse District Council must make the changes necessary to remedy the failings of the plan in relation to the tests of soundness and the requirement to have regard to national planning policy.	The location of the proposed Park and Ride at Lodge Hill has been put forward by Oxfordshire County Council who have responsibility for planning for highways as the Highways Authority and as set out with the adopted Local Transport Plan 4 and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy.
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No	Comments on behalf of Oxford Preservation Trust - Accessibility	Comments were received from Oxford Preservation Trust in relation to accessibility. Specific comments included the following: Paragraph 2.58 should be amended to:- "...the Council is committed to fully incorporating these principles in the development at Dalton Barracks." We consider that the proposed Park and Ride site at Lodge Hill referred to in paragraphs 2.79 – 2.82 should be removed from the plan and replaced with a Park and Ride at Marcham. Plan should be amended to accord with tests for soundness and in regard to the NPPF	The location of the proposed Park and Ride at Lodge Hill has been put forward by Oxfordshire County Council who have responsibility for planning for highways as the Highways Authority and as set out with the adopted Local Transport Plan 4 and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy. The Council considers that the plan is consistent with national policy, guidance and legislation and meets the tests of soundness.
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No	Comments on behalf of Oxford Preservation Trust - Design	Oxford Preservation Trust would like a firm commitment to Core Policies 37 and 38 in addition to a Design Guide SPD. Concern regarding visual impact of solar panels and would like firm commitment to Design Guide Principles DG 77 and 86	The Council recognise the importance of planning for the site comprehensively, considering its long-term potential and planning appropriately for infrastructure. The preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site will set out the detailed parameters to inform masterplanning of the site that will also facilitate greater opportunities for stakeholders to influence, in more detail, planning for the site. All development proposals will need to conform with the policies set out in the Development Plan as a whole, including Core Policies 37 and 38 and the Design Guide SPD.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No	Comments on behalf of Oxford Preservation Trust - Garden Village principles	<p>Comments were received from Oxford Preservation Trust in relation to Garden Village principles. Specific comments included the following:</p> <p>Support for Garden Village principles and those principles omitted in the previous consultation. Require further clarification on how such principles are to be developed and incorporated.</p> <p>Oxford Preservation Trust suggested the following amendment to paragraph 2.58, as follows: "...the Council is keen to explore how these principles can inform the opportunity for development at Dalton Barracks" To: "...the Council is committed to fully incorporating these principles in the development at Dalton Barracks.</p>	The Council recognise the importance of planning for the site comprehensively, considering its long-term potential and planning appropriately for infrastructure. The preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site will set out the detailed parameters to inform masterplanning of the site that will also facilitate greater opportunities for stakeholders to influence, in more detail, planning for the site.
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No	Comments on behalf of Oxford Preservation Trust - Garden Village principles	Oxford Preservation Trust support Garden Village principles and those principles omitted in the previous consultation. Require further clarification on how such principles are to be developed and incorporated.	The Council recognise the importance of planning for the site comprehensively, considering its long-term potential and planning appropriately for infrastructure. The preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site will set out the detailed parameters to inform masterplanning of the site that will also facilitate greater opportunities for stakeholders to influence, in more detail, planning for the site.
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No	Comments on behalf of Oxford Preservation Trust - Housing numbers	Oxford Preservation Trust commented that the proposed housing numbers should be determined once the Garden Village principles have been addressed as these will dictate housing numbers	The Council recognise the importance of planning for the site comprehensively, considering its long-term potential and planning appropriately for infrastructure. The preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site will set out the detailed parameters to inform masterplanning of the site that will also facilitate greater opportunities for stakeholders to influence, in more detail, planning for the site.
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments on behalf of Stagecoach Oxford - Bus Frequency	<p>Comments were received from Stagecoach Oxford in relation to bus services. Specific comments included:</p> <p>Dalton Barracks is selected based on the fact it is served currently by a half-hourly bus services. This again is not correct in that only one bus per hour of the two in the corridor currently serves the site.</p> <p>In this instance, we do recognise that it is likely to be possible and may well prove to be both appropriate to divert both services to the site.</p> <p>It is probably more appropriate and logical for the site appraisal process to focus rather more on the potential for candidate sites to either provide improved public transport, or benefit directly from such improvements as are credibly foreseeable.</p>	The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council understands that existing bus services can be improved to serve the site in the short term with more frequent services being provided for in the longer term. The Council will continue to work closely with both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, to enable the development to improve bus frequency and connectivity to adjacent settlements.
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments on behalf of Stagecoach Oxford - Single	Comments were received from Stagecoach Oxford in relation to bus services. Specific comments included:	The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The Council understands that

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							carriageway north-bound bus lane between the Lodge Hill A34 Interchange and Hinksey A34 Interchange	<p>Stagecoach broadly supports the identification of up to 1200 dwellings to be provided at Dalton Barracks, within the Plan period, we have some reservations regarding sustainability.</p> <p>While a reasonable level of bus service can no doubt be provided in due course, we cannot see that a business case exists for a dedicated Busway link to Lodge Hill.</p> <p>A development limited in scale to 1200 dwellings, would require more direct services potentially avoiding Abingdon or Wootton and Cumnor, neither scenario would appear especially plausible to us.</p>	existing bus services can be improved to serve the site in the short term with more frequent services being provided for in the longer term. The Council will continue to work closely with both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, to enable the development to improve bus frequency and connectivity to adjacent settlements.
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments on behalf of Stagecoach Oxford - Single carriageway north-bound bus lane between the Lodge Hill A34 Interchange and Hinksey A34 Interchange	<p>Comments were received from Stagecoach Oxford in relation to bus services. Specific comments included:</p> <p>Dalton Barracks lies considerably off-line of any existing frequent bus service. It is also relatively distant from the city when a bus journey is considered, via Abingdon or Cumnor/Botley.</p> <p>The quantum of development deliverable in the Plan period is modest, and accordingly, the level of demand that would sustain an increase in provision is relatively limited.</p> <p>A dedicated bus only link across open countryside and crossing the A34 to Lodge Hill would be either economically feasible, practically deliverable, or serve to sufficiently reduce bus journey times to materially influence mode choice.</p> <p>Given that it would serve only the new settlement, its impact would be entirely restricted to journeys originating from the site itself, and its economic benefit relative to its cost would no doubt be grossly inadequate to justify the necessary funding.</p> <p>Contributions should be applied to bus priority on existing or proposed corridors that sustain much higher flows and public transport frequencies, with commensurately much greater mitigation impacts.</p>	The Council will continue to work closely with both Oxfordshire County Council and local bus operators, to enable the development to improve bus frequency, pedestrian and cycle connectivity to adjacent settlements.
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills		Comments on behalf of Thames Water Utilities - Wastewater network capacity	<p>Comments were received from Thames Water in relation to wastewater network capacity. Specific comments included the following:</p> <p>The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable able to support the demand anticipated from this development.</p> <p>Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development.</p> <p>Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is</p>	The Council welcome comments from Thames Water who have been involved in the preparation of the plan and who have assisted with preparing the Local Plan evidence, including the Water Cycle Study. Whilst the Council recognise that new infrastructure will be required to support development at the site, it is not aware of any barriers to this being provided. We understand that Thames Water have not identified any objections to the site and are content the Development Site Templates provide sufficient clarity. VOWH have also signed a Statement of Common Ground with Thames Water that confirms the position of both parties.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application	
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills		Comments on behalf of Thames Water Utilities - Water supply capacity	Comments were received from Thames Water in relation to wastewater network capacity. Specific comments included the following: Concerns regarding Water Supply Capability in relation to this site. The water supply network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Investigations of the impact of the development are required and completion of this will take several 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. The following paragraph should be included in the Development Plan. "Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply 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 water infrastructure.	Please see response above. The suggested wording is included in the General Requirements for all housing site allocations on page 3 of the plan Appendices.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Comments on behalf on BBOWT - Garden Village principles	BBOWT support the Garden Village principles and those principles omitted in the previous consultation. Require further clarification on how such principles are to be developed and incorporated, particularly in relation to sustainability	The Council recognise the importance of planning for the site comprehensively, considering its long-term potential and planning appropriately for infrastructure. The preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site will set out the detailed parameters to inform masterplanning of the site that will also facilitate greater opportunities for stakeholders to influence, in more detail, planning for the site.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Comments on behalf on BBOWT - Scale of proposed allocation	Comments were received from BBOWT in relation to the scale of the proposed allocation. Specific comments included the following: Concerns about potential impacts on Dry Sandford Pit SSSI and other designated sites including Cothill Fen SAC were raised in the previous consultation. We note a minor change to the western boundary of this allocation but this does in our view not constitute a substantial change to this proposed site allocation and our previous comments still apply. The long-term potential in the excess of 4,000 dwellings subject to appropriate infrastructure. This is more than three times as much as currently proposed and more than outlined in the previous consultation. This scale of proposal needs to be	The Site Development Template ensures developers consider methods to enhance biodiversity value of the site for the environment and future occupants. Developers will be required to undertake habitat and species surveys in line with relevant best practice and retain important ecological assets or undertaken appropriate mitigation or compensation measures if loss is unavoidable. Furthermore, Core Policies 45 and 46 in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensure the appropriate provision of Green Infrastructure through new development and the need to protect and enhance biodiversity.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								assessed comprehensively at this stage rather than phased.	
785705	Mr Brian Rixon	Sunningwell Parish Council				No	Comments on behalf on Sunningwell Parish Council	<p>SPC supports the use of "brownfield" sites for redevelopment over greenfield sites. SPC has previously supported the Dalton Barracks site allocation on this basis, subject to certain conditions.</p> <p>SPC seeks reassessment of the allocation at Dalton Barracks to either delete it from the plan or to reduce the allocation numbers due to over-supply of housing in Vale.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Part 2 plan is to address the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be provided within the Vale. The Council is proposing this housing is provided within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area as this area is closest to and accessible to Oxford. It is proposed that the unmet need is met through a combination of Part 1 and Part 2 sites. The Plan also needs to ensure sufficient housing is provided in this Sub-Area to meet the Vale need. On this basis, there is no over-supply within this sub-area.</p> <p>There are additional sites proposed within the South-East Vale Sub-Area for reasons set out in the plan, and these do increase the proposed housing supply within this Sub-Area set out in the Part 1 plan. This housing is not considered to make any contribution to addressing unmet need for Oxford. It is understood that this approach is supported by both Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council.</p>
1142673	Mr Neil Porter	Abingdon Air & County Show				No	Community Services and Facilities	<p>There were a few comments that suggested the provision of alternative community services and facilities. Specific comments included:</p> <p>The provision of a heritage centre and café should be considered within the showground site honouring the military background of Abingdon and Dalton Barracks and will help to create job opportunities</p> <p>Proposals for a showground facility with runway and perimeter track should be considered as it would contribute towards the local economy and provide a tourist attraction</p>	<p>Noted. Development of the Dalton Barracks site provides opportunities for significant infrastructure including social and community facilities. The proposed Country Park, along with other Green Infrastructure, offers an opportunity to provide facilities of greater benefit for the development alone and have benefit to the wider area and community.</p>
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No	Concern about impact on existing residents	<p>Greater consideration should be given to existing residents of surrounding settlements in terms of minimising adverse impacts and maximising opportunities e.g. air quality at Shippon</p> <p>The site should be developed sympathetically to local environment and communities by ensuring adequate bus services, business and work opportunities are catered for.</p>	<p>The Development Site Template and proposed Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as SPD provides opportunities for planning comprehensively for the site and giving consideration to how development can be integrated with existing communities. The site will provide substantial areas of Green Infrastructure. Public Transport is discussed in relation to separate responses.</p> <p>The proposed masterplan and development framework will be developed to ensure the successful integration of development. The proposed masterplan document will also provide further community consultation to enable the input of existing residents into the future development.</p>
1097479	David Hutchinson					No			
1144164	Mrs J Gibbard								

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No	Country Park	<p>There were a number of comments received in relation to the proposed country park for the allocation at Dalton Barracks. Specific comments included the following:</p> <p>No mention of connectivity to settlements such as Wootton, Dry Sandford and Whitecross</p> <p>Isolated area of Green Infrastructure located to the west of the development is not appropriately designed and integrated, and makes no contribution to a green infrastructure network</p> <p>A requirement for the development to provide a buffer between proposed development on the site and designated sites, the western wide of Dalton Barracks should be retained as open space in the form of Country Park for recreational use for residents is contrary to commitments in the Part 1 plan that everyone should have accessible natural green space</p> <p>Location of the Country Park to the west of the Garden Village development is inconsistent with Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy and Core Policy 45 in the adopted Part 1 plan</p> <p>Location of the Country Park should provide an opportunity to meet other needs and aspirations of existing local residents e.g. protecting the character and identity of Shippon and its separation from the proposed new development</p> <p>Country Park should encircle the new development and connect into existing development via green corridors</p>	The Council have made a commitment in policy to prepare a Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as SPD and inform the masterplanning of the site. This ensures the Country Park is planned for comprehensively and fully integrated into planning for the wider site.
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore		Deliverability	<p>There were a number of comment received, including from St Helen Without Parish Council, in relation to the deliverability of the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. Specific comments included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uncertainty regarding the availability of the release of the operational area of Dalton Barracks which may affect the deliverability of the allocation by 2031 not legally compliant to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated important to specify clearly which areas are intended to be developed within the plan period, as this could have impaction for the deliverability of the proposed allocation Dalton Barracks is not scheduled to close until 2029, but is earmarked to provide 1,200 dwellings during the plan period 	Noted. The Council understands that development can commence from 2024 as confirmed by the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and DIO. The Masterplanning of the site will be informed by the Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as SPD and involving key stakeholders including the Parish Council.
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd,							
879120	Gow Family								
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning				
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No			
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman	Bovis Homes Limited				Yes			
1022473		Rosconn Group	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning				
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield	Wootton and St Helen Without				No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096329		Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee						Council has identified an opportunity to release the site sooner than 2029 but provide no information to support this	
1096701		Blanchard Enterprises	1096331	Mr Simon Handy	Strutt & Parker LLP	No		Unlikely the site will begin to deliver in the short to medium term	
1096815		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning			Greater certainty on the ability to deliver 1,200 dwellings should be demonstrated or a readjustment of the trajectory	
1096895	MBC Estates	CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning	No		Garden Village development involves complexities of collaboration, infrastructure funding and delivery and time delays	
1096915		MBC Estates Ltd	1096293	Mr Ashley Maltman	West Waddy ADP	No		Unknown what form of commitment the MOD has given that the actual site will be vacated in time and whether the delivery programme is achievable	
1097353	Liam Ryder	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No		No account of the timetable to adopt the Local Plan or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), no account of time to prepare and submit a planning application, determine application and period for judicial review	
1097666		Gladman Developments				No		Clear from the Site Development Templates that there are known highway, ecology and environmental issues	
1097677		Catesby Estates Ltd	1097667	Louise Steele	Framptons	No		Topic Papers do not provide sufficient evidence that the true nature and extent of the level of infrastructure required to support the development has been yet properly considered	
1098046	Mrs Madeleine Russell	David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley	No		Limited information as to how the site will be disposed of and made available for development	
1099225		St Helen Without Parish Council				Yes		Selection of this site is contrary to paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework	
1143092	Mrs Sian Keeling	Welbeck Strategic Land Ltd	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning	No		Complexities associated with the disposal of public sector land in military use surrounding re provision of services, security, deregulation, disposal and remediation	
1144168	The Binning Family	David Wilson Homes Ltd (Southern)	1143090	Mrs Sophie Horsley	Strutt & Parker	No		Part 1 plan identified strategic sites, not the intention that these be deferred to the Part 2 plan	
1144174	The Nissen Family		1144167	John Savills		No		The Council's Housing Trajectory (October 2017) indicates that the site will deliver housing from 2023/2024 onwards. A delay of just 12 months indicates that the 1,200 dwellings expected at this site would not be achievable at this site during the Plan period	
1144780	J A Pye		1144167	John Savills		No		Delivery from 2023/2024 should be seen as hugely overly optimistic and that in reality, the site is unlikely to be able to deliver housing until much later.	
1144780	J A Pye		1144779	Mr Alan Divall	West Waddy Adp	No		If the site is not released until 2029 then there is a significant prospect that the site will not be delivered during the Plan period.	
1145048		Earl of Plymouth Estates Ltd	1145367	Mrs Sarah Moorhouse	Litchfields	No		The proposed allocation is unsound since it fails the requirement at paragraph 182 of the NPPF	
1145064	Mr and Mrs Simon and Gemma Hartwright		765833	Mr Jason Hill	Savills	No		Concerns regarding timescale for delivery of such a large, complex site and that the timescale is	
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Wolf Bond Planning	No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>considered hugely overly optimistic. This is based on recent detailed reports which examined urban extensions and large scale housing sites, including Hourigan Connolly report from February 2014 entitled 'A report into the delivery of urban extensions' and The NLP report 'Start to Finish: How Quickly do Large-Scale Housing Sites Deliver' was published in November 2016)</p> <p>The RTPI report on The Deliverability and Affordability of Housing in the South West of England October 2017 looking at the progress of six large housing developments in the South West of between 650 and 8,000 homes. The average time taken to secure outline consent was 4.7 years.</p> <p>The Grove Airfield application For example was submitted in 2012 and outline planning permission was granted in 2017. No applications for the approval of reserved matters (residential) have been submitted. Potentially at least 6 years after the submission of the outline application before such submissions are made and longer still before the first dwellings are completed.</p> <p>Concern over delay in deliverability terms, citing RAF Stanbridge as an example from closure to outline permission</p> <p>Similar assertions were made by the DIO in relation to the Ministry of Defence Site in Ashchurch during the formation of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy, before the site was made unavailable for residential development by the DIO, just prior to the publication of the Main Modification of the Plan</p> <p>Experience of similar sites such as Graven Hill highlights that the delivery period is not realistic.</p> <p>It was suggested that the allocation can be accommodated as part of the Operational Area without removing land from the Green Belt. When deliverability of the whole site has been confirmed by the MOD, justification for larger development can be considered.</p> <p>It was suggested that in order to make the Plan sound, the Dalton Barracks site should be removed from the LPP2 proposed allocations unless further evidence is produced by the Council/MOD. Alternatively, the level of housing expected to be delivered at the site during the Plan period should be significantly reduced in order to be based upon reasonable expectations (and based on robust evidence) about when the site will become available, and the rate of delivery thereafter.</p>	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
828782	Mrs Emily Smith						Duty to co-operate	<p>One comment was received in relation to the Duty to Cooperate. specific comments included:</p> <p>The Vale has not fulfilled its duty to cooperate in relation to the transport infrastructure planning Additional housing at Dalton Barracks cannot be justified by the provision of a Park and Ride at Lodge Hill.</p> <p>A Park and Ride at Lodge Hill would encourage residents from Dalton Barracks to drive to Lodge Hill to get into Oxford.</p> <p>What is required is investment in local bus services and cycle routes into Abingdon and Oxford to discourage car use.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the Duty to Cooperate has been met as evidence by the Duty to Cooperate Topic Paper and Statements of Common Ground with relevant parties.</p> <p>The location of the proposed Park and Ride at Lodge Hill has been put forward by the Highways Authority who have responsibility for planning for highways as the Highways Authority and as set out with the adopted Local Transport Plan 4 and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy.</p>
1099907	Liz Pickering	Education & Skills Funding Agency					Education and Skills	Support for site development templates in terms of education provision	Noted
742134 826174 1095853	Mr Robert Warne Mr Daniel Scharf Dr Janet Banfield	S.P.A.D.E Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No No No	Garden Village Principles	<p>There were a number of comments received in relation to the Garden Village principles. Specific comments included the following:</p> <p>Garden Village principles set out in paragraph 2.58 are larger scale Garden City principles. Garden Villages, Towns and Cities (DCLG, 2016) updates the former garden city principles by specifying that garden villages should be discrete settlements and not an extension of an existing town or village Dalton Barracks development, as currently proposed to merge with Shippon, contradicts and is inconsistent with national guidance</p> <p>Disregard for the views of existing local residents undermines community involvement and any prospects for community support for the development</p> <p>Support in principle for Garden Village principles, but further clarification is required as to how they will be developed and incorporated.</p> <p>It was suggested that additional text be included where appropriate to reference examples of other local Garden Village development such as that being accomplished by Cherwell District Council within the eco village development at Bicester.</p>	Garden Town/ or Village proposals do not preclude existing settlements being expanded and developed as Garden Towns, or Garden Villages. Didcot has been classified as a Garden Town and will involve supporting substantial (c. 15,000 homes) at and adjoining the existing settlement of Didcot. Shippon currently adjoins the built form of the Dalton Barracks site. The size of the site will facilitate the inclusion of substantial areas of Green Infrastructure and the relationship and connections to Shippon can be explored further through the master planning work.
1098082 1143225 1143699 1144099	Phillip Carder mr Graham Sloper Mrs Debbie Chaundy Mr Robert Evans					No No	General Objection	<p>There were a number of comments received in relation to public consultation and the consultation process. Specific comments included the following:</p> <p>No consideration given to the local communities who will be affected by these proposals</p>	The Council recognise the importance of planning for the site comprehensively, considering its long-term potential and planning appropriately for infrastructure. The preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site will set out the detailed parameters to inform masterplanning of the site that will also facilitate greater opportunities for stakeholders to influence, in more detail, planning for the site.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1145552	Mr Bruno Delacave					No		Proposals show a complete lack of understanding of the impact on the existing communities and the rural character of the Green Belt Identity of Shippon village has not been acknowledged in the future plans for the area Through consultation events, there has been no positive steps by the Council to support the local residents of the affected areas	
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No	General Support	Comment were received in support of the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. Specific comments included: Support for redeveloping Daltons Barracks Provision must be made to retain the Army Reserve Centre to the East of the site as an integral part of the local community and to encourage recruiting. Concern regarding the proposed overdevelopment of the site in the longer term, with mention of 4000 houses. This would serve as an unacceptable intrusion into the greenbelt. The actual development should only be allowed in that part of the green belt that currently includes buildings as far as the adjacent N-S road serving those buildings, but not to its west. The cumulative impact of adding this site to the other development should be undertaken, to prove that this size of development is viable, not least in terms of the highways infrastructure Support for the Dalton Barracks site which is an appropriate brownfield site for development	Noted
1096052	Mr Geoff Fitzgerald				Yes				
1097479	David Hutchinson				No				
1143714	Ms Jenny Lee								
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill	Oxford Green Belt Network				No	Green Belt	There were a number of comments received including from Wootton Parish Council, St Helen Without Parish Council in relation to the Green Belt. Specific comments included the following: 1200 dwellings could easily be accommodated in the northern area of the brownfield site, (Core Policy 13), there is no substantiation for the removal of land from the Green Belt for the period of this plan Revision of the western boundary takes out extra land from the green belt which is inconsistent with paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework Proposal to remove Shippon from the Green Belt is not legally compliant and not sound Proposed cycle and bus route between the Garden Village to Lodge Hill Park and Ride needs to be re-routed to avoid taking land out of the Green Belt at Whitecross When the deliverability of the whole site is confirmed by the MOD, the justification for the	The Council has published the Exceptional Circumstances Report to set out its case for removing Dalton Barracks from the Green Belt. The Council considers that its proposals are consistent with national policy and that overall, the plan represents an appropriate strategy for the district up to 2031.
730294	Mr George Edmonds-Brown	Wootton Parish Council				No			
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock					No			
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning				
1022242	Dr David Illingworth	North Abingdon Local Plan Group				No			
1096618	Mr John Roberts					No			
1098046	Mrs Madeleine Russell	St Helen Without Parish Council				No			
1141744	Mr Derek James					No			
1143704	Mr David Belcher								

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096052	Mr Geoff Fitzgerald					Yes		<p>envisaged larger development can be considered, if this housing need is still required</p> <p>No special circumstances have been demonstrated by the Council to remove land from the Green Belt for development and no justification for removing the village of Shippon from the Green Belt</p> <p>Proposals show a lack of understanding for the impacts on existing communities and the rural character of the Oxford Green Belt</p> <p>Proposal is inconsistent with paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>Proposal to remove land from the Green Belt is not proportional to the need for 1,200 homes</p>	
1142673	Mr Neil Porter	Abingdon Air & County Show				No	Historic Environment	<p>One general comment was received in relation to heritage and the historic environment:</p> <p>Concern regarding the historical value of the buildings on site and their loss.</p> <p>Would support the reuse of these buildings, particularly for employment or transport use.</p> <p>The more modern buildings could be converted into flats and other facilities. This approach would be quicker than demolition and rebuilding</p>	<p>Noted. The site promoters have undertaken an historic impact assessment of the site and this detail, along with Historic England's advice will help to inform the comprehensive approach to planning for the site.</p> <p>An Additional Modification is proposed to the Development Site Template to provide clarity on the approach to protecting the historic environment at Dalton Barracks.</p>
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley		Housing Delivery Rates	<p>One general comment was received in relation to housing delivery rates. Specific comments included the following:</p> <p>Concern regarding over optimistic housing delivery rates. The Council's Housing Trajectory of October 2017 suggests that delivery is expected from 2023/2024 onwards.</p> <p>If the site were released immediately upon the adoption of the LPP2 (planned for December 2018), this indicates that housing at the allocation would need to be delivered at a rate of approximately 92 dwellings per annum. This assumes there are at least two sales outlets as this level is unlikely to be achieved by one outlet.</p> <p>Development Template at Appendix A of the LPP2 identifies significant infrastructure requirements even higher (and in all likelihood, substantially higher) rates of housing delivery would be required.</p> <p>Evidence demonstrates that delivery rates of 200 dwellings per annum at Dalton Barracks are likely to be overly optimistic when compared to the usual build out rates of house builders. Such levels of development would require the involvement of a number of housing developer outlets</p> <p>The contribution that Dalton Barracks will make to the supply of new homes during the plan period should therefore be reduced significantly as the evidence is not robust.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council understands that development can commence from 2024 as confirmed by the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and DIO. The Masterplanning of the site will be informed by the Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as SPD and involving key stakeholders including the Parish Council.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning	Office use only - blank	Housing Delivery Strategy	Unavailability of quoted documents and site not quoted within Housing Delivery Strategy	The Housing Delivery Strategy has been jointly prepared with South Oxfordshire and provides an action plan for delivering housing in general terms to support planning policy. It will apply to all development across the district. It has been used to inform some of the Development Management policies set out in the Part 2 plan.
874304 1096204	John Fathers Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No No	Housing numbers	<p>SPADE seeks either the complete removal of the Dalton Barracks site allocation or a substantial reduction in the numbers allocated to Dalton Barracks to 540 (1,200 –660) and the complete removal of other smaller less sustainable sites including Marcham and Fyfield / Kingston Bagpuize from Local Plan 2031 Part 2. SPADE proposes retaining Dalton Barracks in the Green Belt and restricting the allocation to the built form of the existing site.</p> <p>Comments object to the proposal and request further work is undertaken to assess the proposals and undertake more evidence.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Part 2 plan is to address the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be provided within the Vale. The Council is proposing this housing is provided within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area as this area is closest to and accessible to Oxford. It is proposed that the unmet need is met through a combination of Part 1 and Part 2 sites. The Plan also needs to ensure sufficient housing is provided in this Sub-Area to meet the Vale need. On this basis, there is no over-supply within this sub-area.</p> <p>There are additional sites proposed within the South-East Vale Sub-Area for reasons set out in the plan, and these do increase the proposed housing supply within this Sub-Area set out in the Part 1 plan. This housing is not considered to make any contribution to addressing unmet need for Oxford. It is understood that this approach is supported by both Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council.</p> <p>The Council considers the plan is an appropriate strategy in accordance with national policy, guidance and legislation.</p>
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Woolf Bond Planning	No	Housing White Paper	There is a reliance on one single site to meet the unmet needs of Oxford City. This is not consistent with Planning Policy which recommends a range of different sizes of sites to ensure flexibility. This is important particularly as there are potential delivery issues within the Plan period. The Council should return to the original Green Belt Review which identified a number of appropriate sustainable sites	The Part 1 and Part 2 plans supports the delivery of 25 site allocations of different size, type and geography in accordance with expert advice and consistent with advice of the Home Builders Federation. The Part 1 sites that make some contribution to addressing unmet need within the Vale are already allocated, and either have planning permission or are within planning and so able to deliver housing even before the 2021 target identified by the Oxfordshire Growth Board. The use of these sites to contribute to Oxford unmet need was supported by the Part 1 plan Inspector.
879508 1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning	No	Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)	Concern about the lack of firm proposals for the provision of infrastructure in particular highways and transportation. There is a substantial wish list of infrastructure which is obviously critical to the delivery of Dalton Barracks, but apart from 'working closely' supported by 'studies' there is no mention of firm proposals or any kind of public funding. Any financial contribution from the Dalton Barracks development (1,200 dwellings) is very unlikely to fund much of this 'wish list'. Further clarification	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements to support the proposed 1,200 dwellings up to 2031 are set out within the Development Site Templates and IDP. Whilst a route for a potential longer-term cycle/ busway is proposed, there is no expectation that this is either required to support the development of 1,200 dwellings or will be delivered in the plan period. The Council recognise that more work is needed to plan for the longer-term potential of the</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								required within the IDP as to the costs of the proposed Busway. It would be preferable to create an on-site integrated transport hub within the allocation site in line with Garden Village principles.	site, which will be informed, in part, by the Comprehensive Development Framework for the site.
729283	Mrs Victoria Talbot	Sunningwell Parish Council	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning	No	Local Transport Infrastructure	There were a number of comments received, including from Ashbury Parish Council and Sunningwell Parish Council, in relation to local transport infrastructure. Specific comments included the following: Local transport infrastructure for the proposed allocation at Dalton Barrack is insufficient Park and Ride site at Lodge Hill justification for additional housing growth at Dalton Barracks, contrary to advice from OCC and demonstrates a lack of cooperation with key stakeholders Enhancement of local bus services e.g. bus service 4 is essential to make the site sustainable Commuter traffic from the proposed developments would feed onto trunk roads that are already heavily congested at peak times Intention to provide enhancements to the existing 4/4B bus services is supported, potential to reroute existing 15 service from Witney to Abingdon Unnecessary to progress the bus and cycle link as set out in Core Policy 12a Further reassessment of the location of any A34 south corridor Park and Ride Objective assessment of the A34/A415 junction Roads have limited public footpaths and are unsafe for vehicles and pedestrians Further consideration should be given to cycle lanes and cycle racks adjacent to bus stops on route into Oxford The provision of essential highways and transportation infrastructure has only reached the stage of a 'wish list', no mention of the detail necessary or the provision of funding required to have confidence that this essential infrastructure will be available Information needs to be provided on how new infrastructure is to direct traffic away from routes such as Faringdon Road, Elm Tree Walk and Barrow Road Improving the junction between Long Tow and the Wootton Road will direct some traffic travelling toward Abingdon down the Wootton road towards some secondary schools Outer ring road from the current entrance to the airfield at Barrow Road to Whitecross will also help take traffic away from the existing Shippon village	The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development. The partnership working includes preparing a sustainable transport study for the area that focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford, focusing on bus/cycle/walking access to/from Dalton Barracks. Other evidence includes the Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study and in partnership with OCC, proposals are made for a north bound bus lane on the A34 connecting Lodge Hill and Hinksey Junctions; a new Park and Ride is proposed at Lodge Hill by the County Council along with a Rapid Transit Route connecting to Oxford. Discussions and work is ongoing to ensure bus services are improved along with improved pedestrian and cycle connections. The Development Site Template includes a comprehensive package of requirements relating to access and highways. This includes improving access to the A34 at Marcham. Core Policy 8b includes a commitment to plan for the site comprehensively with the preparation of a Comprehensive Masterplan to be adopted as SPD.
756175	Mr Robin Draper								
785705	Mr Brian Rixon								
828782	Mrs Emily Smith								
872591	Miss Layla Moran					Liberal Democrats, Oxford West and Abingdon			
879508						Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd			
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas					Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment			
1097479	David Hutchinson								
1097828	Lee Church								
1141744	Mr Derek James								
1142989	Mrs Fiona Freeman								
1143223	Mr Lee Church								
1144032	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson								
1144034	Mr Mark Partington								
1144775	Ms J Partington								
1144861	Mrs Catherine Lewis								
1144874	Ms Pearl Givinichi-Lewis								
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Woolf Bond Planning	No			
1145537	Ms Clare Arnold	Ashbury Parish Council				No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Site is reliant upon new linkages to the A34, a dedicated bus lane along the A34 and the proposed new park and ride sites Additional provision for the site to link to a Park and Ride is likely to be detrimental to the existing 4/4B service making it commercially unviable and loss of service to residents at Cumnor and Wootton	
1144025	Dr Victoria Hayman					No	Loss of leisure facility	One comment was received relating to the loss of existing leisure facilities. Comments included: The proposals remove a valuable sporting facility for local children especially teenagers No consultation was undertaken on this aspect.	The proposed development provides an opportunity to provide a range of new services and facilities including substantial areas of open space, Green Infrastructure and formal and informal leisure facilities. This will provide facilities for the existing and new residents and have a wider value beyond the proposed development. If there are any losses of existing facilities, these will need to be replaced with at least equivalent facilities.
1096052 1097479	Mr Geoff Fitzgerald David Hutchinson					Yes No	Masterplanning	There were a few comments received in relation to masterplanning. Specific comments included: Limited transparency in what form the development will take place No documentation to show where development will start, how many houses will initially be developed and the planned schedule for the remaining development of homes No details provided on planned infrastructure or the provision/siting of new facilities. Evidence required from the Vale of the White Horse DC, i.e. to provide tangible plans that can be properly scrutinised The LPP2 (page 37) states that "Proposals for development at Dalton Barracks must demonstrate how they contribute towards a comprehensive approach to development", but no comprehensive framework has been presented to local residents No comprehensive approach to development has been presented Although details are mentioned as forthcoming in a development framework and masterplan, there is no phasing information or schedule and no information regarding infrastructure.	The Local Plan is relatively strategic in nature. Core Policy 8a gives a commitment to work with key stakeholders, including the County Council and local community to undertake masterplanning for all site allocations. However, for the Dalton Barracks proposal there is a specific policy, Core Policy 8b, that commits the Council to prepare a Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as SPD, which will provide more opportunity for stakeholders including the parish councils and neighbourhood plan group to engage in the detailed work-strands.
868096 1144874	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth Ms Pearl Givinichi-Lewis					No No	Park and Ride site at Lodge Hill	There were a few comments received in relation to the Park and Ride site at Lodge Hill. Specific comments included the following: The proposed Park and Ride at Lodge Hill is not in the most suitable place and would be better located at the Marcham interchange instead. Thereby not needing the proposed bus & cycle route linking the Dalton Barracks site to the Lodge Hill P&R, which cuts across green belt farmland in a way that would	The proposed park and ride at Lodge Hill is a proposal of the County Council, who as Highways Authority, have responsibility for planning for highways, and is included within the adopted Local Transport Plan and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy. The Council have included provision for safeguarding the park and ride site at the request of the County Council. The Council continues to work in partnership with the County Council and the park and ride has been

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>make the fields difficult to farm, and which would have adverse effects on Sunningwell.</p> <p>A P&R at the Marcham interchange would be better as it would take northbound traffic to Oxford off the A34 sooner.</p> <p>North Abingdon is already well provided with buses that run up the A34 (X3, X13, X2, S8)</p> <p>The proposed park and ride facility presumes that the majority of residents would work in Oxford, which is not the case. The proposal would increase traffic on the already congested A34 which would not be alleviated by the park and ride.</p>	factored into the joint highways evidence supporting the Local Plan process.
729955	Mrs Sue Thomas	Beaulieu Court Management Company Ltd				No	Public transport	<p>There were a number of comments received in relation to the provision of public transport. Specific comments included the following:</p> <p>Support improvements towards the existing 4/4B bus service as the primary source of public transport for the site to access Oxford, object to the safeguarding for the bus and cycle link between Dalton Barracks</p> <p>Full effective local community engagement and consultation should be undertaken to determine the most effective solution/location to enhance sustainable travel from and to Dalton Barracks</p> <p>Site should be planned as a mixed-use development including shops, schools, small industrial units/offices to reduce the need to travel elsewhere for work and leisure</p> <p>Even if Park and Ride sites and related bus priority measures were provided in the future, the enhancement of existing commercial bus service adjacent to the site would provide a quicker journey to Oxford</p>	<p>The Council have worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess highway impact of development.</p> <p>The partnership working includes preparing a sustainable transport study for the area that focuses on sustainable transport improvements between Abingdon and Oxford, focusing on bus/cycle/walking access to/from Dalton Barracks. Other evidence includes the Evaluation of Transport Impacts Study and in partnership with OCC, proposals are made for a north bound bus lane on the A34 connecting Lodge Hill and Hinksey Junctions; a new Park and Ride is proposed at Lodge Hill by the County Council along with a Rapid Transit Route connecting to Oxford. Discussions and work is ongoing to ensure bus services are improved along with improved pedestrian and cycle connections. The Development Site Template includes a comprehensive package of requirements relating to access and highways. This includes improving access to the A34 at Marcham. Core Policy 8b includes a commitment to plan for the site comprehensively with the preparation of a Comprehensive Masterplan to be adopted as SPD.</p>
871494	Mr Noel Newson					No			
1095760	Mr Alex White					No			
1144235	Mr Anthony Thomas								
1144249	Ms Annabel Ownsworth								
1144923	Dr Henry Bennett-Clark								
1145551	Vicky Russell								
1145552	Mr Bruno Delacave						No		
1143089	Mrs Anne Newman					No			
756175	Mr Robin Draper	St Helen Without Parish Council				No	Scale of proposed allocation	<p>There were a few comments received in relation to the scale of the proposed allocation. Specific comments included the following:</p> <p>The proposal to accommodate 4000 + dwellings on site is not accompanied by any justification of the need for this higher number and requires an enormous area of the Dalton Barracks and the adjoining Abingdon Airfield MOD site and the village of Shippon be removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Previous Planning Inspector's advice was against removing land from the Green Belt when it is unclear if the land would be needed for future development.</p>	<p>The Part 2 plan proposes to allocate the site for 1,200 homes up to 2031, although the plan also acknowledges that the site has potential to accommodate more housing in the longer term. Any development in the longer term would need to comply with the policy requirements and be subject to further assessment. The commitment to prepare a Comprehensive Development Framework to be adopted as SPD provides an opportunity to ensure that any development coming forward in the plan period maximises the opportunity to form a coherent development scheme overall.</p>
1098046	Mrs Madeleine Russell					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								No evidence to substantiate that future development of the scale predicted, is going to be necessary or appropriate beyond 2031. Concern regarding overdevelopment of the site with 400 dwellings which would have unacceptable impact on Green Belt.	
1145537	Ms Clare Arnold	Ashbury Parish Council					Settlement Hierarchy	Shippon is categorised as a "smaller village" within core policy 3 of LPP1, where any development should be modest and proportionate in scale and primarily be to meet local needs. This is in contradiction of the Spatial Strategy set out in LPP1, and if adopted would render the core of the Local Plan all but meaningless.	The Council considers that the development proposed at Dalton Barracks will provide services and facilities equivalent to a larger village.
785820	Councillor Catherine Webber	Vale of White Horse District Council				No	Shippon Village	Adverse impact on Shippon village and its heritage Concern over coalescence between the existing and proposed settlements Concern regarding removal of the village from the Green Belt, this should be to reconsidered and to reinstate the village into the Green Belt, as they have done for Whitecross	The Council is satisfied that all alternatives have been assessed and that development at Dalton Barracks will not cause any significant harm to Green Belt purposes. The removal of land from the Green Belt allows the potential to maximise the efficient reuse of previously developed land in this area, allowing it to be masterplanned comprehensively and cohesively.
1142673 1144168 1073039	Mr Neil Porter The Binning Family Mr Michael Lewington	Abingdon Air & County Show				No No	Site area	There were a few comments received in relation to the site area. Specific comments included: The whole of the redline site should come out of the green belt not just the area shown on figure 2.3 and Appendix L. Additional land surrounding the Barracks/airfield site should also be removed as it contributes very little towards the main objectives of the green belt round Oxford. Visually, this part of the Vale from Oxford, would have very little if any impact on the setting of Oxford Similar conclusions were reached by the consultants when they reassessed the green belt in this vicinity. It makes more sense to create easily identifiable boundaries for the green belt in this vicinity and using existing public roads as boundaries rather than just what the MOD own. Additional parcels of land will be needed for improved access and infrastructure, further employment or more housing as the settlement grows post 2031 The boundary line for proposed development has increased beyond the original boundary in the previous draft. Concern over impact upon Green Belt areas Concern regarding the adverse visual impact, setting and rural character of the area Concern regarding impact on existing residents.	The Council consider that the maps set out within the Part 2 plan provide clarity on which areas are considered available for development and which areas will remain Green Belt. The MOD site within the red line boundary will be re-developed. The Statement of Common Ground between the VOWH and the DIO make clear that development can come forward from 2024 and sets out an indicative masterplan and trajectory for the site. The Council have been clear that housing owned by the MOD outside the red line boundary does not form part of the development boundary. The MOD have a number of bases nearby and may wish to continue to use this housing even after the MOD use at Dalton Barracks comes to an end.
871494	Mr Noel Newson					No	Site Development template	Flaws within the Site development template. Comment also objects to the proposed safeguarding for highway schemes.	Noted. The proposed highway schemes are commented on separately.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No	Support a reduction in housing allocation	Support for a reduction in housing numbers as site could progress more quickly before the site is vacated by the Ministry of Defence. Fewer homes would avoid any potential of coalescence with Wootton, Whitecross or Shippon. This approach would give greater latitude to the required site-wide master planning process.	The Council considers the plan represents an appropriate strategy for the district up to 2031 and is consistent with national policy, guidance and legislation. It is necessary to plan for the quantum of unmet need for Oxford to be addressed with the Vale while also meeting the identified need for housing for the Vale, as specified by the Part 1 plan. On this basis, there is no scope for reducing the number of dwellings proposed in the Abingdon-on-Thames Sub-Area upto 2031.
729283	Mrs Victoria Talbot					Yes	Support for highway infrastructure	Support for the new southern slip road onto the A34 at Lodge Hill. Works should be undertaken prior to the construction of the new dwellings	Noted
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No	Support for public transport improvements	Support the improvements to the bus service to serve the allocation site. This approach is preferable to the park and ride option at Lodge Hill as the improved bus service is considered more sustainable.	Noted
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning		Support for removal of land from Green Belt	Support for removal of Green Belt in this location due to exceptional circumstances.	Noted.
1142840 1144126 1144133	Mr Ian Rhead Mrs Sheila Bury Mr Mark Rogers					No	Sustainability	The percentage increase in the number of houses in North Abingdon is far too great to be sustainable. The park-and-ride and other amenities should be integrated within the current Dalton barracks site and links to the A34 and improvements to the bus routes would follow naturally from that location. The travel sustainability plan for 1200 homes is not reliant upon the proposed park and ride at Lodge Hill but an improved route 4 bus service.	Noted. The Park and Ride site at Lodge Hill is proposed by the County Council who as Highways Authority have responsibility for planning for highways and is set out in the adopted Local Transport Plan and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy.
866690 871494 1144162	Mrs Anthea Pearson Mr Noel Newson Mr Tom Lewis					No No	Sustainable Transport	There were a number of comments received in relation to sustainable transport. Specific comments included the following: Failure to examine viable alternatives such as providing a cycle lane along Wootton Road to link to the north of Abingdon-on-Thames Site could be made sustainable by enhancing existing 4/4B bus service and being sympathetic to surrounding communities including Whitecross and Shippon Support principle of some development, as it is close to existing commercial bus service linking to Oxford and Abingdon, but safeguarding of land for Park and Ride sites and a bus/cycle link between Dalton Barracks and Lodge Hill should be removed from the Plan Too much emphasis on the Park and Ride facilities for longer distance journeys rather than improving local public transport and walking and cycling links	The Council have worked with the County Council to prepare evidence to inform the allocation and support the Development Site Templates and IDP. The Main access to the strategic highway network will be via improved access to Marcham interchange in the A34, although the Council understand there is potential for increased frequency of bus connectivity to the site in the short term, as well as opportunities for excellent connectivity to the site in the longer term, especially of larger scale growth is supported. Highway impact is partly mitigated by the MOD units currently using the site moving during the plan period so as the scale of growth increases, the MOD use of the site will reduce. The Comprehensive Development Framework will inform the masterplanning of the site. It is understood that the first phases of development up to 1,200 units will form single development this maximising opportunities for improved public transport connections and highway upgrades associated with development up to 2031.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
728817	Mrs Elizabeth Bennett					No	Traffic and congestion	There were a number of comments received in relation to traffic and congestion and impacts associated with the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks. Specific concerns raised the following:	The Council have worked with the County Council to prepare evidence to inform the allocation and support the Development Site Templates and IDP. The Main access to the strategic highway network will be via improved access to Marcham interchange in the A34, although the Council understand there is potential for increased frequency of bus connectivity to the site in the short term, as well as opportunities for excellent connectivity to the site in the longer term, especially of larger scale growth is supported. Highway impact is partly mitigated by the MOD units currently using the site moving during the plan period so as the scale of growth increases, the MOD use of the site will reduce. The Comprehensive Development Framework will inform the masterplanning of the site. It is understood that the first phases of development up to 1,200 units will form single development this maximising opportunities for improved public transport connections and highway upgrades associated with development up to 2031.
729283	Mrs Victoria Talbot				No				
830206	Mr David Miles				No		Additional traffic from the site will have an adverse effect on the local road network e.g. Wootton Road and at Whitecross		
874304	John Fathers				No		Proposed park and ride would have detrimental impact on the road through the village; the proposed cycle/bus link would cut through landscape and roads will be used as 'rat runs' causing further congestion		
1142783	Mr John Whittle				No		Increased rat running through local roads such as Barrow Road and Faringdon Road		
1143699	Mrs Debbie Chaundy				No		Two other country lanes to the west and north are insufficient width to allow cars to overtake bicycles and buses		
1143704	Mr David Belcher				No		Proposed Lodge Hill Park and Ride would create additional vehicular traffic through Sunningwell village		
1144039	Mr Noel Blatchford				No		Sunningwell Road is unsuitable for cyclists and pedestrians		
1144073	Mr and Mrs David and Marian Pinfold				No		An alternative was suggested to improve bus service and a provide a road for buses/cyclists that runs alongside the A34, causing lower impact on environment		
1144310	Mr and Mrs Stuart and Charlotte Bates				No				

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

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
874535 865508	Mr Anthony Parsons Dr Kate Dean					No	A34 bus lane - General	Two general comment has been made in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a new bus lane northbound on the A34 between Lodge Hill and Hinksey Hill. The representation seeks clarification on the detail of this proposal, including whether it would impact upon the existing bridges and would it take up one of two existing lanes.	The comment is noted. It is understood that there is sufficient land available to provide a dedicated bus lane which would not impact upon the existing infrastructure, including the existing carriageways. Further detailed feasibility work is required to fully understand how this can be implemented successfully, and will require close cooperation with Highways England, Oxfordshire County Council and the bus operators.
1095853 1144164	Dr Janet Banfield Mrs J Gibbard	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No	A34 bus lane - Object	<p>A small number of objections have been made in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a new bus lane northbound on the A34 between Lodge Hill and Hinksey Hill. These comments include:</p> <p>Hinksey Hill is already a major bottleneck during peak hours. Increasing traffic will make the issue worse. A bus lane would have a detrimental effect on existing bus services</p> <p>The proposed lane will have a negligible impact overall on transport in the area.</p> <p>There is no dedicated southbound lane which would make the overall journey less appealing.</p> <p>There is no commitment to funding for this piece of infrastructure at the present time.</p> <p>There is no evidence to support the need to safeguard this land.</p> <p>The proposed Expressway from Oxford to Cambridge may resolve issues along this section of the A34.</p> <p>The comments seek the deletion of the safeguarded land for this particular scheme from the Part 2 Plan.</p>	<p>The council would like to respond to the comments as follows:</p> <p>The council recognises that traffic is an issue on the A34. Following discussion with key stakeholders on this matter, the council is proposing land to be safeguarded for a dedicated bus lane which will provide a high quality, reliable and sustainable option for public transport.</p> <p>Transport modelling has indicated that there is no requirement for a dedicated bus lane southbound on the A34 between Hinksey Hill and Lodge Hill. Traffic performs better in this area at PM peak hours than they do northbound during AM peak hours.</p> <p>The council recognises that there is currently no funding for this scheme at present. Further detailed feasibility work is required in order to better understand the costs associated with implementing this scheme. This will give consideration to how this particular scheme would operate alongside growth in the area, including the potential for a Park and Ride at Lodge Hill. Although funding is not secured at present, this does not preclude the potential for such funding to be secured within the plan period.</p> <p>A number of route options are currently being assessed for the proposed Oxford - Cambridge Expressway, some of which would have major benefits to the A34 in this area. Further detailed work is required to fully understand the most suitable route for the Expressway</p>
729502 1144189 928610 725596	Ms Debbie Baker Mrs Charlotte Reaney Lynette Hughes Mr Nicholas Small	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD) Oxfordshire County Council Stagecoach Oxford	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)	Yes	A34 bus lane - Support	<p>A small number of comments of support are made specifically in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a new bus lane northbound on the A34 between Lodge Hill and Hinksey Hill. Support has been received by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation; Oxfordshire County Council and Stagecoach Oxford.</p> <p>One comment seeks the extension of the proposed bus lane to run from Marcham Interchange to Hinksey Hill, and to locate a Park and Ride at that location. Oxfordshire County Council identify that the scheme is not currently funded and that the scheme may not</p>	<p>Comments of support are welcomed and have been noted.</p> <p>The safeguarded of land for a dedicated bus lane on the A34 northbound is based on the evidence available to date, and follows engagement with a number of key stakeholders, including Oxfordshire County Council and Highways England. This does not preclude the option that further land may be safeguarded in future reviews of the Local Plan to Marcham Interchange should updated evidence suggest this is appropriate.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								be delivered in the plan period. It does form part of the Oxford Transport Strategy in Local Transport Plan 4, alongside a new Park and Ride at Lodge Hill. Stagecoach mention that this should be approached by Highways England and Oxfordshire County Council as part of a wider strategy to manage the pressure on this corridor as a whole.	The Council notes the comments received from Oxfordshire County Council in relation to the status of funding for this site. The Council are keen to engage with all relevant stakeholders, and in particular Highways England and Oxfordshire County Council on a wider strategy for the A34. This commitment is set out in Core Policy 34 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1.
1144552	Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies		Yes	Cumnor PandR - General	One general comment has been made in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a future Park and Ride near Cumnor. This has been made by the landowners of the site who state that the proposed Park and Ride could be developed as part of a wider housing scheme to provide homes to meet the unmet housing needs of Oxford. This would enable the ability for residents to walk to facility, further reducing the impact on the local transport network.	The comment is noted. The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection. Further details are set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper 2. The Council has tested the site as a potential additional allocation and has not recommended it for inclusion in the Part 2 plan. The Council considers that no part of this site is suitable in landscape terms for residential development.
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock					No	Cumnor PandR - Object	A number of objections have been made in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a future Park and Ride near Cumnor. Key comments include the following: The safeguarded land is not compliant with Paragraph 90 of the NPPF, namely that Local Transport Infrastructure is not appropriate development in the Green Belt unless it preserves the openness of the Green Belt. Park and Rides contain large buildings to provide facilities. The development of the safeguarded land for a Park and Ridge would damage the green belt and the sensitive landscape in this area. Green Belt Study highlights the importance of this land in contributing towards the purposes of the Green Belt. One comment notes the site's location in an elevated, open and prominent sweep of countryside. Development of the safeguarded land for a Park and Ride would harm the setting of Cumnor Village. Development of the safeguarded land for a Park and Ride would have an adverse impact on the landscape character in the area. Alternative sites have not been rigorously tested. The Sustainability Transport Study for the Abingdon to Oxford Corridor does not consider in detail any environmental factors. Comments from CPRE state that a future Park and Ride at Cumnor would not be viable. CPRE cite that the Park and Ride would only draw 763 cars per day, despite providing a capacity for 1,200 vehicles. Site was proposed by VoWH and not OCC's site. Paragraph 2.80 is therefore misleading. The safeguarded land at Cumnor would do very little to serve future employees of Harwell Campus and Science Vale.	Comments objecting to the proposed safeguarded land for a future Park and Ride are noted. The Council would like to respond to the comments as follows: Any future proposals for a Park and Ride at this site will need to comply with the policies of Local Plan 2031 as a whole. "Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility", criterion v. of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 states that "The Council will work with Oxfordshire County Council and others to ensure that transport improvements are designed to minimise any effects on the amenities, character and special qualities of the surrounding area". The important landscape settings of settlements also forms part of a number of key features which are to be protected from harmful development and where possible enhanced, as set out in "Core Policy 44: Landscape" of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The Council can confirm that the land safeguarded for future Park and Ride sites at Cumnor and Lodge Hill have been identified by Oxfordshire County Council. The Council consider that the wording of paragraph 2.80 is therefore correct. The safeguarding of land for a future Park and Ride near Cumnor is set out in Local Transport Plan 4 (Volume 4: Cycle Strategy and Bus and Rapid Transit Strategy) and is principally intended to serve commuters travelling to Oxford City, rather than to Science Vale. The purpose of this location is to maximise the potential for intercepting trips, closer to their point of origin before they cross the congested A34.
871494	Mr Noel Newson				No				
928876	Mr Stephen Pickles				No				
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England			No				
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council			No				
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford							

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Stagecoach state that the proposed Park and Ride may not be most suitable to facilitate either a reasonable rate of interception nor efficiently taking advantage of passing services, due to its distance from the A420. Stagecoach also mention that the interchange at this location is unusually complex.</p> <p>A number of recommendations have been suggested as a result of the objections received. These are:</p> <p>Modification - Delete the safeguarded land for a future Park and Ride at Cumnor for Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Modification - Additional criteria should be included in the policy including the following: i) A requirement for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to be undertaken; ii) Extensive tree and shrub planting around and within the car park to ensure that it will fit in with the local landscape, including a woodland belt around the edge.</p> <p>Modification - Replace the two proposed safeguarded areas for a Park and Ride (Cumnor and Lodge Hill) and provide one at the Marcham Interchange. Modification - An alternative site on the triangle of land between Oxford Road and Cumnor Hill should be considered.</p> <p>A number of comments endorse the representations made by SPADE and Sunningwell Parish Council and request that the Council take SPADE's comments into account and give further consideration to the Plan and its proposals. Comment objects to Park and Rides at Cumnor and Lodge Hill, and the cycle link between Dalton Barracks and lodge Hill. Comment requests the removal of Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt</p>	
1144552 928610	Merton College Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council	1144555	Mr Davies		Yes	Cumnor PandR - Support	<p>A small number of comments of support have been received specifically for the proposed safeguarding of land for a future Park and Ride near Cumnor. These include the landowners of the site who welcome further engagement on an appropriate solution for a Park and Ride in this location. Oxfordshire County Council also provide a comment of support, noting that the scheme is part of the Oxford Transport Strategy in Local Transport Plan 4. Its notes that although the scheme is not currently funded, it remains a longer-term project.</p>	Comments of support are welcomed and have been noted.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
729283	Mrs Victoria Talbot					No	General	A small number of general comments have been received in relation to Core Policy 12a that neither object nor support the proposed land to be safeguarded by this policy. These include:	Data provided by National Grid is welcomed and will assist the council's knowledge of constraints associated with land to be safeguarded through Core Policy 12a.
852191	Adrian Colwell	Cherwell District Council							
972888		National Grid	1142380	Ms Hannah Lorna Bevins	Amec Foster Wheeler	No		Information from National Grid in relation to the presence of high voltage power lines in the vicinity of land to be safeguarded through this policy.	The indicative arrows shown in Figure 2.4 are intended to represent the general movement of the proposed Bus Rapid Transit routes from the potential future park and ride sites to Oxford City. They are not intended to represent new roads or infrastructure in addition that already identified through this policy.
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council						A query in relation to the indicative arrows shown in Figure 2.4 of the Part 2 plan, as well as clarity on what the proposed "Rapid Transit 2" would be.	
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council						Cherwell District Council make note of Core Policy 12a and the land to be safeguarded through this policy.	The Rapid Transit routes are intended to make efficient use of the existing transport network in these areas. They are proposals of Oxfordshire County Council and are included within the adopted Local Transport Plan.
1144552	Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies		Yes		West Oxfordshire District Council make note of the strategic importance of road corridors such as the A415 which connects Witney with Abingdon-on-Thames, and request that additional text is included in the plan to support this and further engagement with Oxfordshire County Council on this matter.	Comment from Cherwell District Council is noted. Comments from West Oxfordshire District Council are noted. As demonstrated in the statement of common ground with West Oxfordshire, both district councils are committed to future engagement with Oxfordshire County Council on matters of strategic importance, such as those identified by West Oxfordshire at Newbridge.
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford						A recommendation that infrastructure improvements in the area needs to be put in place before any development at Dalton Barracks can take place.	The council will continue to work with key stakeholders, including Stagecoach, to ensure that opportunities for new or enhanced sustainable modes of transport are maximised in key growth areas such as the Abingdon-on-Thames to Oxford corridor.
								Stagecoach welcome the principle that some detailed work has been undertaken which looks at sustainable transport along the Abingdon-on-Thames to Oxford corridor. Stagecoach also makes note that the Local Transport Plan prepared by Oxfordshire County Council is not subject to any form of scrutiny or independent examination. It notes that such evidence is taken as 'a given' rather than challenged through the plan making process.	
1145552	Mr Bruno Delacave					No		A general comment has been received in relation to Core Policy 12a. It notes that the A34 is a source of noise and air pollution, is over capacity and there are safety issues. It also raises a query as to when earth bunds and noise cancelling barriers will be put in place between the south of Abingdon-on-Thames and the north of Oxford.	The council will continue to work with Highways England on matters of strategic importance relating to the A34, including emerging proposals on the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway.
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No	General - Object	A number of general objections have been received in relation to Core Policy 12a. These are summarised as follows:	The council recognise the important role that new technologies and changes taking place in the transport system. The council considers that the existing policies within Local Plan 2031 Part 1, including Core Policies 33 and 35 promoted sustainable modes of transport within the district.
874535	Mr Anthony Parsons					No			Development Policies 17 (Transport Assessments and Travel Plans) and 26 (Air Quality) support opportunities to support the take up of electric and/or low emission vehicles, in accordance with latest best practice.
1094885	Mr Sonke Adlung	Oxford University Press						There is an emphasis on new road building, but little regard is given to the likely changes in transport technologies which are emerging (electric and autonomous vehicles)	
1145054		Bike Safe	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No		The proposed growth in the area will result in significant additional delays on the local road network.	
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford						The proposed schemes will have limited effects in terms of improvements. People will continue to use their private motor vehicles over and above sustainable modes of transport.	
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council							

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>BIKE SAFE seek the inclusion of or a reference to a community path for the B4044. The scheme is widely supported by both the district council and Oxfordshire County Council as well as local businesses. A lot of evidence has been prepared to date on this scheme. Suggested modification by BIKE SAFE - additional scheme proposed to be added to Core Policy 12a: vi. Community Path along the B4044</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council object to the proposed scheme for a public transport and cycle link between Dalton Barracks and Lodge Hill Park and Ride. No evidence exists to support this scheme, or any commercial case to extend the proposed rapid transit line to Dalton Barracks. OCC also consider the Sustainable Transport Study is not sufficiently comprehensive and requires further work to determine the necessary sustainable transport interventions for each site.</p> <p>Stagecoach also question a number of outcomes of the Sustainable Transport Study. Stagecoach note that they had very little engagement in the preparation of this piece of work. Stagecoach also offer some feedback on the effective location and operation of Park and Ride sites.</p>	<p>The council has worked with Oxfordshire County Council on an Evaluation of Transport Impacts which concludes that growth in the district proposed in the Part 2 plan will have limited impact upon the transport network and that appropriate mitigation is proposed to reduce any impact.</p> <p>The council recognises the importance of delivering new sustainable transport schemes in the district such as the B4044 Community Path connecting Eynsham with Botley/Oxford. Core Policy 33 (Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility) supports measures identified in the Local Transport Plan for the district, including within the relevant local area strategies as well as supporting improvements for accessing Oxford.</p>
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					General - Support	<p>A number of general comments of support have been received in relation to Core Policy 12a, including support in principle from Oxfordshire County Council, Stagecoach, Defence Infrastructure Organisation and a small number of site promoters in the sub area. Comments include:</p> <p>This policy will further enhance the suitability and sustainability of land to the north of Abingdon-on-Thames.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council and Stagecoach support the policy in principle, but have a number of concerns with respect to specific schemes.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council also clarify that the safeguarding of land does not mean that there is a commitment to funding for some schemes.</p>	<p>Concerns raised by Oxfordshire County Council and Stagecoach for specific schemes are addressed separately.</p>
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)				
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning	Yes			
1144552	Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies		Yes			
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council							
725305	Mr A Chaundy	Henley Golf Club					Lodge Hill PandR - Object	<p>A large number of objections have been received in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a future Park and Ride at Lodge Hill and bus/cycle link to Dalton Barracks. For clarity, comments make little reference to the proposed upgrading of the Lodge Hill slips, which is also included as part of the land to be safeguarded in this area. There is a balanced mix of objections for both the Park and Ride and the bus/cycle link, with many objecting to both schemes. Many comments from local residents endorse the representations made by the parish councils in the area, and those made by Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment (S.P.A.D.E).</p>	<p>The Council consider that the safeguarding of land for a future Park and Ride at Lodge Hill is consistent with National Policy. The National Planning Policy Framework states that local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a green belt location is not an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt, provided it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.</p>
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill	Oxford Green Belt Network				No			
728817	Mrs Elizabeth Bennett								
729955	Mrs Sue Thomas								
730294	Mr George Edmonds-Brown	Wootton Parish Council				No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
742134	Mr Robert Warne	S.P.A.D.E				No		<p>Key comments are summarised below and include the representations received from Parish Councils in the area, Oxfordshire County Council, S.P.A.D.E., Wootton and St Helen Without NDP Steering Committee, North Abingdon Local Plan Group and other organisations and residents, with many of these stakeholders expressing similar views:</p> <p>Provision of the Park and Ride and bus/cycle link in this area are contrary to National Policy. Reference is made to paragraphs 79, 90 and 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework, that the proposals would be harmful to the Green Belt.</p> <p>There is no need to safeguard the land as it is already sufficiently protected by the Green Belt designation. Provision of the Park and Ride and bus/cycle link in this area would impact upon the setting of Sunningwell.</p> <p>The land safeguarded for a future bus/cycle link is rich in ecology and habitats. A number of comments note the presence of Water Voles and Skylarks.</p> <p>Safeguarding land for a Park and Ride and bus/cycle link in this area is premature to the ongoing work looking at an Expressway linking Oxford with Cambridge. This new expressway will alleviate pressure on the A34 in this area and a new Park and Ride and bus/cycle link would not be required.</p> <p>Issues of congestion and the number of accidents on the A34 in this area reduces the attractiveness of a Park and Ride in this location. The scheme would therefore be unviable.</p> <p>Provision of a Park and Ride at Lodge Hill would result in increased 'rat-running' through Sunningwell.</p> <p>A number of comments are critical of the Sustainable Transport Study which looks at ways to enhance the public transport network along the Abingdon-on-Thames to Oxford corridor. In addition to this, there are a number of separate comments which also state that alternative park and ride sites have not been fully considered at this stage.</p> <p>Many comments make reference to an alternative site for a Park and Ride at the Marcham Interchange (A34/A415).</p> <p>A number of PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS have been made in order to make the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 sound.</p> <p>Delete the land safeguarded for a future Park and Ride at Lodge Hill any subsequent references (including on the adopted policies map and diagrams) from Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>The Council has worked with Oxfordshire County Council on the identification of sites with the potential to deliver a high quality public transport network for Oxford and Oxfordshire, having regard to strategy set out in Local Transport Plan 4. The land safeguarded for a potential future park and ride at Lodge Hill is included in the plan at the request of the County Council who are responsible for planning for highways.</p> <p>The Council recognises that work is ongoing for the proposed Oxford to Cambridge Expressway. The Council continues to work with Highways England and Oxfordshire County Council on this nationally significant piece of infrastructure which could deliver significant improvements to the strategic and local road network in the area.</p> <p>The Council is considering the provision of a bus/cycle link between the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks and a future Park and Ride at Lodge Hill as an option for promoting sustainable modes of transport between the proposed allocation and the wider area, including Oxford City. Further detailed feasibility work is required to fully understand the most sustainable option for the future provision of public transport and other sustainable modes of transport in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.</p>
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No			
866690	Mrs Anthea Pearson					No			
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth					No			
871494	Mr Noel Newson					No			
872038	Mr Peter Clare					No			
872574	Mrs Judith Haworth					No			
872591	Miss Layla Moran	Liberal Democrats, Oxford West and Abingdon				No			
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No			
1022242	Dr David Illingworth	North Abingdon Local Plan Group				No			
1075330	Mrs Judith Hosking					No			
1094284	Mr James Greenman					No			
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No			
1096618	Mr John Roberts					No			
1142088	Mr Michael Henley					No			
1142278	Mrs Judith Hosking					No			
1142392	Mr Vic Johnson					No			
1142411	Mr Mick Wallwork					No			
1142488	Mr and Mrs Peter and					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1142659	Hilary Hawkes					No		Delete the land safeguarded for a bus/cycle link between the proposed allocation at Lodge Hill and the land safeguarded for a future Park and Ride, and any subsequent references (including on the adopted policies map and diagrams) from Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Replace the land safeguarded for a future Park and Ride at Lodge Hill and bus/cycle link with safeguarded land adjacent to Marcham Interchange, which many consider to be a more suitable site and allows additional options for new public transport links with Science Vale to the south.	
1142840	Mrs Cynthia Warmington				No				
1143089	Mr Ian Rhead				No				
1143089	Mrs Anne Newman				No				
1143229	Ms Elizabeth Greenman				No				
1143335	Mr and Mrs A and D Shlugman				No				
1143365	Mrs Sheila Greenman				No				
1143699	Mrs Debbie Chaundy				No				
1143714	Ms Jenny Lee				No				
1143881	Mr Kelleher & KcKenna		1143879	Mr Iain Summerfield		No			
1143999	Mr and Ms Alla and Mike Cordery				No				
1144013	Mr and Ms Edward and Alison Olley and Scott				No				
1144018	Mr John Miller				No				
1144032	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson				No				
1144034	Mr Mark Partington				No				
1144039	Mr Noel Blatchford				No				
1144099	Mr Robert Evans				No				
1144120	Mr Stephen Fairman				No				
1144126	Mrs Sheila Bury				No				
1144133	Mr Mark Rogers				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144154	Sian Miller								
1144162	Mr Tom Lewis					No			
1144164	Mrs J Gibbard								
1144169	Professor Elizabeth Browne								
1144235	Mr Anthony Thomas								
1144249	Ms Annabel Ownsworth								
1144310	Mr and Mrs Stuart and Charlotte Bates								
1144363	Mr and Mrs Paddy and Jan Roche								
1144458	Mr and Mrs Bob and Jill Cowley								
1144470	Mrs Diane McKenna-Rhead					No			
1144544	Ms J Russell								
1144775	Ms J Partington					No			
1144861	Mrs Catherine Lewis					No			
1144868	Mr D.J. Knowles					No			
1144874	Ms Pearl Givinichi-Lewis					No			
1144923	Dr Henry Bennett-Clark	Beaulieu Court Management Company Ltd							
871494	Mr Noel Newson					No			
1144018	Mr John Miller					No			
1144032	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson								

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144154	Sian Miller								
1144189	Mrs Charlotte Reaney					No			
1144310	Mr and Mrs Stuart and Charlotte Bates								
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No			
728817	Mrs Elizabeth Bennett								
828782	Mrs Emily Smith								
930156	Mr John Newton								
1015345	MRS ANNIE THOMAS								
1022242	Dr David Illingworth	North Abingdon Local Plan Group				No			
1075330	Mrs Judith Hosking					No			
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No			
1143089	Mrs Anne Newman					No			
1143229	Ms Elizabeth Greenman					No			
1143335	Mr and Mrs A and D Shlugman								
1144039	Mr Noel Blatchford					No			
1144099	Mr Robert Evans								
1144126	Mrs Sheila Bury								
1144133	Mr Mark Rogers								

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144164	Mrs J Gibbard								
1144169	Professor Elizabeth Browne								
1144235	Mr Anthony Thomas								
1144923	Dr Henry Bennett-Clark	Beaulieu Court Management Company Ltd							
742134	Mr Robert Warne	S.P.A.D.E				No			
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No			
785705	Mr Brian Rixon	Sunningwell Parish Council				No			
785705	Mr Brian Rixon	Sunningwell Parish Council				No			
865508	Dr Kate Dean								
830206	Mr David Miles					No			
1145546	Miss Julia Momey					No			
1145551	Vicky Russell								
1145552	Mr Bruno Delacave					No			
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company				No	Lodge Hill and Cumnor PandR - General - Oxford Bus	<p>A small number of comments have been received in relation to the safeguarding of land for future Park and Ride at Lodge Hill and Cumnor. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>Support the principle of developing new park and ride models where these are feasible.</p> <p>The approach taken for Oxford needs to build upon existing park and ride sites as well as improved and prioritised links for buses between settlements.</p> <p>Concerns are raised that locating new Park and Rides further out of the city will increase journey times and associated costs.</p> <p>The Lodge Hill Park and Ride may be competent if delivered with the A34 bus lane.</p> <p>Propose an amendment to the policy so that the proposed schemes come forward in a coordinated manner applying a sequential test to provision at existing park and rise sites as well as being able to</p>	Please refer to previous responses relating to this matter.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								demonstrate what journey time improvements can be made.	
1100261		Catesby Property Group	1096086	Taylor Cherrett	Turley	Office use only - blank	Marcham Bypass - General	Two general comments have been made in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a Marcham Bypass. The comments made by the site promoters of the proposed additional allocation South East of Marcham acknowledge the proposed opportunities for highway, public transport, walking and cycling improvements. They note the proposed Marcham Bypass and have reserved sufficient land to not prevent this from coming forward in due course.	The general comments are noted. The Council welcomes the fact that sufficient land has been protected from development next to the proposed additional allocation South East of Marcham. Proposals for safeguarding land for the potential long term delivery of a Marcham bypass have been included in the plan at the request of the Highways Authority who have responsibility for planning for highways.
874535 1144989 865508	Mr Anthony Parsons Mrs Cathy Harrison Dr Kate Dean	Environment Agency				No No	Marcham Bypass - Object	Two objections have been made in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a Marcham Bypass. These comments include: The delivery of the bypass, including securing funding, is needed before any development can take place. The Environment Agency raise a concern that the proposed safeguarded land is within areas of Flood Zones 1 and 2, and should be subject to appropriate testing including the Sequential Test or Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Comments objecting to the safeguarded land are noted. The Council would like to respond as follows: Oxfordshire County Council have confirmed that the proposed Marcham Bypass is not required to deliver the growth proposed in Local Plan 2031 Part 2 and that no funding has currently been secured to assist in the delivery of this scheme. The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner alongside growth for the district. The concerns raised by the Environment Agency are noted. The Council has worked with the Environment Agency on these matters and a proposed additional modification to the supporting text of Local Plan 2031 Part 2 sufficiently addresses the concerns raised. These are set out in the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and the Environment Agency.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Marcham Bypass - Support - OCC	One comment of support has been made specifically in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a Marcham Bypass. Support has been received Oxfordshire County Council. Oxfordshire County Council support the principle of this safeguarded scheme, and note that the scheme has been reinstated having regard to the recently designated Air Quality Management Area in Marcham and the need to ensure that alternative ways of addressing traffic in this location are not compromised. Oxfordshire County Council also clarify that the improvements to the Frilford lights junction is also supported, and that improvements to this junction may be required as direct mitigation for development allocated in Local Plan 2031 Part 2.	The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that infrastructure provision across the district is delivered in a timely manner alongside growth.

Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning		Alternative Green Belt release - Land adjacent to the Market Towns	A number of comments propose alternative sites for release from the Green Belt with accompanying narrative and evidence that seeks to demonstrate their suitability. This includes sites at Abingdon, Appleton, Dry Sandford, Egrove, Gooseacre, Radley and Wootton.	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, as set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper. A suite of evidence base studies has been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.</p> <p>The Council has also sought to achieve a balance between minimising any potential impacts on the Green Belt, whilst supporting sustainable development, and meeting the plan objectives.</p> <p>The Dalton Barracks site is predominately brownfield, is well located close to Oxford and Abingdon, and will lead to minimal harmful impact on the Green Belt purposes. The Council is seeking to remove the whole site from the Green Belt, in accordance with the NPPF requirement to minimise the need for regular amendments to the Green Belt. Larger development proposals will support both a larger contribution to infrastructure and a more comprehensive approach to planning for infrastructure and provide new facilities and services to support sustainable growth. However, the sites proposed within the Sub-Area, across both Parts 1 and 2 of the plan include sites of different size, type and location and so provide flexibility and confidence that housing will be delivered throughout the plan period.</p>
879120	Gow Family						Alternative Green Belt release - Land at Appleton	Comments include: Land adjacent to the Market Towns still have the ability to support the most sustainable patterns of living, and development adjacent to Abingdon (in particular the north of Abingdon) provides the best opportunity to deliver new housing that is accessible to Oxford, accessible to the facilities and services available within Abingdon, and is capable of making the best use of planned infrastructure improvements.	
1144174	The Nissen Family		1144167	John Savills		No	Alternative Green Belt release - Land at Dry Sandford	Other comments suggest that smaller sites released from the Green Belt would ensure the Part 2 plan meets the development strategy and ensure that communities continue to provide their existing facilities.	
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No	Alternative Green Belt Release - Land at Egrove, University of Oxford	A number of comments point out that Neighbourhood Plan groups within the Green Belt will be unable to allocate sites if they wished to and so rely on LPP2 to release sites from the Green Belt. It is suggested that the VOWH has a responsibility to allocate sites where there are no sites available within the built form of settlements in the Green Belt.	
1144780	J A Pye		1144779	Mr Alan Divall	West Waddy ADP	No	Alternative Green Belt release - Land at Honeybottom Lane, Wootton	It is suggested that exceptional circumstances exist for the Land at Appleton to be released from the Green Belt as there is concern the retired population will increase and demand for school places and services will therefore reduce if sites are not allocated.	
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore		Alternative Green Belt release - Land at North-East Abingdon, Land North of Radley and Land at Gooseacre	It is suggested that a number of these sites make little contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt and should be released. Furthermore, that the release of small sites from the Green Belt would provide greater flexibility and assist with housing delivery, especially in the short term.	
1022473		Rosconn Group	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning		Alternative Green Belt Release - Land at Wootton	It is suggested that a number of the alternative sites were included in the Council's Green Belt Study and shown to make limited contributions to the Green Belt purposes.	
1097666		Catesby Estates Ltd	1097667	Louise Steele	Framptons	No	Alternative Green Belt release - Land at Wootton (2)	It is also stated that the Part 2 plan does not propose any land to be safeguarded for future requirements, and that if this land is not allocated in Part 2, it should still be removed from the Green Belt and should instead be safeguarded to meet future housing needs.	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Woolf Bond Planning	No	Alternative Green Belt release - Land West of Lashford Lane, Wootton		
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)	1144998	Mr Steven Sensecall	Carter Jonas (Steven Sensecall)		Comments made by the DIO	<p>Comments made on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO), who believe there are exceptional circumstances to justify the amendment to the Green Belt boundary at Dalton Barracks, and have commissioned its own Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>Comments state that the removal of land from the Green Belt for the allocation at Dalton Barracks will have limited impact on the purposes of the Green Belt:</p> <p>Purpose 1: the site is not located adjacent to a major settlement</p> <p>Purpose 2: the closest neighbouring towns are Abingdon-on-Thames, Didcot and Witney, for which the site does not occupy the gaps. The coalescence between lesser settlements has been examined and as a result, boundaries will be heavily treed, retained or planted developed to reduce the visual impact</p> <p>Purpose 4: the site shares no relationship with and makes no contribution to the rural setting and character of the City of Oxford due to intervening topography associated with the Midvale Ridge and is separated from Abingdon-on-Thames by the elevated corridor of the A34</p> <p>As a result of recommendations made within the Landscape and Visual Appraisal, the DIO propose the following mitigations to maintain the purposes of the Green Belt:</p> <p>To maintain the separation function between the proposed development and surrounding urbanised and rural settlements by woodland on eastern edge of site and a belt of open space on western part of the airfield. This peripheral buffer would support a range of habitats</p> <p>Demolition of the tall hangar structures which exert a dominant influence upon the surrounding countryside</p> <p>Releasing a proportion of the open airfield for development without substantially harming the Green Belt</p> <p>The DIO considers that the Local Plan is "sound" and in accordance with Paragraph 182 of the NPPF.</p>	Comments Noted. Core Policy 8b ensures the sites is planned for in accordance with a Comprehensive Masterplan and includes a requirement for: 'development is in accordance with and makes the necessary contributions to a comprehensive landscape plan for the whole site, including the provision of a Country Park of at least 80 hectares'. It is noted that a substantial area of the existing airfield is not proposed for release from the Green Belt and so any development on this area would need to be compatible with Local Plan and National Policy requirements for development within the Green Belt. This includes provision for a substantial Country Park.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1145032	Mr D Bond					No	Green Belt at North Hinksey	<p>Comment states that there has been a change made to the Adopted Policies Map that wrongly includes a proposed change to the Green Belt Boundary at North Hinksey. This is not reflected in the LPP2 Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt and therefore makes the Plan unsound.</p> <p>The comment proposes that the submission proposals map needs to be amended so that the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area no longer seeks to show any change to the Green Belt boundary or extent at North Hinksey.</p>	The Adopted Policies Map is updated to correct a factual error that follows the Examination of the Part 1 plan. This does not relate to the Part 2 plan and no change is proposed as part of the Part 2 process. The Policies Map accompanying the Part 2 plan has been updated to make this clearer.
725864	Dr D.I. Scargill	Oxford Green Belt Network				No	<p>Objection to Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt</p> <p><u>Exceptional circumstances</u> IM Properties v Lichfield has already established that there is no test that green belt land is to be released as a last resort Authorities should amend Green Belt boundaries only when they can demonstrate they have examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting their identified requirements Meeting OAN cannot constitute exceptional circumstances</p> <p><u>Dalton Barracks allocation</u> Objections to Dalton Barracks exceptional circumstances because:</p> <p>No justification or evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to warrant removing further land around Dalton Barracks out of the Green Belt Based on the new OAN figure, housing need was overestimated in the 2014 SHMA Important role of Green Belt in local food systems The potential for custom-splitting is unexplored and should be a reasonable alternative Objections to the removal of land from the Green Belt for the Dalton Barracks allocation because: It is unjustified and inconsistent with National Policy Not legally compliant due to a lack of clarity – difference between Figure 3 in the plan and page 13 of the appendices Significant risk the site may not be delivered during the plan period No reference to housing density, which should be higher to prevent removal of land Better sites exist within the Green Belt which have not been covered in the review</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, as set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper. A suite of evidence base studies has been undertaken to inform the site selection process including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.</p> <p>The Council has also sought to achieve a balance between minimising any potential impacts on the Green Belt, whilst supporting sustainable development, and meeting the plan objectives. The Dalton Barracks site is predominately brownfield, is well located close to Oxford and Abingdon, and will lead to minimal harmful impact on the Green Belt purposes. The Council is seeking to remove the whole site from the Green Belt, in accordance with the NPPF requirement to minimise the need for regular amendments to the Green Belt. Larger development proposals will support both a larger contribution to infrastructure and a more comprehensive approach to planning for infrastructure and provide new facilities and services to support sustainable growth. However, the sites proposed within the Sub-Area, across both Parts 1 and 2 of the plan include sites of different size, type and location and so provide flexibility and confidence that housing will be delivered throughout the plan period.</p> <p>The Council has published evidence to summarise the exceptional circumstances to justify release of the Dalton Barracks site from the Oxford Green Belt and is content that the sites release is both justified and has been sufficiently demonstrated.</p> <p>Whilst the plan on page 13 of the Appendices provides some more detail than Figure 2.3, they are not thought to be inconsistent. The areas shown relating to the proposed development are, for example, consistent.</p>	
729283	Mrs Victoria Talbot				No				
742134	Mr Robert Warne	S.P.A.D.E			No				
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd,			No				
785705	Mr Brian Rixon	Sunningwell Parish Council			No				
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf				No				
828782	Mrs Emily Smith				No				
831747	Mr Richard Whitlock				No				
872574	Mrs Judith Haworth				No				
872591	Miss Layla Moran	Liberal Democrats, Oxford West and Abingdon			No				
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England			No				
879120	Gow Family				No				
911353	Mr Geoff Fitzgerald	St Helen Without Parish Council			Yes				
1015345	MRS ANNIE THOMAS				No				
1022473		Rosconn Group	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning	No			
1094639	Mr Peter White				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No		Sufficient brownfield land exists within the site to accommodate the proposed development and to provide capacity for future development (and would be consistent with LPP1 Core Policy 13), although it should not be assumed that the whole curtilage of a brownfield site should be developed	
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No		Significant impact on the visual and spatial openness of the Green Belt Impact on landscape and biodiversity Loss of Green Belt amenity Risk of sprawl and merging Abingdon, Wootton, Dry Sandford and Shippon contrary to green belt purposes	
1096618	Mr John Roberts					No		Boundary should be redrawn in line with the current built areas	
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning	No		Removal of reference that Dalton Barracks will be a 'garden village'	
1096895	MBC Estates	MBC Estates Ltd	1096293	Mr Ashley Maltman	West Waddy ADP	No		No infrastructure improvements proposed through Shippon Village	
1097479	David Hutchinson					No		Comments made state that the following are not exceptional circumstances for release of the Green Belt at Dalton Barracks:	
1097666		Catesby Estates Ltd	1097667	Louise Steele	Framptons	No		The fact the land has become unexpectedly available	
1098082	Phillip Carder					No		Proximity to Oxford	
1141744	Mr Derek James					No		Conducting a Green Belt Study	
1142392	Mr Vic Johnson					No		Dalton Barracks is not specifically required to meet Vale's proportion of Oxford's unmet need as a number of allocations within LPP1 would effectively meet it	
1142936	Mr and Mrs Richard & Jean Jones					No		Some comments objected in principle to the release of land from the Green Belt for Dalton Barracks, but supported the following points:	
1144073	Mr and Mrs David and Marian Pinfold					No		The proposal for the Country Park to remain in the Green Belt	
1144099	Mr Robert Evans					No		Release of part of the site that is already built up or developed as the least bad choice of site	
1144189	Mrs Charlotte Reaney					No		<u>Removal of Shippon from the Green Belt</u>	
1144462	Mrs Ruby Lamboll					No		There is no substantiation for the removal of any land from the Green Belt in and around Shippon	
1144780	J A Pye		1144779	Mr Alan Divall	West Waddy Adp	No		The Heritage of the village is important and it should retain its status	
1144874	Ms Pearl Givinichi-Lewis					No		There is no justification for treating Shippon differently to Whitecross, which has retained its Green Belt status	
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Woolf Bond Planning	No		Shippon was left in the Green Belt for LPP1, but removed without consultation for LPP2	
								Areas of the village might be vulnerable to in-fill development, which would change the character of the village	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p><u>General comments</u></p> <p>General objections</p> <p>The release of any green belt land is unnecessary and unjustified</p> <p>Policy considered unsound as it does not allow for any further Green Belt release outside of those allocations already made elsewhere in Part 2</p> <p>Prevents Neighbourhood Plans from reviewing the Green Belt</p> <p>Comments propose:</p> <p>Retaining Dalton Barracks in the Green Belt and restricting the allocation to the built form of the existing site</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary should be drawn more tightly around the eastern area of the site which is largely covered with buildings. The Inset area should not include Green Belt land which is open, such as the main runway, other areas of runway, aircraft taxiing routes, standing areas for aircraft, grassland, or any isolated minor structures such as lights and markers associated with the take-off and landing of aircraft</p> <p>The removal of paragraph 3 from the policy</p> <p>The area shown in Fig 2.3 bounded in red as the strategic site and referred to as Dalton Barracks should remain in the existing Green Belt and the Strategic site red boundary line should follow the revised inset boundary line containing the PDL in its currently built form</p> <p>Reposition the inset boundaries currently shown on Figure 2.3 further to the East to ensure that the inset boundary restricts any development here to currently built form only</p> <p>The policy should reflect the 6th bullet point of NPPF paragraph 89, that sets out previously developed land can be redeveloped that does not impact the openness of the Green Belt</p> <p>The policy should respect the highlighted case law in the attached comments that sets out that the "openness" of the Green Belt needs to be considered spatially and visually.</p>	
1144868	Mr D.J. Knowles					No	Objection to Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt	Land South-East of Marcham is not located within an area defined as Green Belt and as such there is no conflict with Core Policy 13.	Noted
1100261		Catesby Property Group	1096086	Taylor Cherrett	Turley		Proposed allocation of Land South-East of Marcham	Comments emphasise the importance of the permanence of the Green Belt. If exceptional circumstances are found for Green Belt release, then measures must be taken to remedy and / or mitigate this loss. This may be by providing replacement land,	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, as set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper. A suite of evidence base studies has been undertaken to inform the site selection process

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>improving public access to the Green Belt and improving biodiversity.</p> <p>OPT state that they would like to see higher contributions put towards enhancing these areas and have the expertise and long-term commitment to be able to assist in protecting and managing the green setting of Oxford.</p> <p>The following textual changes are proposed for paragraph 2.58: "...the Council is keen to explore how COMMITTED TO FULLY INCORPORATING these principles can inform the opportunity for IN THE development at Dalton Barracks."</p>	<p>including a green belt assessment of those sites in the green belt.</p> <p>The Council has also sought to achieve a balance between minimising any potential impacts on the Green Belt, whilst supporting sustainable development, and meeting the plan objectives. The Dalton Barracks site is predominately brownfield, is well located close to Oxford and Abingdon, and will lead to minimal harmful impact on the Green Belt purposes. The Council is seeking to remove the whole site from the Green Belt, in accordance with the NPPF requirement to minimise the need for regular amendments to the Green Belt. Larger development proposals will support both a larger contribution to infrastructure and a more comprehensive approach to planning for infrastructure and provide new facilities and services to support sustainable growth. However, the sites proposed within the Sub-Area, across both Parts 1 and 2 of the plan include sites of different size, type and location and so provide flexibility and confidence that housing will be delivered throughout the plan period.</p> <p>The release of Green Belt land currently owned by the MOD at Dalton Barracks presents an opportunity for the development of a highly sustainable settlement, located on substantially brownfield (previously developed) land and with minimal harm to the purposes of the Oxford Green Belt. It will be built under the Garden Village Principles, including the requirement that the development enhances the natural environment, providing a comprehensive Green Infrastructure network and net biodiversity gains.</p> <p>With regards to the transport infrastructure proposed within the green belt, national planning policy states that local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a green belt location is considered not inappropriate development within a green belt.</p>
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No	Protecting and enhancing the Green Belt	<p>There were a number of comments in support of Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt for the following reasons:</p> <p><u>Exceptional circumstances</u> Comments stating the exceptional circumstances do exist due to:</p> <p>The need to deliver sustainable development The lack of alternative sites in sustainable locations</p>	Support noted.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>The limited contribution the land parcels being removed have in terms of the purposes of the Green Belt</p> <p>Meeting Oxford's unmet need in suitable, accessible locations</p> <p>Given the scale of the VoWH's and Oxford City's housing requirement, and an inability to meet this on non-Green Belt land within the District, it is appropriate that Green Belt boundaries should be subject to a review and revision</p> <p>Support for Green Belt Study</p> <p>LPP2 follows the same approach for exceptional circumstances as set out in LPP1</p> <p>The council is entitled to make such a judgement consistent with their statutory duty (section 39(2)) and the NPPF</p>	
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore		Support for Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt	<p>It is suggested that exceptional circumstances do exist to support amendments to the Green Belt, although in some cases, alternative sites are proposed which are considered to also be suitable for release. Alternative sites are discussed separately.</p> <p>The support for exceptional circumstances includes the following:</p> <p>The need to deliver sustainable development, including providing for sustainable patterns of growth and delivering supporting infrastructure. The lack of alternative sites in sustainable locations. The limited contribution the land parcels being removed have in terms of the purposes of the Green Belt; having regard to the intended permanence of Green Belt boundaries and not including land that it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. It is suggested that these exceptional circumstances could be complemented by the fact that the 2,200 homes of Oxford's unmet housing need will need to be met in locations that are accessible to Oxford and therefore provide a further reason to support the approach being taken by the Council.</p> <p>It is suggested that housing need can, as a matter of planning judgement, as well as the desire to promote, plan and achieve sustainable patterns of development, amount to exceptional circumstances through the development plan review process. Such an approach would be consistent with Section 39(2) and national policy (NPPF 83 and 84). 3.9. Exceptional circumstances remain undefined and a matter of planning judgement. As confirmed by the Secretary of State for DCLG, (Nick Boles' letter dated 3/3/14 document LNP 18) local authorities can if they so wish review and tailor the extent of Green Belt in their area to reflect local circumstances. It is a matter</p>	Noted. Please also refer to response relating to Green Belt evidence.
868096	Mrs Vivienne Illingworth					No			
1096815		CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning				
1097666		Catesby Estates Ltd	1097667	Louise Steele	Framptons	No			
1143092	Mrs Sian Keeling	David Wilson Homes Ltd (Southern)	1143090	Mrs Sophie Horsley	Strutt & Parker	Yes			
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Woolf Bond Planning	No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>of their planning judgement as to whether exceptional circumstances apply. 3.10. The Calverton case (Appendix 1) helpfully sets out the matters to examine in establishing exceptional circumstances in the context of national policy and the positive obligation in section 39(2) to plan for sustainable development. The 5 matters were highlighted by Justice Jay at paragraph 51. They mirror the structure and intent of the Framework including paragraph 84. Each of these 5 matters are addressed in relation to the VoWH.</p> <p>On this basis and having regard to the particular facts of the scale of Vale of White Horse's and Oxford City's housing requirement and an inability to meet this on non-Green Belt land within the District it is entirely appropriate that Green Belt boundaries should be subject to a review and revision.</p> <p>One agent (CEG) endorses the view that there are the exceptional circumstances to warrant a Green Belt boundary review, but do not believe this should be constrained solely to amendments to the Green Belt boundary at Dalton Barracks.</p>	
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council					Support for Core Policy 13a: Oxford Green Belt - Statutory West Oxfordshire District Council	The Local Plan Part 2 proposes to release sites from the Green Belt for housing development. The Growth Board work programme identified that the release of Green Belt sites is necessary to help meet Oxford City's unmet housing needs effectively. In principle, West Oxfordshire District Council supports the approach adopted in Core Policy 8b and Core Policy 13a to remove the Dalton Barracks site from the Green Belt so that it can contribute either towards Oxford City's unmet housing needs or towards the Vale of White Horse's own development needs.	Support Noted.

Core Policy 14a: Upper Thames Strategic Storage Reservoir

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096915 1143220	Dr Derek Stork	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd Group Against Reservoir Development	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No No	Core Policy 14a - objection	<p>Several comments made in objection to Core Policy 14a for the following reasons:</p> <p>It has not met the relevant requirements of Section 39 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and cannot be found to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development It cannot be found sound or effective as has not been fully justified The relevant reasonable alternatives have not been assessed in the SA</p> <p>Comments from GARD which state that a banded reservoir of the type proposed at the East Hanney - Steventon site is not a resilient, cost-effective, or environmentally acceptable solution to the water shortage problems of the 21st century, and would:</p> <p>Pose a serious threat to the flood risk of the East Hanney – Steventon and South Abingdon areas Remove substantial areas of Grade 2 or Grade 3a farmland Shrink numerous footpaths, bridle paths and public space access.</p> <p>Comments propose the alteration of Core Policy 14a to remove the area of land between East Hanney and Steventon previously safeguarded under Core Policy 14.</p>	<p>Core Policy 14: Strategic Water Storage Reservoirs as set out in the adopted Local Plan 2031: Part 1 was found to be soundly based following Local Plan Examination. Local Plan 2031: Part 2 proposes only to amend the area covered by Policy 14 at the request of Thames Water. The policy does not in itself inform the decision-making process as to whether a reservoir is needed, nor if it should be located within VOWH. It is for Thames Water and the process of updating their Water Resources Management Plan that will determine these matters. The policy simply safeguards the land, should a decision be taken through the WRMP that a reservoir is needed.</p> <p>The Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) 2014 published by Thames Water, confirms that the Upper Thames Reservoir remains their preferred option, should a large storage reservoir solution be found to be necessary. Details of their appraisals and options considered may be found within the management plan mentioned above.</p>
1096915 1097353 1143289 1145048 1145361	Liam Ryder	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd Gladman Developments Lagan Homes Limited Earl of Plymouth Estates Ltd Hinton Group Ltd	1022452 872479 1145049 1145360	Mr Fenwick Mr Paul Slater Mr Gareth Williams Mr James Griffin	WYG Planning & Environment Edgars Limited Litchfields Hunter Page Planning	No No No No	Expansion of safeguarded area	<p>A number of comments were made objecting to the expansion of the area safeguarded for the Upper Thames Strategic Reservoir for the following reasons:</p> <p>Whilst the safeguarded area appears to be indicative only, the proposal significantly expands the safeguarded area in all directions, which now encompasses the majority of land between the A34 to the east, A388 to the west, railway line to the south and Marcham Mill to the north.</p> <p>It is a matter of concern that no explanation has been provided for this expansion; the Council should publish the evidence that underpins this approach The Council has not referred to any new appropriate evidence since the adoption of LPP1 which justifies the expansion of area; of particular concern is the lack of reference to the Thames Water Resources Management Plan 2019 Concern that the Council might maintain the safeguarding even if the Thames Water Management</p>	<p>Core Policy 14: Strategic Water Storage Reservoirs as set out in the adopted Local Plan 2031: Part 1 was found to be soundly based following Local Plan Examination. Local Plan 2031: Part 2 proposes only to amend the area covered by Policy 14 at the request of Thames Water. The policy does not in itself inform the decision-making process as to whether a reservoir is needed, nor if it should be located within VOWH. It is for Thames Water and the process of updating their Water Resources Management Plan that will determine these matters. The policy simply safeguards the land, should a decision be taken through the WRMP that a reservoir is needed.</p> <p>The Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) 2014 published by Thames Water, confirms that the Upper Thames Reservoir remains their preferred option, should a large storage reservoir solution be found to be necessary. Core Policy 14a safeguards the land that Thames Water feel may be needed to meet future water needs. Details of their appraisals and options considered may be found within the management plan mentioned above.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Plan 2019 does not identify an operational requirement for a reservoir in this location Core Policy 14a is not justified Several comments objected to the expansion of the safeguarded area as it overlaps land interests, including:</p> <p>Land that has planning permission for open space, and the amended boundary of the proposed area abuts residential properties, which is unacceptable Land interests at East Hanney (including land on the north-eastern edge of East Hanney, Land East of the A338) and Land at Steventon that has planning permission for 65 dwellings</p> <p>Several comments recommend that the land safeguarded for a bypass to the south of Abingdon-on-Thames (saved through Core Policy 12 of Local Plan 2031 Part 1) should be planned for comprehensively alongside the proposed flood alleviation scheme and upper Thames reservoir. It is proposed that a Strategic Masterplan for the West of Abingdon is produced which details all future planned flood alleviation, water storage and transport works. This would ensure a comprehensive and rounded approach to development in the West of Abingdon ensuring that opportunities for the delivery of sustainable development are positively encouraged. The suggested Strategic Masterplan should consider all proposed works and their likely impact on adjacent and nearby potential development sites, including land adjacent to the A415.</p>	
752742 1145361	Mr Malcolm Moor	SAFAG Hinton Group Ltd	1145360	Mr James Griffin	Hunter Page Planning	No No	Flood alleviation measures	<p>There is no mention in the plan of how the possible reservoir relates to the proposed Abingdon Flood attenuation measures being produced by the Environment Agency on the same area of land west of the A34; these measures should have been explained in detail and included in the Appendix. Comments state that the Plan and supporting evidence base does not explicitly set out detail for flood alleviation measures, in particular, regarding the impact of severe floods on homes in Abingdon, and states that measures should be taken to provide long term slowing the flow of the River Ock.</p>	<p>The area safeguarded for flood risk management and for the possible future provision of a South Abingdon-on-Thames bypass are set out within the adopted Local Plan 2031: Part 1 which was found to be soundly based following Examination. These matters do not form part of the proposed Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>The Council continue to work closely with the Environment Agency, Thames Water, Highways England and the Highways Authority. None of these bodies have raised any concern relating to the cumulative impact of safeguarding for these schemes. Statements of Common Ground have been signed with these bodies.</p>
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Historic England - Archaeological Interest	<p>Comments made by Historic England in support of Core Policy 14a as an update to Core Policy 14, which requires any proposal for a reservoir to minimise the effect on the archaeological significance of the site.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes Historic England's support</p>
829470	Dr Christopher Baker					No	Impact on infrastructure	<p>Several comments raised concern over the potential impact on infrastructure:</p>	<p>Core Policy 14: Strategic Water Storage Reservoirs as set out in the adopted Local Plan 2031: Part 1 was found to be soundly based following Local Plan</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No	Impact on infrastructure	<p>One comment states that the plan does not address the impact of traffic in the area should the reservoir be built</p> <p>One comment highlights concern regarding the lack of buffer surrounding the major electricity substation included in the safeguarded area; the comment states that Thames Water's current proposal is to leave open land immediately adjoining the embankment and then to locate the flood compensation lower shelf and a watercourse diversion immediately alongside the electricity substation.</p> <p>An existing Intermediate Gas Main crosses part of the site and this area should be removed from the safeguarded land.</p>	<p>Examination. Local Plan 2031: Part 2 proposes only to amend the area covered by Policy 14 at the request of Thames Water. The policy does not in itself inform the decision-making process as to whether a reservoir is needed, nor if it should be located within VOWH. It is for Thames Water and the process of updating their Water Resources Management Plan that will determine these matters. The policy simply safeguards the land, should a decision be taken through the WRMP that a reservoir is needed.</p> <p>Detailed consideration of transport, infrastructure and other matters would form part of any future application for a reservoir, should one be forthcoming, these are adequately covered by the adopted and soundly based policy.</p>
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Impact on the environment	<p>A number of comments were made in relation to the impact of a potential Upper Thames Strategic Reservoir on the environment.</p> <p>Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire (BBO) Wildlife Trust have no principle objection to the safeguarding, but state that little detail is currently available, and thus they have a number of concerns, which include:</p> <p>The area contains considerable amounts of priority habitat (Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh)</p> <p>The reservoir might affect a Local Wildlife Site (The Cuttings and Hitchins Copse LWS)</p> <p>The impact on wildlife in the Thames downstream from the reservoir</p> <p>The potential impact on the Cothill Fen area which lies north of the proposed reservoir site, and includes habitats very sensitive to changes in water quantity and quality</p> <p>The potential impact on designated sites, priority habitats and species will need to be carefully considered and fully examined as part of the assessment of the impact of a reservoir, and should be avoided wherever possible.</p> <p>BBO Wildlife Trust also state that proposals for a new reservoir should be based on an assessed need for increasing water supply, and where possible promote new technologies for reducing the increase in demand for water.</p> <p>Other comments made raised concern over the impact on the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which outline that there has been a failure to take proper account of the likely impact of this safeguarding and subsequent harm of the reservoir development on the AONB.</p> <p>Comments propose the alteration of Core Policy 14a to remove, or as a minimum substantially reduce, the</p>	<p>Core Policy 14: Strategic Water Storage Reservoirs as set out in the adopted Local Plan 2031: Part 1 was found to be soundly based following Local Plan Examination. Local Plan 2031: Part 2 proposes only to amend the area covered by Policy 14 at the request of Thames Water. The policy does not in itself inform the decision-making process as to whether a reservoir is needed, nor if it should be located within VOWH. It is for Thames Water and the process of updating their Water Resources Management Plan that will determine these matters. The policy simply safeguards the land, should a decision be taken through the WRMP that a reservoir is needed.</p> <p>Detailed consideration of environmental and ecology and other matters would form part of any future application for a reservoir, should one be forthcoming, these are adequately covered by the adopted and soundly based policy.</p>
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust			No				
1143220	Dr Derek Stork	Group Against Reservoir Development			No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								area of land previously safeguarded in Core Policy 14.	
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1144960	Ms Katherine Jones			Thames Water - support	<p>Comments made by Thames Water in support of Core Policy 14a and the safeguarded area for the Upper Thames Reservoir site, which reflects the latest plans for the proposal.</p> <p>Thames Water Resource Management Plan 19 will be submitted to DEFRA in December 2017 for a three-month public consultation starting in January 2018. It is anticipated that the final plan will be submitted for approval in the second half of 2018 for the Secretary of State to decide whether or not to hold a Public Inquiry by mid- 2019. Thames Water are also currently working on the draft Business Plan for the next Price Review in 2019. A number of Local Engagement Forums covering these will be held throughout February 2018.</p>	The Council notes the comments from Thames Water.

Core Policy 15a: South East Vale Sub Area

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)				No	Aircraft Safeguarding Zone	The response identifies that development at Harwell Village falls within a designated aircraft safeguarding zone for RAF Benson. The proposals will need to comply with appropriate standards.	Whilst the Part 2 plan does not promote any development at Harwell Village, the response is noted. This matter would be picked up through the Development Management process.
1097491	Summix (Chilton) Development LLP		1097488	Peter Frampton		No	Alternative Site - Chilton	A number of representations identify alternatives sites within the South East Vale Sub-Area for consideration for allocation within the Part 2 plan. These includes sites at: East Hendred, Chilton, East Challow, Milton Heights, Grove east of A338, South of Harwell Campus and Sutton Courtenay. The submissions variously describe the sites as being sustainable locations for development. Comments highlight the importance of providing sufficient sites to provide flexibility, to support housing delivery, and to contribute to significantly boosting the supply of housing within the district. A number of the comments refer to many of the alternatives lying outside the AONB or Oxford Green Belt, therefore providing an opportunity to bring forward development without leading to any impact on these designated areas.	The updated completions and commitments figures, set out in LPP2, mean that the Vale's Objectively Assessed Need (20,560) is already fully planned for, without any need for further allocations within LPP2. Even if the Council's proposed amendment to the windfall allowance was not supported by the Inspector, and without any site allocations in LPP2, supply would still exceed 21,000. It is important to note that the completions and commitments include around 22 percent (around 1300 dwellings) made up of smaller sites (less than 200 dwelling sites); and so the requirement envisaged in LPP1 for small site allocations has been more than adequately met. This is true for the district as a whole, and for each Sub-Area individually. The Council have prepared a short addendum to the Housing Topic Paper to illustrate this point more clearly. Within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, the Part 1 plan identified a need for the Part 2 plan to allocate 56 dwellings; the Part 2 plan actually allocates 1400 dwellings. The housing requirement for this Sub-Area is 12,150 dwellings, the actual proposed supply is 13,362 dwellings. The Sub-Area housing requirement is updated in-line with changes to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area to reflect the residual necessary to meet the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale. The adjustment is based on a pro-rata basis across each of the three Sub-Areas. On this basis, the Council is content the housing requirement figures for the Sub-Area, the Windfall allowance and the proposed site allocations are appropriate, robust and consistent with national policy. The Council is content that its approach to site assessment is sufficiently robust. This approach, and the alternatives considered, are set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper. The Council are seeking to ensure that the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford, to be addressed within the Vale, is met within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and that at least 2,200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. Although the Council are proposing two additional site allocations within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, these are for site specific reasons. One of the two sites (North West Grove) is not expected to deliver until later in the plan period.
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd,					Alternative Site - East Challow		
1145333	Mr John Pearce						Alternative Site - East Hendred		
1096069	Ms Jones	Redcliffe Homes Ltd				No			
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Alternative Site - Grove East of A338		
730259	Mr Graham Mundy	Grove Parish Council				Yes			
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley				
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No	Alternative Site - Harwell Village		
1095934	Ms P Dothie					No	Alternative Site - Housing Allocation		
1145068	Mr Stuart Gibson					No	Alternative Site - Milton Heights		
1097815		Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	1097816	Hannah Bowler	Turley	Office use only - blank	Alternative Site - South of Harwell Campus		
1143993	Mr Marc Rawcliffe					No	Alternative Site - Sutton Courtenay		

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									Overall, the Council is content that the proposed supply set out in the Part 1 and Part 2 plans are deliverable. However, the plan already provides flexibility within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, in the event that some sites deliver more slowly, as provided by Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring Fence. This approach was found to be soundly based through the Part 1 plan examination.
1145068	Mr Stuart Gibson					No	Alternative site - The Crofts, Milton Heights	Comment states that the Harwell Campus allocation will take time to come forward, and may perhaps not be fully implemented within the plan period, especially considering its removal from LPP1. An additional site at The Crofts, Milton Heights is proposed as a sustainable option that is not constrained by the AONB and would help accelerate housing delivering within the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine growth corridor.	The Council have undertaken extensive studies to ensure the site at Harwell Campus can be delivered within the plan period. The Council are working with the Campus, key stakeholders and the site promoters to ensure the site is developed before 2031. The site proposed is different to the sites removed through the part 1 examination. The Council have worked with the Campus to provide exceptional circumstances to demonstrate a need for housing on the Campus. The Council acknowledge other sites submitted to the Council and these have been tested through the site selection process. The results of these can be found within the Site Selection Topic Paper.
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd,					Alternative site - West of Wantage	Comment states that the Council has not adequately demonstrated that insufficient land is available outside the AONB to accommodate housing required to support the growth at Harwell Campus. An additional site at Land to the West of Wantage is proposed as a sustainable option that is not constrained by the AONB and would help accelerate housing delivery within the Science Vale area.	The Council acknowledge other sites submitted to the Council and these have been tested through the site selection process. The results of these can be found within the Site Selection Topic Paper. The new work-live-play community will be delivered as an innovation village, with a new residential neighbourhood being created as an attractive living environment, designed to provide new homes for both permanent and transient employees and will help transform the campus into a world class campus environment.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No	Education - Statutory OCC	Additional secondary school capacity will also be needed in the District. A new secondary school is expected on Grove Airfield further to consented development there. There is some existing capacity in Abingdon, but in the longer term there is an opportunity to create a new secondary school at Dalton Barracks. Additional capacity in Didcot is being created within neighbouring South Oxfordshire (Aureus and an as yet unnamed future school at Didcot North East). Expansions of other existing secondary schools in the Vale are planned (Matthew Arnold, Faringdon, King Alfred's). It is suggested that work is required, in particular on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and on revising the Regulation 123 list, to have confidence that the Plan will be effective - that is that it will be deliverable over the plan period in relation to providing for new and expanding schools	Comments relating to education provision is noted and welcome. The Council continues to work positively with the County Council to plan for infrastructure delivery and is content the plan provides a sufficient policy framework to ensure infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner. The IDP is a live document and will continue to be updated to reflect the most up to date available information and the Council welcome the support from the County Council to achieve this outcome. The Council is reviewing its approach to CIL in the context of the Part 2 plan sites and will ensure appropriate updates are implemented in time for the plan adoption.
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No	Employment Development - Role of Science Vale	A number of responses refer to the specialist nature of the employment sector within the Science Vale area and its role in maximising benefit for the scientific sector and potential for developing its world	This Council is content that sufficient employment land and variety of sites are provided to enable the market to deliver a range of employment uses on different sites and maximise both the areas potential
1097559	MEPC		1097558	Laura Black					

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley			class centre for science and innovation. It is suggested that employment development should be restricted to specific sectors and that the scarce employment space should only be used to further scientific and technical innovation. A number of responses provide narrative setting out the importance of the Science Vale area and its potential for economic growth and the importance of ensuring sufficient housing comes forward to unlock this economic potential.	for science and innovation, in addition to supporting wider employment sectors. The Council considers that this matter relates to policies set out within the Part 1 plan, which was found to be soundly based at Examination. The Part 1 plan was informed by Economic projections to ensure that sufficient employment land was provided for.
728491	Mr Paul Gibbs	Culham Parish Council				No	Implications of Brexit	This response makes reference to the 2016 refresh of the Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan and in particular draws reference to the comments it makes about Brexit. It states, for example, that Brexit could have important implications for the Oxfordshire economy including the potential that alternative funding may need to be found for universities and for science research projects such as the European Space Agency. It is suggested that the impact of Brexit should be known before the scale of growth within the district is confirmed.	The Council note that the SEP refresh included some comments relating to Brexit. However, the Council consider that it is too early to draw any conclusions about what the long-term consequences will be. The Council understands that the European Space Agency already includes members that fall outside the EU, including for example Canada and that many of the business and research organisations within the district, particular within Science Vale, are internationally significant. It is noted that OXLEP have provided support for the approach taken by the Local Plan 2031: Part 2. The Council is content that its monitoring framework is sufficiently robust to ensure that if economic growth were to fall in the future, that future iterations of the plan could take this into account. The Council is obliged to plan on the basis of the best information available at the time.
1051321 1097666	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company Catesby Estates Ltd	1097667	Louise Steele	Framptons	Yes No	LP2011 Allocation - Grove Airfield & Part 1 Allocation at Monks Farm	Some comments are made that relate to the LP2011 allocation at Grove Airfield and the Part 1 allocation at Monks Farm. Reference is made to the slow delivery of housing on this site and the importance of the site delivering the North Grove Link Road.	The Council is content that the Grove Airfield site will deliver in accordance with the published trajectory and acknowledges the importance of delivering the North Grove Link Road. The proposed allocation within the Part 2 plan at North West Grove is designed to assist infrastructure delivery in Grove and facilitate more effective and long term master planning. The site is not expected to deliver until much later in the plan period.
902309	NHS Oxfordshire CCG	Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	1142842	Mrs Anne Lankester		No	LP2011 Allocation at Grove Airfield - Statutory CCG	The CCG state that they can see no reference made to health care provision being provided in relation to the LP2011 allocation at Grove Airfield and going forward ask that developer contributions are considered as a vital element of any large-scale housing development.	Comments noted. The Part 2 plan makes reference within the Site Development Templates to contributions towards health care from the proposed allocations and the Council is content that going forward, this matter is being addressed. The policy requirements of the LP2011 allocation of Grove Airfield is not a matter of soundness for the Part 2 plan.
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley		LP2031 Part 1 Allocation - East of Sutton Courtenay	Reference is made to the LPP1 allocation to the East of Sutton Courtenay that has since had a planning application refused. It is suggested that if it is the view of the LPA that the site cannot be delivered that alternative sites should be allocated elsewhere within the Sub-Area.	The principle of development on land East of Sutton Courtenay is established with the site being allocated within the Part 1 plan. The reason for refusal of the planning application relates to how the applicants have demonstrated how the site will overcome site specific technical constraints. The site will be considered at Planning Appeal in 2018. In the event the delivery of this site is delayed whilst additional technical work is undertaken to demonstrate how the technical constraints can be overcome, the proposed supply within the Sub-Area will still exceed the

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									identified requirement. Within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, the Part 1 plan identified a need for the Part 2 plan to allocate 56 dwellings; the Part 2 plan actually allocates 1400 dwellings. The housing requirement for this Sub-Area is 12,150 dwellings, the actual proposed supply is 13,362 dwellings.
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Public Transport	This comment is critical of the Council's approach to considering opportunities for public transport and suggests that alternative sites may offer more opportunities for Public Transport within the Sub-Area. It is suggested that the Grove Airfield site is particularly problematic and that it will require a new bus service running in parallel to current corridors and is unlikely to support a bus service of more than 30-minute frequency.	The Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council, who as Highways Authority, are well placed to offer advice on matters relating to highway's planning, including for public transport. North West Grove sits between two existing allocations at Grove Airfield and Monks Farm and is connected by the North Grove Link Road. Both of these sites will be served by public transport. The additional allocation at North West Grove can therefore benefit from public transport routes that will be needed in any case, and improve the viability of these services. Grove Airfield is an existing allocation and is not a matter of soundness for the Local Plan Part 2.
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley		South East Vale Housing Requirement	A number of comments refer to the housing requirement for the South-East Vale Sub-Area. In particular, comparison is made to the housing supply figures referred to within Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring Fence and the requirement set out within the Sub-Area Strategy. It is suggested that any housing over and above that set out within CP5, should be provided outside the Ring Fence area, i.e. at Blewbury. However, that given that the Adopted Blewbury Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate any housing, it is suggested that this appears to be unlikely to happen. On this basis, it is suggested that more housing should be allocated within the South-East Vale Sub-Area. The response describes the importance of this Sub-Area to the plan strategy in supporting significant housing, employment and infrastructure delivery and goes onto question the delivery of some of the larger sites and thus that additional sites should be allocated to provide assurance the plan objectives will be met. Furthermore, the proposed allocation at North West Grove is considered unsound as it fails the requirement at Paragraph 182 of National Planning Policy Framework to be positively prepared, that it is not the most appropriate strategy when compared with alternatives, that the site is not effective as it is not deliverable within the plan period.	The Sub-Area strategies provide spatial focus for the plan and ensure it makes appropriate provision for housing across each part of the district. The role of the South-East Vale is clearly articulated in being the main focus of supporting economic growth and thus accommodates the majority of the Vale's housing need, along with employment and infrastructure. Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring Fence sets out the Council's approach to monitoring housing land supply and makes clear that 'for the purposes of the assessment of housing land supply, the ring-fence area will be treated as a separate sub-area with a housing requirement of 11,850 homes in the plan period'. This does not prevent the Council from planning for more housing within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, which for the most part, overlaps with the Ring-Fence, area as reflected by the Sub-Area strategy. There is no reason this additional supply should be restricted to those parts of the Sub-Area that fall outside the Ring-Fence area – those areas outside the Ring-Fence lie within the AONB and are unlikely to support, or deliver any sizable levels of development. The approach described above was found to be soundly based through the Part 1 plan examination. Furthermore, the Part 2 plan seeks to make provision for more housing than the identified requirement. The housing requirement for this Sub-Area, as set out within the Part 2 plan, is 12,150 dwellings, the actual proposed supply is 13,362 dwellings. On this basis, the Council is content the plan is positively prepared and consistent with national policy. It is consistent with the Part 1 plan, that was found to be soundly based and makes provision to not only fully meet the identified Objectively Assessed Need, but provides considerable flexibility.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									As has been explained elsewhere, the North-West Grove Site is not expected to deliver housing until much later in the plan period, there is no reliance on this site doing so and this has no impact on the plans ability to support the identified housing requirement. This site is proposed to assist with delivering the North Grove Link Road and facilitate master-planning for Grove more comprehensively. Even if the North-West Grove Site was not proposed for allocation at all, the identified housing requirement would still be exceeded by over 800 homes.
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council					South East Vale Housing Requirement - Statutory SODC	Core Policy 8a and Core Policy 15a South Oxfordshire District Council support the Vale of White Horse in their approach to managing the delivery of development and focusing growth through the continued use of spatial sub areas and development supply areas. Core Policy 15a, in particular, will support economic investment in Science Vale and Didcot Garden Town and provide new homes near jobs. We also support the view that this will maintain critical investment in, and the delivery of, key infrastructure.	Support noted and welcome.

North-West of Grove

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments from Stagecoach	A number of comments are made by Stagecoach who describe the North-West Grove site as an unsustainable location that is unlikely to be connected by sustainable modes of travel	The North-West Grove Site will be well related to the planned Grove Railway Station. Public Transport provision is being planned for the Grove Airfield and Monks Farm sites and so, on this basis, there is no reason why the North-West Grove site, that sits between the two sites, could not also be successfully connected. Indeed, the identification of the site for allocation facilitates master planning and planning more generally for this wider area together.
1097677 874560 758199	Ms Helen Marshall John Richards	David Wilson Homes (Southern) Campaign to Protect Rural England Dandara Ltd,	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley	No	Deliverability of site	<p>There have been a number of comments relating to the deliverability of the site within the local plan time period. These include:</p> <p>Due to Vale's admission that the housing will not come forward until the end of the plan period, shows that 400 homes are not needed in Grove.</p> <p>The site is not able to come forward until the effective completions of Grove Airfield and Monks Farm. Concern is raised over the delivery of the Monks Farm site, which is said to be constrained by a BOAT. This is thought to impact on the delivery of the Part 2 proposed allocation at North West Grove, which is considered to be unlikely until beyond the plan period. Grove Airfield was allocated within Local Plan 2011 and should, by now, have been delivering housing. Due to the delay of this site, the allocation for 400 dwellings in the North-West of Grove is not likely to come forward within this plan period.</p> <p>The SA highlights that the delivery of the site is uncertain given the scale of committed growth at adjacent sites.</p> <p>The site selection topic paper rules out a site to the West of Wantage due to the significant amount of growth within the area. However, the allocation for 400 dwellings has been proposed without the same concerns. Therefore, the testing of the sites has been inconsistent and raises questions regarding predetermination of the evidence base.</p> <p>The Grove Airfield northern spur road may not be needed within this plan period and therefore this allocation is also not needed before 2031.</p>	The North West Grove site is proposed as an allocation to facilitate a comprehensive approach to masterplanning the north western part of Grove, including the latter phasing of Grove Airfield, the more Western phasing of Monks farm, and thus also facilitating a more comprehensive approach to planning for infrastructure and assist with delivering the North West Grove Link Road, enabling more effective masterplanning for Grove, in particular, the integration of the adjoining Grove Airfield and Monks Farm sites. The site is not expected to deliver housing until later in the plan period. However, the rationale for its allocation is not relied on to deliver housing to meet the Objectively Assessed Need for the district. The planned housing supply within the South-East Vale Sub-Area is greater than the identified requirement, this providing sufficient flexibility. The Council is content that the approach to site selection is robust and is consistent with the approach taken to inform the Local Plan Part 1, which was found to be soundly-based. The approach to site selection is set out within the site selection topic paper and clearly sets out the Council's justification and rationale.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Housing Numbers	<p>There is one comment that highlights that there is no evidence to allocate an additional 400 dwellings to a settlement that the inspector refers to already having a significant expansion with the allocations within Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and Local Plan 2011.</p> <p>The housing requirement for the South-East should have been met within Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and so there should not be a need to allocate any more within part 2. The allocation of an addition 1400 dwellings within the south-east region is not in line with the spatial strategy.</p>	The North-West Grove site is proposed as an allocation to facilitate a comprehensive approach to masterplanning the north-western part of Grove, including the latter phasing of Grove Airfield, the more Western phasing of Monks farm, and thus also facilitating a more comprehensive approach to planning for infrastructure and assist with delivering the North-West Grove Link Road. The site is not expected to deliver housing until later in the plan period. The site is not relied on to deliver housing to meet the Objectively Assessed Need for the district.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>On this basis, the Council does not consider there is any inconsistency in approach. Grove is identified as a Local Service Centre within the Settlement Hierarchy. Development at Grove is considered to be highly consistent with two strands of the Spatial Strategy by focusing sustainable growth within the Science Vale area and by reinforcing the service centre roles of the main settlements across the district.</p> <p>The Council is content that the approach to site selection is robust and is consistent with the approach taken to inform the Local Plan Part 1, which was found to be soundly-based. The approach to site selection is set out within the site selection topic paper and clearly sets out the Council's justification and rationale.</p>
1142392 874560	Mr Vic Johnson Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No No	Infrastructure	<p>It is unclear how the allocation of a site for 400 dwellings will help to contribute to the North Grove Link Road.</p> <p>Local infrastructure will be significantly affected with the new development.</p> <p>If the reason provided by Vale is to allocate this site due to infrastructure needs, the Council need to highlight what facilities are needed and where they will be located</p>	<p>The Infrastructure requirements associated with the proposed site allocations are set out within the Site Development Templates and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that accompanies the plan. Allocating the North-West Grove site allows this site and area of Grove more generally to be planned more comprehensively and holistically. The North-West Grove Link Road will run through part of this site and so the allocation of the site can clearly assist in unlocking its delivery.</p>
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Mission Statement	<p>There is no indication how the new development will achieve a healthy and sustainable community.</p>	<p>The Council considers that the Development Plan policies taken together help to achieve sustainable development and contribute towards achieving healthy and sustainable communities. Infrastructure requirements are set out within the Site Development Templates for the proposed allocations that also provide policy requirements for the sites. As has been explained elsewhere, the allocation of this site helps to facilitate a more comprehensive approach to master planning for this area of Grove and assist with infrastructure delivery.</p>
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley		North West of Grove - Flooding	<p>The Topic Paper states that the site north west of Grove is associated with high groundwater flood risk. The site is in an area of medium to high risk of groundwater flooding as stated in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>	<p>The Council have undertaken various evidence based studies to inform the allocations within the Part 2 plan. Any required flood risk mitigation will be addressed in more detail during the masterplanning stage.</p>
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Requirement for SPD - Statutory OCC	<p>Oxfordshire County Council confirm that a number of matters they raised through the Preferred Options consultation have been addressed and that they have no concern over increasing the proposed allocation from 300 to 400 dwellings. The County Council consider that the plan is unsound if the total scale of development at the site is not determined within the plan document. It is suggested that an SPD could be prepared for the north-western area of Grove to assist with planning for this area and support a comprehensive approach.</p>	<p>The Council welcome the comments from the County Council and acknowledge the support for the approach to planning for the north-western part of Grove comprehensively. The Council does not have any objection to the preparation of an SPD for this part of Grove and recognise that this could be beneficial. However, the Council does not consider that the omission of a commitment to prepare an SPD is a matter of soundness of the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>The Council are proposing to allocate the site for up to 400 dwellings. The Council have sought to ensure the policy recognises that the site could accommodate more development in the longer term,</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									subject to appropriate infrastructure improvements. The onus would be on a developer demonstrating that additional development was both consistent with the Development Plan taken as a whole and able to support the delivery of appropriate infrastructure. This approach provides both flexibility and time to ensure sufficient evidence is provided to support the potential of additional development in the longer term, i.e. beyond the plan period.
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England					Support	The allocation of land north-west Grove is supported as it provides a logical complement to the existing allocated sites and complies with the requirements of the NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing in the District. Grove Parish Council and Persimmon Homes state their support for the proposed allocation at North West Grove.	Noted
758065	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	758063	Mr Andrew Raven	Savills	Support			
755900	Mr Keith Roberts	Persimmon Homes Wessex Ltd				Yes	Support		
730259	Mr Graham Mundy	Grove Parish Council				Yes	Support		
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley		Transport infrastructure	There are a number of comments relating to delivering transport infrastructure to support the development. These are: The land safeguarded for the train station is unjustified. The allocation of the site go against the aspirations to reopen the train station. There are limited opportunities to access the site. Denchworth road is narrow and does not provide the opportunity for two cars to pass safely. OCC commented on a planning application on a site to the north of Denchworth road stating that the highways network in the area, could only serve 150 dwellings and not 456. Without the GNLR in place, access to the site would be expected through Denchworth Road. The delivery of the GNLR road is dependent on the delivery of Grove Airfield and Monks Farm. North-West of Grove allocation is not required to complete the GNLR given that this infrastructure to the south of Denchworth Road is secured by the Grove Airfield permission. Developer contributions will be looked at to explore the potential for a sustainable bus service linking the three sites. North West Grove is not currently served by an hourly bus service as stated within the appraisal summary tables. The site is not served by public transport at all. Denchworth road is unsuitable to accommodate a regular bus service.	The North Grove Link Road will travel through the site, connecting Grove Airfield and Monks farm. Developers for all three sites will be expected to fund the road which will help ensure a joint up community. The location of appropriate infrastructure to support all three sites will be finalised through the master planning process of the sites. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan indicates the infrastructure needed and the financial contribution required The Infrastructure requirements associated with the proposed site allocations are set out within the Site Development Templates and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that accompanies the plan. Allocating the North-West Grove site allows this site and area of Grove more generally to be planned more comprehensively and holistically. The North-West Grove Link Road will run through part of this site and so the allocation of the site can clearly assist in unlocking its delivery. The North-West Grove Site will be well related to the planned Grove Railway Station. Public Transport provision is being planned for the Grove Airfield and Monks Farm sites and so, on this basis, there is no reason why the North-West Grove site, that sits between the two sites, could not also be successfully connected. Indeed, the identification of the site for allocation now facilitate master planning and planning more generally for this wider area together. This is more likely to assist the planning and delivery of viable public transport as it confirms the longer term scale of development and its location.
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company				Yes			
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford							
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								A bus service will not be provided until the North-West Grove Link Road is open. Sites within LPP1 has been allocated around existing built up areas with little or no regards to effective integration with current bus services.	
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Transport infrastructure - Statutory OCC	Oxfordshire County Council would like to raise concerns over the two level crossings to the east of the proposed allocation. These are PROW and should not be closed. This may need investigating further. There are potential issues to signalised Brook Lane Denchworth Road bridge and the need to consider PROW, cycle paths and future bus routes	The Council note the concerns the County Council has and will continue to work with them to overcome these issues. Proposals will need to comply with the policies within the Local Plan including development management 31: Protection of Public Rights of Way, National Trails and Open Access Areas.
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills	Office use only - blank	Water and Waste Network - Statutory Thames Water	There are two comments from Thames Water commenting on the Waste and Water Network within the area. It is suggested that development can probably not be supported using current facilities, in relation to the wasterwater network and drainage infrastructure. On this basis, it is expected that upgrades will be required and the developers are encouraged to work with Thames Water through the planning application process	The Council have worked closely with Thames Water and are grateful for their support. The Council have ensured that suitable upgrades are delivered through development to a range of requirements, including for utilities and for flood risk and drainage in accordance with the requirements set out in the Site Development Templates. The Council have prepared a Statement of Common Ground with Thames Water that confirms their support for the plan.

Core Policy 15b: Harwell Campus

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Access and highways	The proposed improvements to access and highways would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and recreational enjoyment of the North Wessex Downs AONB and Icknield Way for the following reasons:	The Council have prepared the Evaluation of Transport Impacts working in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council. The transport requirements are set out within Site Development Template within Appendix A of the Local Plan. This includes the enhancement of the Public Right of way and incorporating existing cycling and walking routes into the development. The implementation of any highway improvements will be considered in the context of masterplanning for the whole site, which is also being informed by the preparation of a Comprehensive Framework Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the campus. Core Policy 15b and the Site Development Templates sets out requirements including the need for development to contribute to a comprehensive landscape plan for the whole campus, no development being permitted within structural open space and perimeter landscaping and the need for higher quality of landscaping being required as a result of new development. The Council acknowledge alternative sites promoted to the Council. An extensive site selection process has been followed and the results are displayed within the site Selection topic paper. The Council are
1022463	Mr Graham Flint	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	724498	Mr Steven Pickles	West Waddy	No		Site boundary to the A4185 consists of line of mature trees which would need to be felled if a new junction was required, making the development visible from the AONB and Icknield Way Surface upgrades to the Hungerford Road byway would result in widening and therefore the removal of trees and hedgerows There is no information in the assessment as to why these improvements are required, specifically relating to access to the area of land north of the Icknield Way.	
1142694	Ms Kim and Holly Pringle and Spence					No		Development must take into account the importance of the North Wessex Downs AONB and Icknield Way as an historic route and they should be protected. One comment stated that the two road traffic surveys at Rowstock roundabout are inaccurate due to when they were conducted. Some comments suggest that the Harwell Campus allocation for 1,000 dwellings should be removed from	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								the Plan. One alternative site has been proposed at Land North of East Hendred.	satisfied that the proposed allocation at Harwell Campus is the most appropriate.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	East Hendred Parish Council					Alternative Sites - Car Parks	<p>The comment suggests that the Council has not considered alternative sites within the campus such as redeveloping car parks to help reduce private car use as promoted through the Didcot Garden Town. This would achieve a greater reduction in car use at Harwell Campus than the Council's proposals for 1,000 dwellings, which would generate an extra 6,000 trips per day, based on the TRICS database assumptions used by the County Council, and a reduced impact on the road network</p>	<p>The Council has considered a range of alternative sites including those submitted through earlier stages of consultation. Further details of this process is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council are preparing a Comprehensive Framework Masterplan for the whole Campus to ensure it is planned for holistically. Core Policy 15b sets out policy requirements, that includes, for example the need for development to be in accordance with and meet the requirements of a travel plan for the whole campus to make the necessary contributions in order to implement sustainable transport initiatives, including minimising car usage and increasing the use of public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>The location of any residential development within the Campus, also needs to be considered in the context of planning for the whole campus, for example, ensuring the site can continue to support significant economic growth, whilst facilitating the creation of a sustainable community.</p> <p>The Council have produced a report demonstrating the exceptional circumstance for the need for housing within Harwell Campus. The Site development templates and the IDP demonstrates the appropriate infrastructure required to promote sustainable modes of transport. By allocating land on the campus for a live-work-play innovation village, it will reduce the need to travel.</p>
1022463 1142694 1145284 1070818	Mr Graham Flint Ms Kim and Holly Pringle and Spence Mr Paul Harrison Mrs Charlotte Horne	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	724498	Mr Steven Pickles	West Waddy	No No	Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>Comments state that the Harwell Campus allocation is not realistic as it will affect biodiversity within the rural and unspoilt landscape surrounding Harwell Campus. Comments made include:</p> <p>Rapidly diminishing green spaces resulting in loss of flora and fauna. Objection to the previous felling of trees on site. One comment was made by a resident who wishes to apply for a Tree Preservation Order. The significant net loss of biodiversity as a result of the present proposed allocation. The site contains two rare plant species (White Helleborine and Yellow Bird's-nest) among other orchid plants. These species need to be considered if the development were to go ahead to enable successful translocation. Topic Paper 2 Site Selection Appendix states ecological impact as green which is misleading; it should be listed as red.</p>	<p>The Council are content that appropriate mitigation for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and green infrastructure of the site has been considered.</p> <p>The site selection process has considered biodiversity and the site promoters have prepared a detailed ecological impact assessment. The Council has engaged with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders including specialist ecology and tree officers on matters relating to biodiversity the natural environment.</p> <p>Appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 sets out the requirements for appropriate biodiversity and green infrastructure provisions to ensure the proposed site allocation at Harwell Campus is suitable, sustainable and meets the requirements set out within the NPPF. These provisions are supported by the conclusions within the Joint Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Habitats Regulations Assessment which set out the green infrastructure opportunities that could help to</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Common toads, common lizards, two species of bat were recorded on site and should be protected.</p> <p>There are no specific habitat protection or mitigation measures identified in Policy 15b.</p> <p>Concerns following Part 1 have not been alleviated.</p> <p>The site meets the criteria for designation as a County Wildlife site.</p> <p>An alternative site is proposed at Land North of East Hendred which would have less impact on biodiversity and provide the opportunity for habitat creation along the East Hendred Brook.</p> <p>The plan needs to be more detailed with regard to the proximity of new buildings to existing residences at North Drive, and considerations made to the private estate and road access.</p> <p>One comment quotes Didcot Garden Town in regards to biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The comment disapproves of the use of artificial green spaces to place the natural green space on the campus. They believe that the development will not conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>The response believes that 1400 new dwellings being built close to 50 existing dwellings is not appropriate to the location and therefore is not compliant with Development Policy 24.</p> <p>It is impossible to add 1400 dwellings to this area without destroying the area's character. Harwell Campus is not all brownfield. Part of the area is greenfield and used recreationally by the public.</p>	<p>protect and enhance the green infrastructure at Harwell Campus.</p> <p>Part of the land is currently brownfield and can be used to help cater to the housing needs of the campus and the district. Core Policy 15b states that existing important wildlife habitats will be retained and opportunities for the creation of new wildlife will be taken, where possible.</p>
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	East Hendred Parish Council				Office use only - blank	Boundary of Employment Site	<p>Comments state that the site proposed for development in LPP1 was not the same site boundary as proposed for housing in LPP2 (it did not go north of Icknield Way), and was more in keeping with the area (development would have been sparser). One comment states that there is no planning permission for development on this area of land; to refer to the land as 'allocated for development' is misleading the public.</p> <p>The land to the north of Icknield Way was not in the LPP1 employment area which the consultee speculates is because of the worse access and land surface, the allocation of which for housing enables the Campus to sell land that does not have commercial value that they have to pay to maintain.</p>	<p>The land is already allocated for employment through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. The site is allocated for employment use and residential development provides the opportunity not only to reduce likely impacts but also to implement a successful mitigation strategy. .</p> <p>The Council considers the site to be predominantly Brownfield land. The Council will continue to work with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders to ensure the impact of developing on the greenfield aspects of the site and on Icknield Way will be carefully managed and mitigated through the master planning of the site.</p>
1095843	Dr James Wickens		No						
1101804	Alex Chandler		No						
1142694	Ms Kim and Holly Pringle and Spence		No						
1144461	Mr Jamie Brown		Yes						
1144606	Mr Peter Ashbourne		No						
1145040	Mrs Ellen Krier		No						

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>The site is not predominantly brownfield, and includes a large area of biodiverse land, established trees and the Icknield Way. The green at the northern edge of the site, nor the Colonel's houses, are not brownfield. The reference to this being predominantly brownfield should be removed from the plan (proposed correction: "The land proposed for development at Harwell Campus is already allocated for development and is predominantly brownfield (previously developed) land (Appendix C)." Should be removed from the LPP2 and replaced with "ALTHOUGH SOME BROWNFIELD, THE SITE IS PREDOMINATELY WOODED OR RECREATIONAL LAND. THE NORTHERN (ESTIMATED) 8HA OF THE SITE IS NOT BROWNFIELD SITE BUT AN AREA OF LOCAL IMPORTANCE TO THE RESIDENTS WITH THE MATURE WOODLAND AND ABUNDANT FLORA AND FAUNA. THE CURRENT EDGE OF THE SITE MAKES A BEAUTIFUL STATEMENT FOR ALL OF THOSE WHO WISH TO WALK THE HISTORIC ICKNIELD WAY WHICH IS KNOWN AS THE OLDEST ROAD IN BRITAIN AND ALL OF WHICH WOULD BE A HUMONGOUS LOSS TO NOT ONLY AT A LOCAL SCALE BUT ALSO AT NATIONAL SCALE.")</p> <p>One comment states that the border of any proposed housing on this site must be redrawn so as to match that previously allocated for development</p> <p>There are conflicting policies and proposals for Harwell Campus in Saved 2011 Local Plan Policy E7, in 2016 Local Plan Part 1 Policies CP6, CP15, the Map for S.E. Vale & Appendix C, and 2017 Local Plan Part 2 Policies 15a & 15b and Appendix C.</p> <p>Some comments, including those made by East Hendred Parish Council, seek the deletion of the Harwell Campus allocation for 1,000 dwellings from the Plan.</p>	<p>The area proposed for development through the Part 2 plan at Harwell Campus is substantially different to that proposed through the Part 1 process. At Part 1, two parcels of land were promoted, one to the east of the Campus, that was entirely greenfield, undeveloped land that was entirely outside the existing Campus. The second was to the north of the campus, that extended beyond the existing campus, and so beyond areas allocated for employment. The land proposed within the Part 2 plan lies entirely within the existing campus that is already allocated for development. The proposal does not extend beyond the campus boundary at any location.</p>
1142694	Ms Kim and Holly Pringle and Spence					No	Climate change	<p>The allocation at Harwell Campus will increase CO2 emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and increase vehicles in the area. LPP2, specifically in relation to Harwell Campus, details no management of these problems and no development of diverse renewable energy resources.</p>	<p>All proposals for development will need to comply with the policies within Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and Part 2. Core Policies 37 and 40 encourage to the developers to ensure the development is sustainable and resilient to climate change and incorporates climate change adaptations and design measures. Core Policy 41 relates to Renewable Energy and will be considered in relation to planning applications for Harwell Campus.</p> <p>The preparation of a Comprehensive Framework Masterplan for the site provides an enhanced opportunity to plan for climate change resilience. The development of a live work play community also helps to make the site more sustainable, both reducing</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>journeys to work and improving the use of public transport during the day time (i.e. from families living on site- most public transport use may currently be related to journeys to and from work).</p> <p>The Didcot Garden Town Initiative includes work examining opportunities for developing a Combined Heat and Power network at key sites including at Harwell Campus.</p>
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England					Comments from Highways England	Highways England notes the numbers of dwellings allocated at North-West Grove and Harwell Campus	The Council will continue to work positively with Highways England and other key stakeholders to plan appropriately for development. The Site Development Templates include measure relating to planning for highways which Highways England comment on separately.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Comments from Historic England - Historic Environment Assessment	<p>Historic England welcome the reference to an Historic Buildings and Historic Environment Assessment to inform the Comprehensive Development Framework for Harwell Campus, but feel that Policy 15b should contain a firm requirement for development proposals at the Campus to conform to the framework, rather than being "guided" by it. Alternatively, Policy 15b should contain a firm requirement to take the Historic Buildings and Historic Environment Assessment into account to provide protection for historic buildings and environment, as required by the NPPF. In light of this, they suggest an amendment to the text.</p> <p>The first sentence of Core Policy 15b should be amended to read: "All new development at Harwell Campus will be EXPECTED TO CONFORM WITH a comprehensive development framework" and the second and third sentences of the fifth paragraph should be amended to read: "Development proposals will be considered in the context of a comprehensive approach to the whole Campus in accordance with the criteria set out below AND WILL BE EXPECTED TO CONFORM WITH A COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK THAT WILL BE PUBLISHED AS A SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT, WHICH WILL ENSURE THAT:" Alternatively, a fifth criterion should be added: "THE DEVELOPMENT REFLECTS THE HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT ASSESSMENT".</p>	The Council is content the policy requirements set out within the General Requirements for all Housing Site Allocations set out within the Introduction to the Development Site Templates (Appendix A). These include the requirement for heritage assets 'should be conserved and enhanced, where appropriate'.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No	Comments from Oxfordshire County Council - Education	<p>Comments from Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) regarding pupil numbers at both primary and secondary level. The size of allocations at Dalton Barracks, East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Harwell Campus means that they create need for new schools or expansion to existing schools. The Local Plan may not be effective if funding for pupil places cannot be assured.</p> <p>OCC state that further work is required, particularly on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and on the Regulation</p>	Appendix A: Site Development Templates includes the requirement for the developer to deliver a new primary school with nursery provision and contribute towards increasing secondary and SEN school capacity within Didcot and Wantage. The Council is content this is sufficient and ensures the site provides appropriate education infrastructure. This appears to be consistent with advice offered by the County Council.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								123 list, to have confidence that the plan will be effective and deliverable over the plan period in relation to providing for new and expanding schools.	The Council continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other key infrastructure providers to identify infrastructure which is necessary to support growth proposed in the Part 2 plan. The updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is published alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan. The Council are updating their CIL Charging Schedule in parallel to progressing the Part 2 plan.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments from Oxfordshire County Council - Exceptional circumstances	Comment from Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) regarding the Harwell Exceptional Circumstances report, which provides evidence for the proposed allocation of this land which is within the North Wessex Downs AONB. The County is a member of the North Wessex Downs AONB Council of Partners and note their responsibility to have regard to the purpose of AONBs. They understand that the views of the North Wessex Downs AONB Council of Partners are being sought to ensure that exceptional circumstances have been established.	The Council acknowledge the comment submitted from Oxfordshire County Council. The Council understands that the County is a member of the North Wessex Downs AONB Council of Partners. The Council will continue to work with Key stakeholders to ensure the allocation is justified in the context of the Exceptional Circumstances test and that any impact on the AONB is minimised.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments from Oxfordshire County Council - Infrastructure	<p>Comments from Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) regarding infrastructure for the Harwell Campus allocation. The production of a Comprehensive Development Framework should help ensure this new Innovation Village is integrated with the Campus, thus resulting impacts on the transport network. The Campus already benefits from the recent opening of north-facing slips on the A34 at Chilton as well as other improvements to the transport network in the Science Vale.</p> <p>OCC has concerns that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) may not adequately identify the various works required and requests that this is reviewed.</p> <p>The primary school will need to be sited in a position which meets the County's school requirements.</p> <p>OCC state that a revision of the Core Policy 15b is required along the following lines: 'Proposals for development within the Campus must demonstrate how they contribute towards a comprehensive approach to development COMPLY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SPD AND CONTRIBUTE TO INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE MANNER SET OUT IN THAT FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL REQUIRE ALL PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT TO CONTRIBUTE FAIRLY TOWARDS THE JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TRANSPORT, EDUCATION, OPEN SPACE AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE.</p>	The IDP has been updated for the submission of the Local Plan to address these concerns and has been prepared in partnership and on an ongoing basis, with the County Council. The IDP continues to be a live document and can be updated should new information become available in the future. The preparation of a Comprehensive Development Framework for the Campus provides an opportunity to consider more detailed masterplanning matters.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments from Oxfordshire County Council - Supplementary Planning Document	Comment from Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) acknowledging that the District has published appropriate evidence to indicate that the proposed loss of land will not lead to lower job growth. The County note that a SoCG has been prepared with OxLEP and Harwell Science and Innovation Campus Ltd and support the proposal for a Comprehensive Development Framework set out in Core Policy 15b.	The Council acknowledges and welcomes the County Council's support for a comprehensive approach to planning for Harwell Campus and the development of a live work play community. The Council is content that Core Policy 15b provides sufficient flexibility. It is the responsibility of the Council to progress the SPD quickly to provide additional guidance to inform any future applications, without unduly restricting or

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>The policy provides for this to become a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), however it is not clear that the SPD is required in advance of a planning application for the development. They seek revisions of text to ensure this is clear.</p> <p>OCC state that a revision of the Core Policy 15b is required along the following lines: 'Proposals for development within the Campus must demonstrate how they contribute towards a comprehensive approach to development COMPLY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SPD AND CONTRIBUTE TO INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE MANNER SET OUT IN THAT FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL REQUIRE ALL PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT TO CONTRIBUTE FAIRLY TOWARDS THE JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TRANSPORT, EDUCATION, OPEN SPACE AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE.</p>	harming economic growth that may come forward in the short term. The Policy provides a high level policy framework. The Development Site Templates provides further policy requirements for the housing allocation proposed within the Part 2 plan.
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water Utilities	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills		Comments from Thames Water - Water and Wastewater Infrastructure	<p>Comments made by Thames Water stating that the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Strategic water supply infrastructure upgrades and updates to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. A detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application.</p> <p>Thames Water encourage the developer to work with them on these matters.</p>	The Council acknowledges that the existing utilities need upgrading to ensure the new development is sustainable. The Site Development Templates set out the requirement for developers to work with Thames Water to ensure appropriate infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner.
756760 1021077	Mr Roger Turnbull Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	East Hendred Parish Council Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd	No	Contrary to national and local policy	<p>Core Policy 15a is contrary to national and local policy because:</p> <p>The inclusion of Saved Local Plan 2011 Policy E7 is unsound as it has been superseded by LPP1 Policies CP6 and CP15, and a review of these policies in LPP2. It therefore doesn't comply with the NPPF guidance and lacks clarity as to which policies will apply to Harwell Campus and should be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>The allocation is proposed in a location already allocated from employment purposed in LPP1. Residential development in this area will impact on the strategic importance of this employment allocation for the local, regional and national economy.</p>	Policy E7 of the Local Plan 2011 will be superseded by Local Plan 2031 Part 2. Policy E7 is saved and remains saved until it is replaced by Part 2. The saved policies are listed within the Part 1 plan. The council considers that there is sufficient land remaining at Harwell Campus, including within the EZ, to meet the planned economic growth on the site. The principle of development of this land already exists. The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstance study which demonstrates the justification for the development proposed within the Part 2 plan. The Council have signed a Statement of Common Ground with OxLEP who support the proposal.
756760 872717 1097646	Mr Roger Turnbull Mr Brian Morris Ian Hepburn	East Hendred Parish Council North Wessex Downs AONB				No No	DCLG Consultation	<p>Comments made regarding the DCLG Consultation:</p> <p>Extra provision is inappropriate following new calculations for Objectively Assessed Need; increase in the allocation has now included greenfield AONB within the proposed allocated land, whilst off-campus demand may be overstated.</p> <p>East Hendred Parish Council note that the new application of a standard method for calculating housing need (which excludes considerations for economic growth) may impact whether there are</p>	The Govt consultation on the proposed new methodology for calculating housing need includes transitional arrangements for their implementation. They clearly state that any plan to be submitted ahead of the end of March 2018 should do so using existing methodology and evidence. The Govt consultation on a proposed methodology has yet to be finalised and its intended publication date (Spring 2018) may change. It is not appropriate for the Vale to plan on the basis of a future change in policy, that has yet to be finalised, and in any case would be inconsistent with the transitional arrangements.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>exceptional circumstances in relation to Harwell Campus.</p> <p>East Hendred Parish Council seeks the deletion of the proposed housing allocation for 1,000 dwellings at Harwell Campus under Policies 4a, 15a, 15b, Appendices A & C, as not justified when assessed against paragraphs 116-118 of the NPPF. As exceptional circumstances have not been accepted in principle, there can be no justification for a smaller housing allocation, or a different location within the AONB.</p>	<p>Furthermore, there is currently no evidence to indicate that the VOWH housing requirement will change if the new methodology is implemented in its proposed form. The Govt consultation does make it clear that Councils should take account of economic growth when calculating their housing requirement.</p> <p>The Council are satisfied that appropriate justification for the proposed allocation is stated within the Exceptional Circumstances.</p>
1144910	The NDA and Magnox Ltd		1144911	Mr Owain Griffiths		No	Decommissioning and remediation of Harwell Campus	<p>GVA (property advisors for the NDA and Magnox) request that the Harwell Campus site allocation supports the decommissioning and remediation of the Harwell site. This includes the management of waste in line with national strategies and policies, together with new opportunities for development of B1/B2/B8 employment uses. The NDA and Magnox note that the proposed housing allocation comprises land currently subject to remediation and would welcome further discussions with the Council to ensure that the delivery timescales for the allocation are in accord with those for the site's remediation, and that the site can be remediated to an appropriate level for residential development to be delivered. The comment considers that LPP2 does not provide enough context to the on-going decommissioning process at the Harwell site.</p> <p>Comment states that Core Policy 15b should explicitly support activities and uses associated with decommissioning and remediation including:</p> <p>The management of waste in line with national strategies and policies together with employment uses and the proposed housing at the Campus</p> <p>The relevant national strategies which govern waste management and the decommissioning and site remediation process, ensuring compliance with such strategies</p> <p>The activities and uses associated with the decommissioning process taking place at the Harwell site</p> <p>A clear clarification on what the focus of the SPD will be on the post-decommissioning phase for the Campus and its development for housing and employment uses</p> <p>The GVA states that, should Core Policy 15b not be modified as suggested, the policy framework is not considered sound as it would not represent what is deliverable at the site, given the continuing decommissioning and remediation activities which will extend throughout and beyond the plan period. They propose that the wording in Core Policy 15b is</p>	<p>The council will continue to support the decommissioning of land at Harwell Campus to ensure the site will be available for development in the short, medium and long term, including beyond the plan period of 2031 and will continue to work with key stakeholders. The Council is working in partnership with Harwell Campus and will continue to liaise with the Campus on matters relating to the management of the site, including any remediation. This is being considered both in the context of the Comprehensive Framework Masterplan and the emerging trajectory for the site.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>amended to say: "Core Policy 15b: Harwell Campus Comprehensive Development Framework All new development at Harwell Campus will be guided by a comprehensive development framework. The new housing allocated at Harwell Campus will be provided to an exemplar standard and in the form of an Innovation Village to unlock the unique potential for economic growth offered by the Campus. The new Innovation Village will be fully and successfully integrated with the Campus, incorporating on-site services and facilities and reflect a tailored mix of dwellings to help meet the needs of the organisations located at the Campus. This development will come forward in accordance with Core Policies 15a and 15b and the Site Development Template set out in Appendix A. Sufficient land is also made available at Harwell Campus for research, innovation and economic development to accommodate at least 5,400 net additional jobs in the plan period up to 2031 within the designated Enterprise Zone. LAND WITHIN THE NUCLEAR LICENSED SITE AT HARWELL CAMPUS IS SUBJECT TO DECOMMISSIONING OF REDUNDANT FACILITIES, MANAGEMENT OF WASTE IN LINE WITH NATIONAL POLICIES AND STRATEGIES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF WASTE (BOTH DIRECTIVE AND RADIOACTIVE) AND, WHERE APPROPRIATE, THE REMEDIATION OF LAND. LAND WITHIN THE NUCLEAR LICENSED SITE MAY BE RELEASED FOR REDEVELOPMENT FOR ALTERNATIVE USES (INCLUDING NEW EMPLOYMENT USES). HOWEVER, THIS IS DEPENDENT ON THE PROGRESS MADE WITH SITE DECOMMISSIONING AND LAND REMEDIATION. Proposals for development within the Campus must demonstrate how they contribute towards a comprehensive approach to development."</p>	
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire,	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd		Deliverability	<p>Concerns raised over the developability of the Harwell Campus proposal. This proposed allocation is located within the North Wessex Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is therefore extremely sensitive in landscape terms. There is no evidence to suggest that affordable housing could not be appropriately provided for within a short distance from the campus and outside the AONB, nor that Harwell Campus employers would not be successful in attracting people to work there. Moreover, there is no convincing evidence to indicate that refusing such development would have an adverse effect on the local economy. The updated Sustainability Appraisal's assessment of the modified plan in this respect is therefore appropriate.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council acknowledge that the Campus site lies within the AONB, and that it is for the Council to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in accordance with the NPPF, the Campus forms part of a highly industrial site amounting to almost 300 ha that is already allocated for development. The Council consider that the impact of developing the area in question for residential use will have less impact, and be more successfully mitigated against landscape impact, than if it were developed for employment, for which the land is already allocated.</p> <p>The Council have considered a range of alternative site options, including at Rowstock, West of Harwell Village and at North of East Hendred. All of these locations would have greater impact on the setting of the AONB, than developing the campus itself. A further alternative site at Milton Heights lies close to the A34 junction at Miton and further development would be objected to by both Highways England and</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									the Highways Authority both of who support the proposed development at Harwell Campus. The creation of a live work play community at Harwell Campus provides an opportunity to reduce any impact on the AONB, to create highly sustainable development and increase the economic potential of the campus. The Council has set out the exceptional circumstances to develop the site in a report that has accompanied publication of the plan.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	East Hendred Parish Council					Evidence	A large number of comments were made in relation to the evidence produced to support the proposed allocation of 1,000 dwellings at Harwell Campus. Comments relate to the quality of evidence submitted to justify the site, specifically in relation to Exceptional Circumstances; the majority of comments suggest that the Council have not produced sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Exceptional Circumstances exist to justify the need for development, the cost and scope for developing elsewhere and the impact on environment, landscape and recreational opportunities. Comments suggest that the need for development has not been justified because:	The Council believe that through new robust evidence informing Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (including the SQW Harwell Campus Exceptional Circumstances Report), that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation at Harwell Campus. Whilst the Council acknowledge that the Campus site lies within the AONB, and that it is for the Council to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in accordance with the NPPF, the Campus forms part of a highly industrial site amounting to almost 300 ha that is already allocated for development. The site itself is already allocated for employment use through Core Policy 6 and Saved LP2011 Policy E7, therefore the principle of development of this land already exists and the Council believe that some residential development on the northern part of the site will help soften the impact to the AONB and likely result in a reduced impact overall.
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd							
776299	Tom Smailes	Linden Homes				No			
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No			
877876	Mr Chris Broad	Chilton Parish Council				No			
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem	Natural England						No evidence has been provided to suggest that economic growth or job creation is slowing, or employers relocating/deciding not to base themselves at the Campus, due to the absence of housing	
1022426		ptarmigan Land Ltd	1022427	Mr Robin Shepherd	Barton Willmore	Yes		It is inappropriate to use the 'net new employment' figure within Policy 15b because the Campus should provide gross new employment opportunities. As per the Economic Forecasting Report 2014, Policy 15b should be amended to read:	The council considers that there is sufficient land remaining at Harwell Campus, including within the EZ, to meet the planned economic growth on the site. The Inspector's Report into Local Plan 2031 Part 1 concluded that there is a surplus of employment land available to meet future employment needs. The Campus being a national and international asset strengthens the need for housing on site to attract qualified staff and international businesses.
1022463	Mr Graham Flint	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	724498	Mr Steven Pickles	West Waddy	No		"Sufficient land is also made available at Harwell Campus for research, innovation and economic development to accommodate at least 5,400 net 5,800 GROSS additional jobs in the plan period up to 2031 within the designated Enterprise Zone."	A suite of evidence based studies have been undertaken to assess the impact of sites on landscape, infrastructure, flooding and viability which has informed the site selection process. This demonstrates the redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB and will comply with Development Policy 31: Protection of Public Rights of Way, National Trails and Open Access Areas as set out in the Part 2 plan.
1095741	Miss Shugar					No			
1095843	Dr James Wickens					No			
1095934	Ms P Dothie					No		The proposed housing mix is no different to commercial development elsewhere and therefore will not cater to the Campus requirements set out in the SEP	
1096069	Ms Jones	Redcliffe Homes Ltd				No			
1096118	Mrs Farrell					No		o there is no mechanism to monitor the breakdown of floorspace per use class over time. To ensure the objectives of the Enterprise zone can be achieved, a mechanism (linked to a phasing requirement for the housing allocation) should be put into place to monitor the proportion of commercial vs non-commercial uses on the site	
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock	M3 (EU)				No			
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No			
1097487		Harwell Campus Partnership	1145110	Mr Steven Sensecall		Yes		The site would not create a sustainable development or community The need for a "work-live-play community" has not been demonstrated	Please also refer to previous responses.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1097646	Ian Hepburn	North Wessex Downs AONB				No		The Council has only considered economic interest, and not public / environmental and social interest	
1097815		Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	1097816	Hannah Bowler	Turley			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public interest test and exceptional circumstances cannot be satisfied merely due to the national and international importance of the Harwell site 	
1101804	Alex Chandler					No		The Council have not properly evidenced the advantages of developing on the Campus versus the cost and scope of developing elsewhere. Comments state that:	
1142694	Ms Kim and Holly Pringle and Spence					No		High housing density would create a poor standard of living and impact biodiversity	
1142789	Mr Steve Brock					No		Some of the land proposed for housing is not already allocated for development and is instead a new proposal to build on AONB land	
1144255	Mr Johnathan Evans					No		There would be significant loss to employment land which should be supported	
1144368	Ms Rachel Farrell					No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the employment allocation was justified on the basis of Harwell Campus being a world-class location for science & technology 	
1144370	Mrs Françoise Ashbourne					No		No evidence exists to suggest that not supporting residential development at the Campus would be detrimental to the local economy or that projected levels of economic growth would be at risk if no new housing were introduced in the AONB.	
1144461	Mr Jamie Brown					Yes		The Campus' housing requirement (including affordable housing) could be met elsewhere; the need is for improved access to suitable housing for staff, not specifically housing on-site:	
1144606	Mr Peter Ashbourne					No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing buildings could be re-used as housing alternative Land North of East Hendred, South of Summertown and at Wootton are proposed over 12,000 new dwellings of a range of tenure and dwelling size exist in the Science Vale, including 2,500 dwellings at Grove Airfield 	
1144637	Mr Michael Chapman					No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
1145030	Miss Tracey Moggeridge					No			
1145040	Mrs Ellen Krier					No			
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Woolf Bond Planning	No		A number of respondents, including the North Wessex Downs Management Board, have raised concerns regarding the impact of the site on the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities:	
1145333	Mr John Pearce					No			
1145340	Mr Peter Krier					No			
						Yes			
1142694	Ms Kim and Holly Pringle and Spence					No		The proposed allocation for 1,000 dwellings in the AONB is inappropriate and unjustified, and would be harmful to AONB objectives because it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> would have an urbanising effect on the landscape quality and scenic beauty of the AONB would not integrate with the AONB would change the character of Icknield Way would breach the CROW responsibilities 	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Development in the AONB could result in greater pressure to release other land in the AONB for development.</p> <p>Schemes to mitigate the impact of the site on the AONB cannot be used to justify development and would take a long time.</p> <p>Comments were made in general objection to the proposed allocation in relation to the evidence produced because:</p> <p>It is too vague and hard to understand The site allocation would conflict with Core Policies 6 and 29.</p> <p>LPP2 has omitted the NPPF criteria for an assessment of meeting the need some other way. There is surplus supply over need for the Plan period so further allocations are unnecessary.</p> <p>The SQW report fails to demonstrate that the Inspectors objections to the similar sites allocated in LPP2 have been superseded.</p> <p>The Plan is unsound as similar sites within the AONB at Harwell Campus were removed from LPP1.</p> <p>Some comments supportively encouraged the production of further evidence, stating that: The Plan should provide a robust evidence base to consider the longer-term opportunities for land around the Campus to accommodate future growth which cannot be met elsewhere because of the unique location and opportunities offered by the Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the delivery of 1,000 dwellings should be considered a starting point for the creation of an Innovation Village, and this should be recognised within the Plan with an appropriate indication of future growth opportunities <p>The plan itself is not required to demonstrate exceptional circumstances, but a reasonable prospect that an application will be able to demonstrate exceptional circumstances is needed.</p> <p>The development should be informed by careful masterplanning of the site and supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Further explanation is required for housing mix and tenure; the mitigation package and space for green infrastructure; the pattern of proposed development. o <p>Several comments were made regarding difficulties with accessing evidence, for instance, the SQW Harwell Campus Exceptional Circumstances report and the Inspectors Report for LPP1.</p> <p>One comment supported the existence of exceptional circumstances and stated that the Partnership has a pressing need for bespoke accommodation with a</p>	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								range of types and tenures to suit a range of staff from young technicians and laboratory assistants to visiting scientists and those wishing to establish a family home within a vibrant scientific community.	
1097815		Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	1097816	Hannah Bowler	Turley		Evidence - Enterprise Zone	A key argument to develop housing at harwell campus is to cater to the employment purposes of the campus. Developing on employment land contradicts this as the housing proposed within the Enterprise Zone would limit the ability of the employment use of the site to expand beyond the Plan period, and could therefore create additional pressure to develop the AONB. In addition, if unusually large employment needs that have not been predicted are required during the plan period, such as the Diamond Light Source Synchrotron, there may not be the space needed for unanticipated growth. Evidence agrees that Harwell Campus is of regional, national and international importance, and it is reasonable to assume that forecasted employment figures set out are a minimum projected requirement for the plan period.	Please refer to previous responses.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	East Hendred Parish Council							
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd,							
1022463	Mr Graham Flint	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	724498	Mr Steven Pickles	West Waddy	No		There is no evidence to reasonably conclude that the Harwell Campus strategic employment site is unlikely to be fully utilised for employment use in the future. The Council should be aware that some of the other land within the designation that the Council has noted as available to meet this need, such as that currently housing the former Magnox AEA Research establishment will need to be decontaminated before the land can be re-used, which may constrain land availability. Comments made seek further evidence for the Enterprise Zone on: The number of firms and jobs adversely affected by the loss of employment land. The aims of the Government in designating the site as an Enterprise Zone, and The Enterprise Zone benefits lost to existing and potential employers. Comments, including those made by East Hendred Parish Council, propose the deletion of the Harwell Campus allocation for 1,000 dwellings from the plan. One comment proposes an alternative site of 1,000 dwellings at Land North of East Hendred.	
872717	Mr Brian Morris					No	Evidence - Housing tenure	A number of comments were made with reference to the evidence to support housing tenure. Comments state that:	The Council recognise the importance of housing on site providing a tailored mix and tenure to meet the identified needs of the Campus. It is intended that the precise nature of this mix will be set out within the Comprehensive Design Framework SPD, as stated by the Development Site Template
877876	Mr Chris Broad	Chilton Parish Council				No			
1097646	Ian Hepburn	North Wessex Downs AONB				No		There is no clear policy to deliver bespoke housing types and tenures specifically to meet the needs of	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144606	Mr Peter Ashbourne					No		<p>the Campus, specifically how a 'work-live-play' community will be achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the scale of accommodation development and number of units for transient employees is not specified ○ the Campus requires accommodation that is flexible with a high proportion of single and twin units and infrastructure geared to a working age demographic <p>The scheme only needs to meet the requirements for all housing allocations (65% open market and 35% affordable), which is not appropriate or sustainable. The housing tenure proposals are unsound and it would be hard to assess their effectiveness. Campus-type accommodation has specific needs and infrastructure.</p> <p>There is limited research on the take up of housing on alternative adjacent sites by those working on the Campus (a 2015 survey on nearby Chilton Fields estate identified that only 10.4% residents worked on the Campus).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a closer link between employing organisations and the occupants of proposed housing is needed; a successful local historical example of this is Bracknell Development Corporation which offered tranches of La controlled-rent properties to attract incoming new businesses. ○ at the concentration proposed and the consequent damage to the AONB, it is highly unlikely that those attracted to work at the Campus would choose to live there. ○ <p>Some comments specifically object to the proposed Harwell Campus allocation and housing mix and tenure to support the Campus as they are believed to be unsound. Comments request that the Plan is modified to address these concerns.</p> <p>One comment states that the Harwell Campus allocation for 1,000 dwellings should be removed from the plan. Another comment proposes a revision to the Policy to decrease the allocation size to meet solely and specifically the on-site housing requirements of Campus employees for their staff/ visitors; such provision should be made under the continuing control of the Campus.</p> <p>The approach for all serviced and short stay accommodation to be limited to visitors and staff only, and to not be continuously occupied by any individual for more than 12 calendar months at one time, is reasonable and appropriate for its purpose in supporting the specific needs of the Campus.</p>	The Council acknowledge that there is a minor typo within the Development Site Template (page 7) and propose deleting the words 'specified below'.
1144255	Mr Johnathan Evans					No	Evidence - Landscape	<p>The assertion that the site at Harwell Campus would have a limited impact on the landscape is undermined by the evidence document 'Landscape and Visual</p>	The redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. As the site is already

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Appraisal' by HDA which shows the view in Photomontage 1. This shows there to be very detrimental and unmitigated effects on the views approaching Harwell Campus from the North, from Rowstock roundabout.	allocated for employment use, some residential development on the northern part of the site will result in a reduced impact overall. The Council has engaged with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders on matters relating to landscape and the natural environment. It is considered that residential development will be capable of being more successfully mitigated than for employment development. Appropriate green infrastructure will be planted to soften the visual impact of the development and this will be evident through the master planning process.
1144910	The NDA and Magnox Ltd		1144911	Mr Owain Griffiths		No	Flexibility of policy	The policy approach set out by Core Policy 15b needs to recognise the varied operational requirements of the different organisations at the Campus. Any design guidance applied to the Harwell Campus must acknowledge that building design should be proportionate to the operation/use for which the building is required. With regards to the Magnox site, the operational requirements for decommissioning and site remediation activities and uses are very different to those of traditional employment uses on the rest of the Campus. The NDA and Magnox support the inclusion of the NDA/Magnox site within any future LDO for the Campus.	The Council is content the policy and approach to preparing a Comprehensive Development Template for the Campus provides sufficient flexibility. The design of any development will be informed by the Plan policies and SPD. The Council are aware of the of the decommissioning of the site and will continue to work with key stakeholders to ensure this process is sufficiently integrated into the future development of the site.
872717	Mr Brian Morris					No	General objection	General objections made against the new housing development proposed for Harwell Campus within the AONB. One comment states that the Plan is neither sustainable nor positively prepared, and as a result is unsound. Comments request the removal of this site allocation from the Plan.	The Council acknowledge the comments however believe that exceptional circumstances exist to demonstrate the need for housing at Harwell Campus. The Council have produced a number of evidence based studies to support the plan and therefore ensures the plan is positively prepared and therefore sound.
1095934	Ms P Dothie				No				
1101804	Alex Chandler				No				
1144368	Ms Rachel Farrell				No				
730259	Mr Graham Mundy	Grove Parish Council				Yes	General support	One comment was made in general support of the allocation at Harwell Campus, including those made by Grove Parish Council.	The Council welcome the support from Grove Parish Council.
1144461	Mr Jamie Brown					Yes	Glossary	Comment states that the definition of the AONB is not a satisfactory enough definition for such an important designation, and proposes the CROW acts definition should be adopted: "AN AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAETH (AONB) IS LAND PROTECTED BY THE COUNTRYSIDE AND RIGHTS OF WAY ACT 2000 (CROW ACT). IT PROTECTS THE LAND TO CONSERVE AND ENHANCE ITS NATURAL BEAUTY." One comment states that the modification considered to be necessary is the removal of this site from the Plan.	The Council is content that the definition for the AONB is sufficient. It is consistent with the definition provided within the Glossary for the Part 1 plan which is now adopted following examination.
1145340	Mr Peter Krier				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1022463 1144606	Mr Graham Flint Mr Peter Ashbourne	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	724498	Mr Steven Pickles	West Waddy	No No	Historic character Historic character	Comments are made that relate to the historical importance of Icknield Way ('the oldest road in Britain'). Comments suggest that no consideration has been given to the historical and local importance as a right of way and amenity. The provision of 1,000 dwellings and a new road across it would have a substantial detrimental heritage impact (which would be more accurately reflected by a 'red' rating). Comments state that the Harwell Campus allocation for 1,000 dwellings should be removed from the plan to ensure that the national policy of protection for the AONB is respected.	The council are keen to protect the existing bridleway at Icknield Way and has engaged with Historic England in relation to the policy wording and site requirements. There is a requirement for development to contribute towards improvements of NCN route 544 (Icknield Way). The land north of Icknield Way is already allocated for employment through Saved LP2011 Policy E7. The principle of development of this land already exists. The Council's evidence demonstrates the redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB.
1095934 1101804 1144368 1145340	Ms P Dothie Alex Chandler Ms Rachel Farrell Mr Peter Krier					No No No No	Housing Density	Comments made raising concern due to the density of the development. The proposal for roughly 60 dwellings per hectare and insufficient local amenities (schools, medical facilities, shops and an under pressure infrastructure) would have a severe impact on quality of life, and makes the statement "attractive living Environment" (paragraph 2.107-108) redundant. LPP1 approach to have low density housing sufficiently screened with the least hard to the AONB, and LPP2 approach to have high density housing are contradictory and indicate no clear consensus on development at the Campus. Comments propose rewording of paragraph 2.116 to (quoting the Inspector's report): "The need for development of sites (12 and 13) for housing has not been demonstrated and, having regard to the potential for mitigation, it would be likely to cause some harm to the landscape of the AONB and the recreational opportunities it offers." Comments made seek the removal of the Harwell Campus allocation from the Plan.	Please refer to previous responses.
756760 758199 872717 1097646 1097677 1145333	Mr Roger Turnbull John Richards Mr Brian Morris Ian Hepburn Mr John Pearce	East Hendred Parish Council Dandara Ltd, North Wessex Downs AONB David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley	No No	Housing Needs	Several comments were made questioning housing need specifically in relation to the allocation of 1,000 homes at Harwell Campus. Comments made question the strategy for allocating 1,000 homes solely at Harwell Campus within the AONB when the aim of LPP2 is to deliver 1,400 for the Science Vale on the whole. Delivering housing at Harwell Campus is a very niche market that is untested. Housing would need to be delivered that caters specifically for Campus employees, and not the needs of the public. As a result, this cannot be considered to contribute towards the overall housing supply. One comment states that the plan is unsound as it is unjustified. Additional allocations should be identified to contribute to the housing supply at other areas within the Science Vale and South-East Vale Sub-Area. It is proposed that the policy is revised to include a smaller allocation that meets solely and specifically the onsite housing requirements of Campus	The Housing requirement and supply for the Vale is dealt with more fully in relation to comments concerning Core Policy 4a and 15a

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								employers for their staff/visitors. An alternative site is proposed for 150 dwellings at land to the East of High Street, East Hendred. Comments made by East Hendred Parish Council state that there is no pressing need for the Harwell Campus allocation for 1,000 dwellings as there would still be a 5 year housing land supply without it. They propose that the Harwell Campus allocation is removed from the Plan under Policies 4a, 15a, 15b, Appendices A & C, as not justified when assessed against paragraphs 116-118 of the NPPF.	
1022426		ptarmigan Land Ltd	1022427	Mr Robin Shepherd	Barton Willmore	Yes	Housing Needs - Support	One comment supports the need for development at Harwell Campus, identifying that planning proactively to meet the development needs of business and support the economy will help to achieve economic growth. The Science and Innovation taking place at Harwell Campus, alongside other areas within the Science Vale, is nationally significant and is at the core of the UK's strategy for knowledge economy growth. This economic need is strategically important and should be given significant weight.	The Council welcome the support for the need for strategic housing allocations within the Science Vale area, and believe that the proposal for housing at Harwell Campus will support this economic growth.
1095934	Ms P Dothie					No	Inconsistent with local policy	The current proposals for 1,000 dwellings in the North Wessex Downs AONB directly contradicts saved policy E13 from the Local Plan 2011.	Policy E12 is proposed to be replaced by Development Policy 10, as set out within Local Plan Part 2. Saved Policy E7 will be replaced by Core Policy 15b, also set out within the part 2 plan. On this basis, DP 10 would apply to the remainder of the Campus site and there would be no internal plan inconsistencies. DP10 also makes reference to SPD's that may be prepared for strategic employment sites, thus providing further flexibility.
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	East Hendred Parish Council				No	Inconsistent with national policy	The proposed 1,000 dwellings at Harwell Campus is considered unsound as it has not been demonstrated to comply with NPPF guidance on large scale developments in the AONB. The comment requests that references to the proposed housing allocation at Harwell Campus is deleted in Harwell Campus Site Specific Requirements.	The Council are satisfied that the proposed allocation at Harwell Campus complies with the paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF. The Council have demonstrated the exceptional circumstances required to develop land within the AONB as stated within the Harwell Campus Exceptional Circumstances Report published October 2017.
1022426		ptarmigan Land Ltd	1022427	Mr Robin Shepherd	Barton Willmore	Yes	Infrastructure	A comprehensive approach to growth at Harwell Campus that includes housing and other facilities would offer: The potential to reinforce identified infrastructure proposals through increased funding from development for delivery and improving the prospect of delivering additional transport improvements to support the Campus. The opportunity to balance the demand for public transport movement between Harwell and Didcot, enhancing the prospect for faster and more frequent service provision, and Reduced travel distances to work and increased adoption of sustainable modes of transport.	The Council acknowledge the comment regarding infrastructure. The Site development template sets out the infrastructure requirements needed to ensure the site is sustainable. This includes necessary transport needs. The Council will work with Key stakeholders to ensure appropriate and essential infrastructure is delivered.
1097646	Ian Hepburn	North Wessex Downs AONB				No	Innovation Village		Please refer to previous responses.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144255	Mr Johnathan Evans					No	Innovation Village	<p>Comments were made in relation to the Innovation Village approach for delivering housing at Harwell Campus.</p> <p>One comment questioned whether the development is in the public interest as it is unlikely to benefit the wider community, and as a result is unsound. There is no need for this development in the AONB, and therefore this is not sound and should be removed from the policy.</p> <p>Creating a 'larger village' in the area would transform Harwell Campus from an employment site to a general urban area. This would lead to loss of scope for controlling consequential impacts on landscape character and landscape quality as the commercial and domestic developments interacted. Permitted development rights associated with residential housing would limit opportunities to control the extension of housing development. The effects of employment development may be less than the effects of housing, depending on the nature of the employment development intended.</p>	
877876	Mr Chris Broad	Chilton Parish Council				No	Landscape character - North Wessex Downs AONB	<p>Comments were made in relation to the impact of the Harwell Campus allocation on landscape character, particularly as it is harmful North Wessex Downs AONB and does not accord with the principles of sustainable development which has an environmental role. It is unjustified and not consistent with national policy; it does not comply with paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF. As a result, many comments object to the Harwell Campus allocation.</p> <p>The proposed housing will have an adverse effect to the character of the AONB and the surrounding area for the following reasons:</p> <p>It does not consider the current state of the site and how the edge will be viewed. Paragraph 2.110 is not a sound statement and should be removed from LPP2 as it only looks internally and not at the impact of the development on the surroundings. Comments stated that around 10% of the residents currently living at Harwell Campus work there, and it is likely that the residents of the proposed housing will commute out of the development which will have consequences for the AONB and road network.</p> <p>The North-West arable field is of high landscape sensitivity and would undergo an irreversible change from its present character. This should be listed as an area of the Enterprise Zone that is not developable.</p> <p>The housing would be perceived as an isolated urban development in the AONB.</p> <p>The site is part of the typical rural character of the Hendred Plain in the AONB, not typical of the existing Campus.</p>	<p>The Council's Strategic Sites Topic Paper explains the site selection process including the assessment criteria used to determine preferred sites. A suite of evidence base studies have been undertaken to assess the impact of sites on landscape, infrastructure, flooding and viability which has informed the site selection process. This demonstrates the redevelopment of the site for housing is not likely to impact upon the special qualities of the North Wessex Downs AONB. The Council have prepared an Exceptional Circumstance study which demonstrates this.</p> <p>A dedicated policy for the whole of Harwell Campus, including the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document will ensure future development of the site will be informed by detailed principles and a masterplan.</p> <p>Please refer to previous responses.</p>
1022463	Mr Graham Flint	J A Pye Oxford Ltd	724498	Mr Steven Pickles	West Waddy	No			
1095741	Miss Shugar					No			
1096128	Mrs Carmen Somerset Brock	M3 (EU)				No			
1096211	Mr David Farrell					No			
1097646	Ian Hepburn	North Wessex Downs AONB				No			
1101804	Alex Chandler					No			
1142789	Mr Steve Brock					No			
1144255	Mr Johnathan Evans					No			
1144370	Mrs Françoise Ashbourne					No			
1144461	Mr Jamie Brown					Yes			
1144606	Mr Peter Ashbourne					No			
1145340	Mr Peter Krier					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	East Hendred Parish Council				No		<p>The proposed tree screen, if successful, would eliminate entirely views of typical AONB landscape in the southern half the compass.</p> <p>Due to the high density of the site, views of site would be damaged and open views would be lost, existing trees would be lost and there would be little area for open space.</p> <p>Light and noise pollution as a result of residential development will diminish the landscape and affect the AONB.</p> <p>If approved, this would be the largest allocation within an AONB in the UK, setting a precedent that undermines national policy.</p> <p>Several comments were made in relation to various impacts on Icknield Way;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o due to the number of proposed dwellings it is likely they will be close to Icknield Way; no wording is given in the policy or supporting text about the width of any landscaped buffers adjoining Icknield Way or the Hungerford Road bridleway, so there is no evidence to suggest the character and appearance of these would improve in the longer term, as stated in the LVIA o views from Icknield Way would be badly effected o the character of Icknield Way would be damaged o a new road would be required across Icknield Way to access the new properties on the north of the site o the proposal that mitigation would take 10-15 years in unacceptable for an AONB <p>Some comments expressed concern that the loss of allocated employment land would restrict Harwell Campus' ability to meet economic demand and it is entirely feasible that if this land is used for housing, the Campus will expand into open AONB land in the future. LPP2 has failed to properly assess the potential impact of the loss of employment land and more importantly fails to accord with the economic strategy put forward by the LPP1.</p> <p>One comment suggests that it would be preferable to build housing on areas where it has historically been sited, Curie Avenue and South Drive, within the boundary of Harwell Campus and not detrimental to the local landscape, existing occupants and wildlife.</p> <p>A masterplan is required to provide clarity on where development would be located, the height of the buildings, which existing tree belts would be retained and where new planting would be proposed.</p>	
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England			No				
1142392	Mr Vic Johnson				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>It is considered that the 'orange' 'Landscape Impact' rating should be changed to 'red'.</p> <p>A number of comments stated that the necessary modification to make the Plan sound would be to remove the Harwell Campus allocation and Core Policies 15a and 15b from the plan entirely. One comment also states that references to the Innovation Village in the Development Framework policy should be deleted.</p> <p>Additional land has been proposed in replacements of this allocation at North of East Hendred which is not within the AONB and is suitable for development. Alternatively, one comment proposes a revision to the policy to decrease the number of houses to solely meet the onsite housing requirements of the Campus.</p>	
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	East Hendred Parish Council					Landscape character and recreation	<p>Comment made by East Hendred Parish Council stating that the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities for East Hendred, Chilton and Harwell residents, and Campus employees due to the loss of:</p> <p>Existing trees and biodiversity Recreational opportunities Open character within the AONB Views from the National Cycle Route 544 Public rights of way.</p> <p>East Hendred seek the deletion of the proposed housing allocation for 1,000 dwellings at Harwell Campus from the plan as exceptional circumstances have not been accepted in principle, and there can be no justification for a smaller housing allocation, or a different location within the AONB.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection, informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders, including Natural England and the Council's Landscape Officer. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>Core Policy 44 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures development proposals protect, conserve and enhance the Vale's key landscape features. Development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they have responded to landscape character in their proposals through appropriate design and management, taking into account up to date evidence, including the Council's Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>The Council are satisfied that appropriate justification for the proposed allocation is stated within the Exceptional Circumstances report and should therefore not be removed from the plan.</p>
756760 1022463 1097646	Mr Roger Turnbull Mr Graham Flint Ian Hepburn	East Hendred Parish Council J A Pye Oxford Ltd North Wessex Downs AONB	724498	Mr Steven Pickles	West Waddy	No No	Masterplanning	<p>The case that a housing allocation at Harwell Campus would have less impact than employment depends on housing density, height restrictions structural landscaping and open space. Not all the site is available for housing due to the primary school and conservation of existing key biodiversity areas; comments state that if 40% of the site is used for open space & structural landscaping, then the site would only accommodate 600 dwellings on 20 hectares at 30 dwellings per hectare net density (an urban area density, rather than one for a site within the AONB).</p> <p>Assessment of landscape and visual effects of the proposal is hampered by the lack of clarity over exactly what kind of housing development might be proposed across the allocation area. Comments do not accept that housing development across the</p>	<p>The housing tenures and density's will be further explored through the masterplanning process and will be set out within the Comprehensive Development Framework SPD.</p> <p>HDA produced a landscape and visual appraisal of the site and concluded that the site would have no long-term adverse effects of the proposed allocation on the wider AONB and the proposals put forward would deliver a number of benefits to the AONB landscape.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>allocation site would necessarily have less impact on the AONB than employment development.</p> <p>East Hendred Parish Council seek further information on the proposed housing density and structural landscaping.</p> <p>Comments, including those made by East Hendred Parish Council, seek the deletion of the proposed Harwell Campus allocation for 1,000 dwellings from the Plan.</p>	
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	<p>CPRE has suggested that the Plan is unsound as an additional policy should be included in the Part 2 plan in relation to the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), given its location within this national policy designation.</p> <p>CPRE has proposed the following wording for a policy related to the North Wessex Downs AONB:</p> <p>IN DETERMINING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WITHIN THE NORTH WESSEX DOWNS AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB) AND PROPOSALS WHICH WOULD AFFECT ITS SETTING, GREAT WEIGHT WILL BE GIVEN TO CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE AREA'S NATURAL BEAUTY, LANDSCAPE AND COUNTRYSIDE, INCLUDING ITS WILDLIFE, HISTORIC CHARACTER AND HERITAGE ASSETS. THE NORTH WESSEX DOWNS AONB MANAGEMENT PLAN AND GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS ARE MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS IN DECISION MAKING RELEVANT TO THE AONB. MAJOR DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED WITHIN THE AONB UNLESS IT SATISFIES THE EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES SET OUT IN NATIONAL POLICY AND GUIDANCE. PROPOSALS THAT SUPPORT THE ECONOMY AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING OF COMMUNITIES LOCATED IN THE NORTH WESSEX DOWNS AONB, INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING SCHEMES AND SMALL SCALE RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT, WILL BE SUPPORTED, PROVIDED THEY ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE GREAT WEIGHT THAT MUST BE GIVEN TO CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE LANDSCAPE AND NATURAL SCENIC BEAUTY OF THE AREA.</p> <p>A few comments suggested that the Plan should conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the North Wessex Downs AONB in accordance with national planning policy and guidance.</p>	Core Policy 44: Landscape of the adopted Part 1 plan ensures high priority is given to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the North Wessex Downs AONB and planning decisions will have regard to its setting, in accordance with national policy. There are other relevant policies within the adopted Part 1 plan and emerging Part 2 plan that provide for the conservation and enhancement of the North Wessex Downs AONB and its setting and to consider the impact on the AONB when assessing development proposals.
872717	Mr Brian Morris					No	Scale of development	<p>Comment states that the Exceptional Circumstances report has proved the economic importance of the Harwell Campus (in terms of job creation) and has made a case for on-site housing, but there is no</p>	Please refer to previous responses.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								factual basis (only aspirational projections) for such a large allocation of 1000 dwellings.	
756760 1095741	Mr Roger Turnbull Miss Shugar	East Hendred Parish Council				No	Site Selection	Comments, including those made by East Hendred Parish Council, state that more cost-effective land outside the North Wessex Down's AONB should be used and seek the removal of this allocation from the Plan; this is of local and national interest. The cost and scope of developing elsewhere outside the AONB would depend on what other sources of housing were available to achieve a 5-year housing land supply and meet the needs of the Campus. The Council has not considered a reasonable alternative option that would achieve sustainable development at Harwell Campus. The loss of employment land and Enterprise Zone benefits for potential employers would have cost implications and may result in further land allocations for employment within the AONB adjoining the Campus.	Please refer to previous responses.
1097487		Harwell Campus Partnership	1145110	Mr Steven Sensecall		Yes	Supplementary Planning Document and Local Development Order	Comments made by Harwell Campus Partnership state that a comprehensive approach to development can be achieved through the site-wide Framework Masterplan. The Partnership understands the need for a clear framework for future development but would question the need for SPD. Moreover, the Partnership understands the potential benefits of an LDO but would question whether one is necessarily required in order to deliver the Plan's objectives. The Partnership would welcome further discussions with the Council about the best way forward with regard to the current Framework Masterplan becoming a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).	The Council note that the Campus have worked on preparing a draft SPD over the last couple of years with the view of seeking to adopt this document as SPD by the Council. The Council consider that an SPD would offer an appropriate balance between providing detailed guidance, supporting the Part 2 plan policy, ensure a comprehensive approach to masterplanning the site and provide more opportunities for a wider range of stakeholders to participate and engage in the process. The Council welcome the campus's support for the principle of development a framework masterplan for the site.
1022426		ptarmigan Land Ltd	1022427	Mr Robin Shepherd	Barton Willmore	Yes	Support for Exceptional circumstances	<p>Comment supports and agrees with the conclusions made within the Harwell Campus Exceptional Circumstances report published in October 2017, and states that there are three common themes that would affect the longer-term growth at Harwell if not addressed:</p> <p>Housing in nearby towns is not sufficient - particularly for the younger professionals</p> <p>The shortage is not just in housing but in the wider community facilities the campus needs to create a lively environment that meets social needs; and</p> <p>Attracting people is hard, made harder by lack of housing and facilities.</p> <p>The comment states that whilst alternative sites may not be located within the AONB, the assessment shows they are affected by a number of other issues which together make them unsuitable. In addition to these constraints none of the alternative sites would be able to address the wider issues for Harwell Campus, which include the needs for facilities to</p>	The Council acknowledge the support for the exceptional circumstances and will continue to work with key stakeholders in delivering a sustainable live-work-play community

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								support the community located there. Housing at Harwell Campus will be able to fund other facilities needed at the campus through planning obligations but will also provide the population to make them viable. Without this additional population, these facilities may not be viable with a community that is only there predominantly during the working week. The comments made state that Exceptional Circumstances exist to justify major development within the AONB in this location, and as a result, Policies 15a and 15b are sound.	
1022426		ptarmigan Land Ltd	1022427	Mr Robin Shepherd	Barton Willmore	Yes	Support for Innovation Village	A number of comments were made in support of the Innovation Village proposal at Harwell Campus. Comments fully support the live-work-play community and consider the allocation to be justified and sound. These representations support the Council's view that in order to achieve the economic potential of Harwell Campus, and indeed the wider Science Vale strategy and Strategic Economic Plan for the area, a step change the is needed to allow it to compete internationally. Harwell Campus is a major asset on the Science Vale and Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford corridors. The lack of suitable homes and facilities is hindering the economic growth potential. The built environment needs to adapt to the changes in working practices, desire for café culture and flexible working within a high-quality environment the increasing fluidity of the labour force, increasing international competition that are ahead in responding to the needs of research and related companies. Minimising the need to travel and encouraging the adoption of sustainable modes of transport have been consistent threads in national and local transport policy for several years. Comments state that locating housing at Harwell Campus brings these social and environmental benefits. Comments suggest that the comments made by the Inspector did not sound a death knell for a live-work-play environment at Harwell, but instead provided sign posts of what further evidence was required to demonstrate exceptional circumstances for major development in this location. In accordance with the NPPF, exceptional circumstances exist for locating housing within the AONB at Harwell Campus due to the built-up backdrop and brownfield land status of the proposed site, there would be limited detrimental effects on the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities. We support the Council that residential led mixed-use development at Harwell Campus is in the public interest and therefore consistent with the requirements of paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Despite supporting the proposal in principle, some comments consider that the policy requires some amendments to ensure it is effective; for instance:	The Council acknowledges the support for the proposed allocation and will continue to work with key stakeholders to ensure the site is suitable and sustainable. The Council have considered the requested changes and proposed a minor modification to the supporting text.
1097487		Harwell Campus Partnership	1145110	Mr Steven Sensecall	Yes				
1097815		Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	1097816	Hannah Bowler	Turley				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>There is a need for housing and facilities that are currently not available</p> <p>The reference to net additional jobs of 5,400 within the designated Enterprise zone should be amended to 5,800 as per the Council's own evidence base</p> <p>Through discussions between Harwell Campus and Officers, it is considered that the capacity of the Enterprise Zone within the Campus to 2037 is 10,093 jobs which is in excess of the 9,000 jobs envisaged to 2033 through the Local Plan Part 1</p> <p>A smart monitoring mechanism be put into the plan to ensure that the Campus can meet its objectives as an Enterprise Zone</p>	
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company				Yes	Support from Oxford Bus Company	<p>Comment made in support of developing an SPD that will include infrastructure required to make the site deliverable. Support is also made for the Sustainability Appraisal and Policy 15b which promote sustainable transport opportunities at Harwell Campus. Oxford Bus Company would be keen to explore options for improving the bus service between Didcot and Harwell as part of an overall masterplan for the area.</p> <p>Support for policy wording regarding improved frequency and hours of service on strategic bus routes between Wantage, Harwell and Didcot. Comments propose that the policy is reworded to:</p> <p>Refer to bus operators to ensure the site is operationally deliverable, and</p> <p>Include reference to the level and scope of bus service improvements to this development and the relevant developers' contributions arising from it.</p>	The Council acknowledge the support from the Oxford Bus Company. The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders in the development of the SPD to ensure appropriate infrastructure is provided to ensure the development is sustainable. The Council is satisfied the current wording provides sufficient clarity and flexibility.
1097487		Harwell Campus Partnership	1145110	Mr Steven Sensecall		Yes	Support from Site Promoter	<p>A number of comments were made by the Site Promoter in support of the allocation of Harwell Campus within the Part 2 Plan. Comments demonstrate that:</p> <p>There is more than sufficient land at Harwell to accommodate "at least 5,400 'net' additional jobs in the Enterprise Zone in the Plan period to 2031 and considerably more across the Campus as a whole. Its comprehensive, Campus-wide proposals are sustainable.</p> <p>Any adverse impacts on the AONB can be effectively mitigated, and</p> <p>Having regard to the requirements of paragraph 116 in the NPPF, the 'exceptional circumstances' identified at paragraph 2.98 in the Plan are robust, defensible and in the public interest on the basis that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the Harwell Campus is nationally and internationally significant in terms of science and innovation development 	The Council acknowledge the support and will continue to work with key stakeholders in developing the site.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ there is a compelling need for bespoke housing on-site to meet the particular needs of those currently working on-site and to attract new national and international science and technology related businesses and institutions to the Campus and that this need cannot be met off-site ○ any detrimental impacts on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities will be moderated by the fact that the Campus is a brownfield site, which is already allocated for additional development in the development plan. 	
1142694	Ms Kim and Holly Pringle and Spence					No	Water and wastewater infrastructure	<p>Comment states that the sewage and water pipes within the proposed areas are not sufficient and cannot cope with the existing number of dwellings in the area. This has previously resulted in flooding as the current pipes are not able to cope with the waste/water demand currently on the area. Comment suggests that Thames Water have no plans to manage Didcot's population increase, and states that the infrastructure should be improved before any new dwellings are agreed. There is no reference in the report to the sewers of existing dwellings at North Drive and the effect of additional dwellings in the area. Removing trees and developing houses whilst not improving the water ways will result in more flooding.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with key Stakeholders to ensure that appropriate water and wastewater infrastructure is delivered to ensure the sustainability of the site. Developers are required to work with Thames Water at an early stage to ensure appropriate water and waste infrastructure is delivered for the site and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The Council considers that these matters are sufficiently covered within the Development Site Templates and notes that a Statement of Common Ground has been prepared between Thames Water and Harwell Campus.</p>

Core Policy 16b: Didcot Garden Town

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)				No	Aerodrome Safeguarding Area	<p>Several comments were made by DIO in relation to the Didcot Garden Town Masterplan area. The area falls within the 91.4m aerodrome height safeguarding consultation zone around RAL Benson, and within the statutory birdstrike safeguarding consultation zones. The following development should be referred to them for review:</p> <p>That exceeding the 91.4m aerodrome height Any SUDs schemes or development including the creation of balancing ponds, as these developments may attract flocking bird species hazardous to air traffic safety.</p>	Noted. The DIO will continue to be consulted on all planning applications within the Didcot Garden Town area.
756175 1142392	Mr Robin Draper Mr Vic Johnson					No No	Deliverability Deliverability	<p>Comments state that the Didcot Garden Town proposals may be undeliverable and that the development of this initiative is unsound as it does not mention the need for effective Governance. Comments propose the following new paragraph is added:</p>	The Local Plan 2031: Part 2 simply proposes to include in policy the Didcot Garden Town Principles that have been developed through a comprehensive process including consultation and engagement with local stakeholders and residents. However, the Part 2 plan does not in itself make any proposals for Didcot Garden Town or seek to demonstrate that they are

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Didcot Garden Town (DGT) straddles two District Councils, with all the difficulties that entails as well as numerous villages that will be affected by it. Key to the maximising the benefit of the DGT Initiative is that effective, accountable and transparent governance arrangements are put in place in a timely fashion. In that there will be a need for strong representation by the surrounding villages and local communities with robust voting rights, to avoid their be adversely affected.	deliverable or undeliverable. It is envisaged that a separate Development Plan Document is prepared for the Didcot Garden Town area, which will be subject to all legislative requirements. The Part 2 plan does not have a role in influencing governance arrangements associated with the Garden Town project.
1144989	Mrs Cathy Harrison	Environment Agency					Environment Agency comments on Masterplan Principles	Environment Agency comment recommending the following change to the Masterplan Principle 'Landscape and Green Infrastructure' to improve clarity and accuracy: Adding reference to Part 1 Core Policies 40 (Sustainable Design and Construction) and 43 (Natural Resources) to ensure attention is brought to water efficiency in new housing developments and good water efficiency practices.	The Council notes the comments from the Environment Agency.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Historic England comments on Heritage and archaeology	Comments were made by Historic England in relation to Heritage and Archaeology, including: Heritage: support for the Masterplan Principle 5 (Heritage) Archaeology: the area proposed for Garden Town should be subject to detailed archaeological assessment to inform the masterplan. There are a number of existing archaeological studies as part of the proposed area, but the comment states that these have not been collated and reviewed, which would be helpful to do as a first step in compiling an evidence base for the masterplan.	The Council welcomes Historic England's support for Masterplan Principle 5. It is envisaged that a separate Development Plan Document will be prepared for the Didcot Garden Town area that will be subject to all normal legislative requirements and be informed by detailed evidence. This will include appropriate consideration for archaeology.
1096672		Mays Properties Ltd	1096673		G R Planning Consultancy Ltd	No	Masterplan area - objection	Objection to the designated area, which includes landholdings at Milton Interchange Services in Milton which has outline planning permission for roadside services. Comment indicates that there is no justification nor planning reason to include it in the Masterplan area, and requests that the land South of the A4130 at Milton Interchange is removed from the designated Didcot Garden Town master planning area.	The Council consider that the Masterplan area, which has been informed by the Council's Delivery Plan for the Didcot Garden Town area, is appropriate. The adoption of the new local Plan 2031 will not override planning applications which have been approved and are still extant at the time of adoption.
1097559	MEPC						Masterplan area - support	Comments of support from MEPC for the Didcot Garden Town proposed development plan and shared vision of the area, which seeks to accommodate the growth of Didcot. The Masterplan area encompasses Milton Park, which provides a real opportunity to a create cohesive, inter-connected plan for the local area. MEPC would welcome the opportunity to discuss the development proposals in greater detail.	Noted
752742 826174	Mr Malcolm Moor Mr Daniel Scharf	SAFAG				No No	Masterplan Principles Masterplan Principles	Comments were made in support of these Masterplan Principles, stating that the plan has been improved through the plan making process and has addressed many concerns. Despite this, several comments	The council welcomes the support for the Didcot Garden Town Principles. These principles have been designed specifically for Didcot Garden Town, and other development policies

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company				Yes	Masterplan Principles	<p>raised that these principles should not be limited to the Didcot Garden Town area and instead should apply to the whole district. One comment specifically states that 'green living' and 'innovative habitat planting and food growing zones' should apply to all new larger scale development, and the Plan should include the market garden zones currently omitted from the list; at present, the necessary research into food supply systems has not been carried out. This would improve transport and quality of life, therefore addressing the ambition to make the Vale a truly outstanding place to life and work.</p> <p>Support for the Masterplan Principles relating to transport, in particular reducing the reliance on motorised vehicles and moving towards active and public transport. Oxford Bus Company comments stated that they would be content to discuss potential bus routing options and developers' contributions that would apply with the planning authority and developer although we support site specific Section 106 funding to provide services which are commercially unviable.</p>	<p>will cover the rest of the district. It would not be appropriate to apply the principles of a garden town to the district as a whole.</p> <p>Local food production and habitat creation is encouraged within the Green Infrastructure Strategy. The Council notes the comments from the Oxford Bus company.</p>
756760	Mr Roger Turnbull	East Hendred Parish Council				No	Objection - no allocated development sites	<p>Comment states that the policy relating to Figure 2.8 is unsound because it does not identify sites for housing. The preparation of a Masterplan and Supplementary Planning Guidance should be based on strategic policies in Local Plan Part 2 (on the amount, type, scale and location of housing in Didcot Garden Town). In this respect the policy does not comply with NPPF guidance on identifying suitable sites for housing in sustainable locations.</p>	<p>The Local Plan 2031: Parts 1 and 2 seek to fully meet the Objectively Assessed Need for housing for the District based on robust and soundly-based evidence and as adopted in the Part 1 plan following local plan Examination, and to fully meet the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale. The Didcot Garden Town principles affect the quality of development coming forward within the Garden Town Area, they do not inform the allocation of housing across the district as a whole.</p>
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council					SODC - support	<p>Comments from South Oxfordshire District Council to support the inclusion of this policy and the joint work on this project. Of particular importance is the viable infrastructure in Didcot and its potential impact on other new facilities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
730017	Ms Ruth Cross	South Oxfordshire District Council					SODC Leisure Team comment	<p>South Oxfordshire District Council Leisure Team propose the following textual modification to paragraph 2.123: "and will include substantial areas of formal and informal open space, SPORTS FACILITIES and green infrastructure"</p>	<p>The Council consider the current wording to be sufficient and believe the Leisure Policies sufficiently cover this.</p>

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

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
827932	Julie Maberley	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No	General	Two general comments have been received in relation to Core Policy 18a. These are summarised as follows: Wantage and Grove Campaign Group has requested that land is safeguarded for a transport interchange near Wantage and Grove. Oxfordshire County Council note that their support for safeguarded land for transport schemes does not mean that there is a commitment to funding these schemes.	The Council considers that the safeguarding of land for a future train station at Grove (as set out in Core Policy 19 and the emerging Core Policy 19a) represents an ideal opportunity to deliver a transport interchange near Wantage and Grove. Such a scheme would likely bring together bus and rail services in one location. The Council is committed to working with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner alongside planned growth for the district.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council							
827932	Julie Maberley	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No	Milton Heights Pedestrian and Cycle Bridge - General	One general comment has been received relating to the Milton Heights Pedestrian and Cycle Bridge. Wantage and Grove Campaign Group seek additional land to be safeguarded between Wantage/Grove and the key employment sites at Harwell and Didcot.	Route improvements to the A417 between Wantage and Blewbury, in addition to improvements to the strategic cycle network in the South East Vale Sub Area are included in Core Policy 17 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. Further details of this is set out in Volume 2 (annex 1) of the Local Transport Plan 4. The National Cycle Network Route 544 currently connects Wantage and Harwell. Further links to this route are also being considered, including linking with the Abingdon-on-Thames to Harwell corridor. A separate route is also being considered alongside the existing railway line which could connect Wantage and Grove with Milton Park and Didcot.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Milton Heights Pedestrian and Cycle Bridge - Support - OCC	One comment of support has been received in relation to the Milton Heights Pedestrian and Cycle Bridge. Oxfordshire County Council confirms funding has been secured for this piece of infrastructure.	Comment of support is welcomed and is noted. The Council welcome the provision of new infrastructure that promotes sustainable modes of transport in Science Vale.
972888		National Grid	1142380	Ms Hannah Lorna Bevins	Amec Foster Wheeler	No	Milton Slips - General	A small number of general comments made relating to the proposed safeguarding of land for dedicated access to / from the A34 to Milton Park. The comments are summarised as follows: Information from National Grid relating to the presence of high voltage power lines in the vicinity of land to be safeguarded through this policy. The Ministry of Defence (Defence Infrastructure Organisation) makes reference to safeguarding zones and birdstrike safeguarding zones in the area of this proposed scheme. The MOD will need to be consulted if any structure exceeds 91.4m in height or if proposals contain SUDs schemes or balancing ponds which may attract flocking bird species. Oxfordshire County Council clarifies that a number of options are currently being explored for future capacity improvements at the Milton Interchange, one of which is dedicated slip roads to Milton Park. Additional modifications to this particular safeguarded area may be required if more up to date evidence suggests this is required.	General comments are welcomed and have been noted. The Council would like to respond as follows: Data provided by National Grid is welcomed and will assist the council's knowledge of constraints associated with land to be safeguarded through Core Policy 12a. The Council will consult with the relevant office of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation should such proposals come forward on this site. The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council on exploring all options for future infrastructure improvements in this area.
729502	Ms Debbie Baker	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)				No			
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council							

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
727681	Mr Gordon Brown					No	CP18a - Milton Slips - Object	<p>A significant number of objections have been received in relation to the proposed land to be safeguarded for direct access to / from the A34 to Milton Park. The majority of these objections relate to the inclusion of land at Drayton Park Golf Club in the safeguarded area. A summary of these objections are as follows:</p> <p>The loss of two holes on the golf course would significantly impact the business and overall function of the tournament course.</p> <p>The lack of consultation with owners or members of the golf club in relation to the safeguarded land, prior to its inclusion in Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p> <p>The loss of this land at the Golf Club would result in a loss of recreational space.</p> <p>The loss of this land at the Golf Club would result in a loss of social space.</p> <p>The loss of this land at the Golf Club would result in a loss of wildlife, including potentially some protected species (water vole).</p> <p>No evidence is available to demonstrate that an additional slip road will address future issues at the Milton Interchange.</p> <p>In addition to the above, a small number of objections have been received relating to the following:</p> <p>The scheme will impact on the nearby Grade I listed building Milton Manor.</p> <p>The scheme would result in increased noise pollution for residents of Milton.</p> <p>PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS include:</p> <p>A significant number of comments seeking the removal of the two holes on the golf course from land to be safeguarded.</p> <p>The complete deletion of the land to be safeguarded for dedicated access to / from the A34 to Milton Park, including any subsequent references within the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p> <p>Seek employers/employees at Milton Park to stagger their start/finish times for work to reduce pressure at this junction.</p>	<p>Oxfordshire County Council has indicated that the safeguarding of land for a dedicated access to / from the A34 to Milton Park is one of a number of options currently being considered to address long term growth in the immediate area.</p> <p>The Council has investigated the issues raised relating to safeguarding of land extending into Drayton Park Golf Course, and has worked with Oxfordshire County Council on the potential to revise the northern boundary of the safeguarded land to exclude holes 9 and 10. Both Councils agree that the boundary can be revised without substantially impacting the suitability of this scheme as a future option. The Council therefore propose an additional modification to Local Plan 2031 Part 2 which revises the land to be safeguarded, and hope that this adequately addresses the concerns raised by the landowners and members of the golf course.</p> <p>The Council considers that details of this scheme are at a very early stage, and is intended to form part of a range of options to be tested to ensure long term growth beyond the plan period does not significantly impact upon the Milton Interchange. Its inclusion within Core Policy 18a should not be taken that this scheme will be selected as the preferred option in due course.</p> <p>The setting of listed buildings such as Milton Manor and the potential for increased noise pollution as a result of this scheme will form part of the factors that will be considered when options are tested in due course. Any future scheme, should it come forward, will need to comply with National Policy as well as the adopted policies of the Local Plan including where they relate to the Historic Environment (Core Policy 39) and noise pollution (Core Policy 18).</p> <p>The Council proposes a modification to remove the two holes of Drayton Park Golf Club from the safeguarded land. The Council does not consider it appropriate to delete the scheme in its entirety as this could prejudice the option to consider this scheme in further detail, should other forms of development come forward on this land in due course. The Milton Interchange forms a key access point to Didcot and Science Vale and it is important that all options for improvements to this junction are considered at this stage.</p>
830085	Garry Cook					No			
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler					No			
1095942	Mr Geoffery Spiero					No			
1142970	Mr Steve Greenwood					No			
1144066	Mr James Oliphant					No			
1144097	Mr Joseph Taylor					No			
1144118	Mr Stuart Thompson					No			
1144151	Mr Brian Monnery					No			
1144176	Mr William Major					No			
1144184	Mr Anthony Jones					No			
1144318	Mr Simon Berry					No			
1144329	Mr Clifford Bosley					No			
1144470	Mrs Diane McKenna-Rhead					No			
1144485	Mrs Rosemary Chapman					No			
1144501	Mrs Mary McKenna					No			
1144599	Mr Derek Chapman					No			
1144600	Mr Oliver Bowden					No			
1144602	Mr Nicholas Ball					No			
1144603	MR Michael Allsworth					No			
1144608	Mr Douglas Whiting					No			
1144858	Mr Kenneth Fort					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144858	Mr Kenneth Fort					No			
1144859	Mr Steven George					No			
1144867	Mr Steven Greenwood								
1144869	Mr Dudley Grimwood					No			
1144924	MR Michael Millard					No			
1144927	Mr William King MClachlan					No			
1144965	Mr Alaistar Crossan					No			
1144967	Mr John Cottis								
1144969	Mr Alan Davies					No			
1144972	Mr John Fisher					No			
1144974	Mr Peter Hamp					No			
1144981	Mr John Henderson					No			
1144982	Mr Nick Sanderson					No			
1144983	Mr Graham Sanderson					No			
1144984	Dr Leslie Russell					No			
1144988	Mr John Henley					No			
1144990	Mr Lawrence King					No			
1144993	Mr Robert Lennox					No			
1144994	Miss Emily Marsh					No			
1144999	Mr Roger Wilkins					No			
1145004	Mrs Gwendoline McEwen					No			
1145006	Mr Terry Stacey					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1145009	Mrs Frances Stacey					No			
1145010	Mr John Sargent					No			
1145012	Mr Christopher Spearing					No			
1145019	Mrs Roberta Wheeler					No			
1145021	Mr Robert Whiting					No			
1145022	Mr David Wheeler					No			
1145024	Mr Roland Turner					No			
1145331	Mrs Margaret Harte					No			
1145346	Mr Edward Harte					No			
1153597	Mr Jonathan Draycott					No			
1097559	MEPC						Milton Slips - Support	Two comments of support have been received in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for dedicated access to / from the A34 to Milton Park. The comments are summarised as follows: Support from the owners of Milton Park for this safeguarded land. Support from South Oxfordshire District Council for schemes which improve access arrangements to Milton Park.	Comments of support are welcomed and are noted. The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders to ensure that all possible options to deliver long term growth at the Milton Interchange can be considered in detail.
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council							
1095813	Mrs Linda Martin	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council				No	Thames Crossing - Object	A small number of objections have been made in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a Thames River Crossing. These comments include: Sutton Courtenay Parish Council highlight that no account has been taken of recent studies regarding congestion in the area around Sutton Courtenay. Little regard has been given to significant heritage constraints, including scheduled monuments, which have not been adequately considered. Development at Culham (in SODC) is unsound and requires the delivery of this infrastructure. The Environment Agency raise concerns that some of the land safeguarded is located in areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3. They request that further work is required where proposals include land in Flood Zone	The Council supports the principle of a new Thames River Crossing connecting Culham with Didcot. The purpose of this scheme is to alleviate traffic congestion in the area, including at existing river crossings such as that near Sutton Courtenay. The principle of safeguarding land within Vale of White Horse District for the Thames River Crossing has already been agreed through the existing safeguarded land set out in Core Policy 18 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. Local Plan 2031 Part 2 seeks only to update the boundaries of the safeguarded area to exclude known heritage constraints, including a number of important scheduled monuments. It is a matter for South Oxfordshire District Council's emerging Local Plan 2033 to demonstrate soundness of the proposed growth at Culham.
1101566	Summix Ltd/Pye Homes		874611	Mr Greg Mitchell	Framptons Town Planning	No			
1144989	Mrs Cathy Harrison	Environment Agency				No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>2 and 3, including a Sequential Test and Level 2 SFRA.</p> <p>Some RECOMMENDATIONS have been highlighted by these comments, which are summarised as follows:</p> <p>Sutton Courtenay Parish Council seek an explanation as to why the western land to be safeguarded is included as its delivery would attract a significant amount of increased traffic, contrary to information provided by Oxfordshire County Council which confirms that the local road network is over capacity.</p> <p>As some comments consider that the proposed scheme is unsound, although not specifically stated, these objectors would seek the deletion of land to be safeguarded for a Thames River Crossing and any subsequent references from Local Plan 2031 Part 2 in order for the plan to be made sound.</p>	<p>The Council recognises the importance of protecting areas which are at risk of flooding, as highlighted by the representation made by the Environment Agency. The council have worked with the Environment Agency on the concerns raised and have agreed through a statement of common ground that an additional modification to the supporting text of Core Policy 19a would address their concerns.</p> <p>In addressing the recommendations, the Council would like to respond as follows:</p> <p>The principle of safeguarding land in Vale of White Horse District Council for a future river crossing between Culham and Didcot is intended to alleviate traffic congestion in this area. Existing bridges in the area comprise of single lane crossings which are signalised and were not designed to manage current traffic flows in the area. The proposed river crossing would provide a more suitable alternative for traffic seeking to access Didcot from north of the River Thames. The scheme is likely to divert traffic away from the settlements of Sutton Courtenay and Appleford.</p> <p>The Council considers that the principle of safeguarding land for this scheme has already been demonstrated through its existing safeguarding in Core Policy 18 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The scheme will deliver an important strategic link between the strategic employment site at Culham and Didcot, which is important to unlocking the growth potential of Science Vale.</p>
928610 1100197	Lynette Hughes Mr Peter Canavan	Oxfordshire County Council South Oxfordshire District Council					Thames Crossing - Support	<p>Two comments of support have been received in relation to the proposed safeguarding of land for a Thames River Crossing. The comments are summarised as follows:</p> <p>Support from Oxfordshire County Council, who note the amendments to the existing safeguarded area are principally intended to exclude land designated as Scheduled Monuments.</p> <p>Support from South Oxfordshire District Council who note the importance placed on a cross-border package of highways improvements.</p>	<p>Comments of support are welcomed and are noted. The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council, South Oxfordshire District Council and other key stakeholders to ensure the successful delivery of a Thames River Crossing between Culham and Didcot.</p>

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

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response	
1138404	Mr Don Oldcorn					Yes	General	One general comment has been received for Core Policy 19a. This seeks the provision of pedestrian access to a railway station in Grove for residents of East Hanney village.	Comment is noted. While the Part 2 plan does not identify a specific pedestrian route linking the village of East Hanney with a possible future train station at Grove, it is important that any future railway station in this area maximises opportunities for local residents to use sustainable modes of transport. This will be considered as part of any future work for the station.	
758065	Mrs Vanessa Wooldridge	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	758063	Mr Andrew Raven	Savills	Yes and No	Object	A number of representations have been received which object to safeguarding land for the re-opening of Grove Station (Core Policy 19a). Key comments include the following:	<p>The safeguarding of land to support the future re-opening of Grove Railway Station remains an ambition of the council. It is recognised that further detailed feasibility studies are required in order to determine the most suitable location for a station at Grove. Some of this work is currently being undertaken in conjunction with Oxfordshire County Council and other key stakeholders. The land safeguarded through Core Policy 19a represents the outcomes of studies done to date and does not preclude other land in the vicinity from being considered further in the future, should new evidence demonstrate this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council recognises the importance of Williams F1 as a key employer for Grove, Wantage and the wider Science Vale area. A number of options are currently being considered for the location of a future train station at Grove and the council are keen to engage with all relevant stakeholders as more detailed feasibility studies emerge for the scheme. The provision of a train station will consolidate the area's key role in supporting strong economic growth for Science Vale. Network Rail have confirmed that the land safeguarded for a station through Local Plan 2031 Part 1, east of the A338, is no longer a suitable option due to the electrification works which have taken place on the line in this location. The provision of a new station at Grove will need to comply with the requirements for National Planning Policy Framework, including where they relate to noise (Paragraph 109 of the NPPF) and light pollution (paragraph 125 of the NPPF). Section 4 of the NPPF places a strong emphasis on maximising sustainable modes of transport. The provision of a new station at Grove will provide local residents with a high quality public transport system which is intended to reduce the number of people using the local road network. This may in time provide fast, frequent and reliable transport connections to Didcot, Oxford, Swindon and the wider area, including London. The council recognises the representation made by Oxfordshire County Council, and welcome its support in principle for safeguarding land in this location. The district council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council, Network Rail, and 	
1096810		Williams Grand Prix Engineering Limited	1096811	Mr Mike Robinson	Strutt & Parker LLP					A number of representations highlight that there is a lack of robust evidence supporting the proposed safeguarded sites for a station, including in relation to design and deliverability;
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley					Representations from Williams F1 that part of the land safeguarded is in their ownership and could impact upon future operations of the site. They do not object to the principle of safeguarding land for a future station at Grove but recommends future engagement as detailed proposal emerge;
1143258							No			<p>A separate representation stating that a station next to Williams F1 could undermine facilities there, such as the recently constructed wind tunnel;</p> <p>Representations from the site promoters of the "Tulwick Farm" site to the east of the A338 object to the deletion of original land safeguarded for a station through Local Plan 2031 Part 1, and request its inclusion again in Local Plan 2031 Part 2;</p> <p>The safeguarded land is not consistent with National Policy with respect to noise and light pollution as a result of a new station;</p> <p>The A338 is already heavily congested and a train station would only add to this problem;</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council support the principle of safeguarding land for a future station at Grove. They highlight that if more detailed work in the short-term results in amendments to the boundaries of the safeguarded land, then this may result in a modification to the plan.</p> <p>The Environment Agency raise concerns that some of the land safeguarded is located in areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3. They request that further work is required where proposals include land in Flood Zone 2 and 3, including a Sequential Test and Level 2 SFRA.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>other key stakeholders on preparing more detailed feasibility studies for a new station at Grove. The council will consider the outcomes of any future work in due course, including whether any changes are required to the currently identified safeguarded areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council recognises the importance of protected areas which are at risk of flooding, as highlighted by the representation made by the Environment Agency. The council agrees that further detailed feasibility work is required to determine the most suitable and sustainable location for a train station at Grove. Should additional feasibility work continue to identify land which is at a higher risk of flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3), then proposals will need to apply the sequential test and undertake further studies as appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 100 of the NPPF. The council have worked with the Environment Agency on the concerns raised and have agreed through a statement of common ground that an additional modification to the supporting text of Core Policy 19a would address their concerns.
1144989	Mrs Cathy Harrison	Environment Agency				No	Object - EA	The Environment Agency raise concerns that some of the land safeguarded is located in areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3. They request that further work is required where proposals include land in Flood Zone 2 and 3, including a Sequential Test and Level 2 SFRA.	The council recognises the importance of protected areas which are at risk of flooding, as highlighted by the representation made by the Environment Agency. The council agrees that further detailed feasibility work is required to determine the most suitable and sustainable location for a train station at Grove. Should additional feasibility work continue to identify land which is at a higher risk of flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3), then proposals will need to apply the sequential test and undertake further studies as appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 100 of the NPPF. The council have worked with the Environment Agency on the concerns raised and have agreed through a statement of common ground that an additional modification to the supporting text of Core Policy 19a would address their concerns.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Object - OCC	Oxfordshire County Council support the principle of safeguarding land for a future station at Grove. They highlight that if more detailed work in the short-term results in amendments to the boundaries of the safeguarded land, then this may result in a modification to the plan.	The council recognises the representation made by Oxfordshire County council, and welcome its support in principle for safeguarding land in this location. The district council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County council, Network Rail, and other key stakeholders on preparing more detailed feasibility studies for a new Station at Grove. The council will consider the outcomes of any future work in due course, including whether any changes are required to the currently identified safeguarded areas.
730259 874560	Mr Graham Mundy Ms Helen Marshall	Grove Parish Council Campaign to Protect Rural England				Yes Yes	Support	Two comments of general support have been received for Core Policy 19a. These are from Grove Parish Council and CPRE. CPRE note that there is no commitment from Network Rail and hope that this can be brought forward as an urgent matter.	Comments of support and welcomed and have been noted. The council is committed to working with Network Rail and other key stakeholders on a new train station at Grove in the Plan period.

Core Policy 20a: Housing Supply Western Vale Sub-Area

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1098047	Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey					Alternative Sites - Faringdon	A number of representations identify alternative sites within the Western Vale Sub-Area for consideration for allocation within the Part 2 plan. These includes sites at: Faringdon, Longcot, Shellingford, Shrivenham, Stanford in the Vale, Uffington, West Wantage and Westcot. The submissions variously describe the sites as being sustainable locations for development. Comments highlight the importance of providing sufficient sites to provide flexibility, to support housing delivery, and to contribute to significantly boosting the supply of housing within the district. It is suggested that not allocating housing within the Western Vale Sub-Area is inconsistent with the Part 1 plan that identifies a housing requirement for the Part 2 plan within the Western Vale Sub-Area. Some comments consider the Western Vale Sub-Area is a suitable location for development to support unmet housing need for Oxford and the South-East Vale Sub-Area.	Having updated the completions and commitment figures for inclusion in the Submission Part 2 plan, the housing requirement for the Western Vale Sub-Area is fully met, without the need for any further allocations within the Part 2 plan. The Sub-Area housing requirement is updated in-line with changes to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area to reflect the residual necessary to meet the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale. The windfall allowance has also been updated to reflect recent past delivery, although the approach is still considered to be cautious. However, even without these changes, the supply would still exceed the identified need for the Western Vale Sub-Area, as set out in the Part 1 plan, and on this basis, no further allocations are required. Core Policy 20 was found to be soundly based at Examination for the Part 1 plan, which also makes provision for the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, to ensure the policy and plan provides flexibility.
1098047	Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd	No			
1099225		Welbeck Strategic Land Ltd	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning				
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning		Alternative Site - Longcot		
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning		Alternative Site – Shellingford		
1096854		RH Systems	1144378	Mrs Sarah Kasparian	Bell Cornwell LLP	No	Alternative Sites - Shrivenham		
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No			
1143975	Mr Tim Browning		1142270	Mr Jon Alsop	Savills	Yes	Alternative Site - Stanford in the Vale		
1096069	Ms Jones	Redcliffe Homes Ltd				No	Alternative Site – Uffington		
1096101	Mr Randal Joseph Pakeman	Drivewalk Ltd	832055	Mr Paul Butt	Paul Butt Planning	No	Alternative Site - West Wantage		
737350	Mr James Lonsdale	The Lonsdale Estate	722577		JPPC	No	Alternative Site -Westcot		
1096854		RH Systems	1144378	Mrs Sarah Kasparian	Bell Cornwell LLP	No	Duty to Cooperate - Swindon	The plan is not sound as it does not comply with the duty to cooperate requirement. The plan does not take into account the close relationship the Western Sub-Are has with Swindon and the wider Swindon Borough. It is noted that the sub area is a distance from Oxford, however does not take into account the spatial locations of larger settlements such as Shrivenham and Swindon. Swindon provides employment to the residents of Western Vale and this is not mentioned within the plan.	The Council acknowledges the distance between Swindon and the settlements within Western Vale. The Council have produced a statement of common Ground with Swindon Borough Council and will continue to work with neighbouring councils in looking at cross strategic issues.
730221	Councillor Alison Thomson	Vale of White Horse District Council					Education	One comment from the Chairman of the Faringdon Pre-School Management Committee expresses concern about the need for a new building and site of the pre-school. The pre-school is run as a not-for-profit charity and many of the children come from financially weak families; raising financial support for school improvements is difficult. The pre-school is a valuable part of the community and requires extra support which should be fed into the LPP2.	The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council who are the education authority within the County. The Part 2 plan does not propose any additional site allocations in the Western Vale Sub-Area as this area does not relate well to either Oxford, or Science Vale, which form the main focus of the document. It is therefore unable to make provisions to support educational infrastructure within the western Vale sub area.
1098047	Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd	No	Settlement Hierarchy	This comment questions whether the Part 2 plan is consistent with the Settlement Hierarchy established by the Part 1 plan and whether the role of Faringdon has changed. It is suggested that in its current form,	The Council considers that the Part 2 plan is fully consistent with the Part 1 plan, including the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								the plan is unsound, and that this could be remedied by distributing development across the whole district, in accordance with the Spatial Strategy established by the Part 1 plan. It is suggested that the Western Vale is appropriate to accommodate housing need for Oxford and that too much focus for unmet housing need for Oxford falls to the Abingdon-on-Thames/Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. Consideration is also given to the role of smaller sites to assist with housing delivery.	The Council are seeking to ensure that the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford, to be addressed within the Vale, is met within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and that at least 2,200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. The Council does not consider that the Western Vale Sub-Area is sufficiently close or accessible to Oxford to be a suitable location for housing to meet the Oxford need. This approach, and the sites proposed as allocations within the Part 2 plan, are all considered to be fully consistent with both the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy. Having updated the completions and commitment figures for inclusion in the Submission Part 2 plan, the housing requirement for the Western Vale Sub-Area is fully met, without the need for any further allocations within the Part 2 plan. Core Policy 20 was found to be soundly based at Examination for the Part 1 plan, which also makes provision for the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, to ensure the policy and plan provides flexibility.
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman	Bovis Homes Limited				No	Sub-Area Boundaries	The Sub-Area Boundaries are described as arbitrary, which are considered to rule out the Western Vale area from providing more housing within the Part 2 plan. The deliverability of the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks is questioned along with the need to plan for at least an additional 7,000 homes for Oxford.	The Sub-Area Boundaries were found to be soundly based through Examination into the Part 1 plan. The Council considers that the Part 2 plan is fully consistent with the Part 1 plan, including the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy. The Council are seeking to ensure that the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford, to be addressed within the Vale, is met within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and that at least 2,200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. The Council does not consider that the Western Vale Sub-Area is sufficiently close or accessible to Oxford to be a suitable location for housing to meet the Oxford need. This approach, and the sites proposed as allocations within the Part 2 plan, are all considered to be fully consistent with both the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy. Having updated the completions and commitment figures for inclusion in the Submission Part 2 plan, the housing requirement for the Western Vale Sub-Area is fully met, without the need for any further allocations within the Part 2 plan. Core Policy 20 was found to be soundly based at Examination for the Part 1 plan, which also makes provision for the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, to ensure the policy and plan provides flexibility. The Council is satisfied that the proposed allocation is deliverable within the plan period and has provided further evidence from DIO to demonstrate this. The matter of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is discussed elsewhere.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									The Oxfordshire SHMA has been scrutinised at Local Plan Examination for Vale, Cherwell and West Oxfordshire and the proposed apportionment of unmet need has been agreed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board.
1096854		RH Systems	1144378	Mrs Sarah Kasparian	Bell Cornwell LLP	No	Western Vale Sub- Area - LPP1 Allocations	This response focuses on the role of the Land West of Coxwell Road site allocated within the Part 1 plan. Whilst it was allocated for 200 dwellings, an application was approved in advance of the adoption of the Part 1 plan for 200 dwellings, on a smaller site area. It is suggested that the site could accommodate more development now.	The Council considers that this response relates to a Part 1 allocation and does not affect the soundness of the Part 2 plan. Whilst the site was allocated for 'around' 200 dwellings subject to master planning and the policy requirements being demonstrably complied with. This does not preclude more development coming forward on the allocated site, subject to the policy requirements being met. This is a matter for the Development Management process.
1099225		Welbeck Strategic Land Ltd	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning				
737350	Mr James Lonsdale	The Lonsdale Estate	722577		JPPC	No	Western Vale Sub-Area - Unmet Housing for Oxford/ Flexibility and Distribution	A number of responses suggest that it is unreasonable for the Plan to seek to restrict the search for the unmet housing needs to two sub areas, excluding the Western Vale. The Plan is therefore not positively prepared or justified and fails the tests of soundness. It is also suggested that the plan should make provision for an increased number of dwellings to meet the unmet need of Oxford City by at least 7,000 and that parts of the Western Vale, including for example East Challow, should be recognised as capable of providing additional housing. It is stated that a 20 % buffer is needed to ensure a realistic prospect of achieving the planning supply, which is particularly pertinent given the historic under-delivery. The deliverability of the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks is questioned along with the potential harm for planning for additional housing within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. It is suggested that work is needed to update the Part 1 plan, to update the housing requirement for the Western Vale Sub-Area and to work more with Swindon to explore the potential for the Western Vale to accommodate more housing for Swindon. It is suggested that failure to allocate additional housing within the Western Vale Sub-Area within the Part 2 renders it to be unsound, as it does not comply with the Spatial Strategy. It is suggested that the residual housing need from the Part 1 plan, should be distributed across the whole district.	Having updated the completions and commitment figures for inclusion in the Submission Part 2 plan, the housing requirement for the Western Vale Sub-Area is fully met, without the need for any further allocations within the Part 2 plan. The Sub-Area housing requirement is updated in-line with changes to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area to reflect the residual necessary to meet the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale. The windfall allowance has also been updated to reflect recent past delivery, although the approach is still considered to be cautious. However, even without these changes, the supply would still exceed the identified need for the Western Vale Sub-Area, as set out in the Part 1 plan, and on this basis, no further allocations are required. Core Policy 20 was found to be soundly based at Examination for the Part 1 plan, which also makes provision for the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, to ensure the policy and plan provides flexibility. The Council are seeking to ensure that the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford, to be addressed within the Vale, is met within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and that at least 2,200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. The Council does not consider that the Western Vale Sub-Area is sufficiently close or accessible to Oxford to be a suitable location for housing to meet the oxford need. Although the Council are proposing two additional site allocations within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, these are for site specific reasons. The Council does not consider that the Western Vale Sub-Area is sufficiently close or accessible to the Science Vale area, however, it will be a matter for a future local plan, seeking to meet housing need for the district beyond 2031 to consider the housing need for the
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman	Bovis Homes Limited				No			
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning				
1096854		RH Systems	1144378	Mrs Sarah Kasparian	Bell Cornwell LLP	No			
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No			
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley				
1098047	Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				
1099225		Welbeck Strategic Land Ltd	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning	No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>Western Vale. On this basis, it will be appropriate for all reasonable alternative sites to be considered as part of any future local plan process.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks is deliverable within the plan period and has provided further evidence from DIO to demonstrate this.</p> <p>The matter of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is discussed elsewhere. The Oxfordshire SHMA has been scrutinised at Local Plan Examination for Vale, Cherwell and West Oxfordshire and the proposed apportionment of unmet need has been agreed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board.</p>

Chapter 3

Housing

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comment from Oxfordshire County Council	Oxfordshire County Council does not have any matters to raise regarding the Development Management Policies relating to Housing.	Noted
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No	Community led housing	The response refers to the lack of policies relating to community led housing, co-housing or community land trusts, which are considered to be important to meet housing needs across the district. It is suggested that the plan does not support sustainable policies by planning to address under-occupation leading to an unnecessarily large number of new houses. It is also suggested that the plan fails to provide sufficient small houses to meet the need.	The Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and 2 is informed by the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that identifies the 'Objectively Assessed Need' for housing for the Vale, for which the Vale plan is seeking to meet in full. The SHMA has been subject to scrutiny at Local Plan Examination and found to be robust and soundly based for the Vale Local Plan Part 1 and for the Cherwell Local Plan. The SHMA identifies a suitable housing mix to meet identified need. This is supported by Core Policy 22, as set out within the Local Plan Part 1, which was also subject to Examination and found sound. The Council does not consider that it is necessary to plan specifically for co-housing, community led housing or community land trusts; the policy framework is considered to provide sufficient flexibility. These types of housing could be supported by Neighbourhood Plans if communities wished to support them.
752742 826174	Mr Malcolm Moor Mr Daniel Scharf	SAFAG				No No	DP1: Self and Custom Build - Advertising	Two comments raise concern over the lack of advertisement of the Self Build Register; this is suggested to result in the need being under represented. Furthermore, it is suggested that without a clear requirement for developers to reserve plots within their proposed schemes the identified need will not be met. A requirement of 5 % of dwellings within large schemes being provided as self/ custom build is suggested to be required. It is suggested that the policy is not consistent with Government policy that is seeking to increase the provision of self/ custom building. It is suggested that custom splitting of housing could also assist with meeting the identified need.	The Council supports the provision of self/ custom build and Policy DP1 is considered to provide a positive framework to assist with delivering housing of this type. The Council does not consider that it is necessary to set an arbitrary threshold for all strategic sites to provide self/ custom build as this approach may not be sufficiently flexible. The Council considers that the Self/Custom Build Register is sufficiently advertised through both national Government and the District Council's websites.
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS					DP1: Self and Custom Build - Evidence	This comment suggests that there is a lack of evidence to support and justify the policy.	The Self build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016), places a duty on local planning authorities to keep a register of those interested in Self and Custom build. This register is used to recognise a local need for Self and Custom build. The Self and Custom Build register within Vale currently demonstrates a need within the district to encourage and support self and custom build. The Joint Housing Strategy also highlights a need for the Council to consider the provision of a policy for self and Custom Build. The Planning Practice Guidance states that councils should consider how they can best support self-build and custom housebuilding in their area, including

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									developing policies in their Local Plan for self-build and custom housebuilding.
1094599	Mr James Proyer	Persimmon Homes (Wessex)					DP1: Self Build - Comment	One comment supported the principle of a policy related to self-build and custom build, but questioned the available evidence to justify the need for this policy. Comment raised a concern that the provision of self-build plots would reduce the land available for traditional market and affordable homes, however acknowledged that the policy does not propose an absolute requirement for self-build plots to be incorporated into major development schemes.	The Self build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016), places a duty on local planning authorities to keep a register of those interested in Self and Custom build. This register is used to recognise a local need for Self and Custom build. The Self and Custom Build register within Vale currently demonstrates a need within the district to encourage and support self and custom build. The Joint Housing Strategy also highlights a need for the Council to consider the provision of a policy for self and Custom Build. The Planning Practice Guidance states that councils should consider how they can best support self-build and custom housebuilding in their area, including developing policies in their Local Plan for self-build and custom housebuilding.
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council					DP1: Self Build - Support - Statutory Consultee SODC	South Oxfordshire District Council support the addition of the proposed policy supporting self and custom build housing.	The Council note the support provided.
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS					DP1: Self Build - Time period	There are two comments which question the time constraint of completing a self and custom build property within three years of purchasing the plot of land. This could lead to plots being left undeveloped. It will also be difficult to monitor a plot of land purchased for self and custom build. The term purchasing is too ambiguous and unclear. It is unclear how self and custom build plots will contribute towards affordable housing	There is a recognised need for self and custom build plots. The time restriction will ensure the need is being fulfilled and supports housing growth within the district. The council recognises the difficulty in monitoring the purchasing of land for self and custom build and are investigating ways to keep a record of self and custom build planning applications.
1094599	Mr James Proyer	Persimmon Homes (Wessex)							
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS					DP1: Self Build and Custom Build - Affordable homes contribution	A number of comments refer to the role of Self/ Custom Build contributing to the provision of Affordable Housing in particular seeking further clarification. For example stating that CP24 doesn't refer to Self/ Custom Build and that the Housing White Paper does not specify that self/ custom build can contribute towards affordable housing provision. It is suggested that the policy is inconsistent with Paragraph 17 of the NPPF as it does not support a practical framework whereby decisions on planning applications can be made with predictability and efficiency. Certainty is requested for where self/ custom build will contribute to affordable housing, rather than "may" contribute. It is also suggested that the time-period of six months would be more appropriate, after the initial period of twelve months, to avoid plots being left undeveloped for any significant period of time.	The Council supports the provision of self/ custom build and Policy DP1 is considered to provide a positive framework to assist with delivering housing of this type. The Council does not consider that it is necessary to set an arbitrary threshold for all strategic sites to provide self/ custom build as this approach may not be sufficiently flexible, however, the policy does not preclude self/ custom build being provided. It is important a balance is found ensuring both a positive policy framework, but without incurring undue burden on developers that could affect site viability and hinder the delivery of either important infrastructure or affordable housing. The Council considers that the Self/ Custom Build Register is sufficiently advertised through both national Government and the District Council's websites.
1096854		RH Systems	1144378	Mrs Sarah Kasparian	Bell Cornwell LLP	No			
1144620	House Builders Federation		1144619	Mr Mark Behrendt					
1142405	Mr Roy Brown					No	DP2: Appendix I	The response highlights that Appendix I does not include reference to units of measurement.	The Council note this error and will propose an amendment to provide clarity on this matter.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS					DP2: Space Standards	It is suggested that the policy could be used to impose standards to proposals at reserve matters stage, thus impacting scheme viability and delaying delivery. It is suggested that clarity is provided to the supporting text that such standards should not be applied to proposals that have already been granted consent.	The Council is satisfied that the policy is sufficiently clear. New policies adopted after consent is granted would not ordinarily be retrospectively applied to proposals already consented. The Council does not consider any modifications are required.
1094599	Mr James Proyer	Persimmon Homes (Wessex)							
1102921	Legal and General Homes		1144761	Mr Nathan McLoughlin					
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council					DP2: Space Standards - Statutory Consultee SODC	South Oxfordshire District Council support the addition of the proposed policy supporting Space Standards	The Council note the support provided.
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire,	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd		DP2: Space Standards - Comment	One comment supported the principle of a policy related to space standards, but recognised that it is important that needs could change over the plan period and therefore the policy should include sufficient flexibility to accommodate changing circumstances.	The Council has prepared evidence to support this policy which is presented within the Housing Strategy. The Viability Statement supports the inclusion of the policy and ensures that the inclusion of the Nationally Described Space Standards will have minimal impact on the viability of the development. This being said, the Nationally Described Space Standards will be subject to viability testing through the planning application process with an open book approach between the Council and the developer.
878369	Mr Damian Sullivan	Thakeham Homes Ltd					DP2: Space Standards - Evidence	<p>There are a number of comments that relate to Development Policy 2, in particular that insufficient evidence has been provided to justify the policy. These comments suggest:</p> <p>The PPG requires local authorities to provide evidence to demonstrate a need and viability to implementing building regulations M4 standards. Reference to the DCLG's Technical Housing Standards and Part M of the Building Regulations is too prescriptive.</p> <p>The Viability report highlights that more new development is above the space standards. Viability for implementing the space standards needs to be assessed against the other policies.</p> <p>Wessex Economics report contradicts itself. It needs to be demonstrated that the need exists locally and not be a blanket policy requirement.</p> <p>Government stating that one size fits all approach may not reflect the needs and aspirations of a wider range of households.</p> <p>Viability study does not provide justification for this policy.</p> <p>Technical Housing Standards should only be used as a guide and the Housing White Paper states that they will be reviewed.</p> <p>Due to lack of evidence, these requirements set out in the policy should not be mandatory.</p>	<p>The Council has prepared an up to date Housing Delivery Strategy. This strategy has been informed by detailed evidence work and has identified a need to ensure that Nationally Described Space Standards are met within the Vale. These standards have been tested through the Local Plan Viability Evidence and found to be sufficiently robust.</p> <p>The Viability Statement supports the inclusion of the policy and ensures that the inclusion of the Nationally Described Space Standards will have minimal impact on the viability of the development.</p> <p>The key findings of the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) demonstrated a need for the Part 2 plan to provide additional policies and detail relating to the provision of housing for specialist and older population needs and to consider policies that support the provision of smaller dwellings. The Council's Housing Delivery Strategy draws on information contained within the SHMA, and identified that though demographic and disability research and data, there is a case for increasing housing stock for accessible and adaptable buildings in line with Part M (Categories 2 and 3) of the Building Regulations.</p> <p>The Housing Delivery Strategy also demonstrates there is a need in the district to apply specific standards, subject to viability assessment and that a substantial proportion of small properties within the market sector that fall below the new nationally described space standards.</p>
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No			
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS							
1021077	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire,	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				
1094599	Mr James Proyer	Persimmon Homes (Wessex)							
1102921	Legal and General Homes		1144761	Mr Nathan McLoughlin					

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								No evidence is provided as to how specialist accommodation outside of allocated sites will be used to contribute to the need of accessible and adaptable housing. No consideration has been provided as to the location of new dwellings. The policy will add additional conflicts over viability.	
1102921	Legal and General Homes		1144761	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			DP2: Space Standards - Evidence	This comment does not dispute the inclusion of the space standards in principle, however have concerns over the currently requirements.	The Council note the support in principle and will look to address their concerns within other comments.
878369 1094599 1102921	Mr Damian Sullivan Mr James Proyer Legal and General Homes	Thakeham Homes Ltd Persimmon Homes (Wessex)	1144761	Mr Nathan McLoughlin		No	DP2: Space Standards - Viability	<p>There are a number of comments relating to the viability of the space standards. These comments suggest:</p> <p>These standards should be avoided for reserved matters applications. There are a number of outline applications yet to be determined.</p> <p>Space standards play an important role in determining the viability of the development and the agreements set out in S106.</p> <p>It is the council's responsibility to ensure policies are viable and the responsibility should not fall to applicants.</p> <p>Viability update shows no recognition of the increased costs associated with meeting the proposed standards</p> <p>By introducing space standards on new development, it will affect how affordable house prices.</p> <p>The public should not be limited to just new builds but existing dwellings should also meet these standards.</p> <p>The requirement of 5% affordable homes meeting Building Regulations M4 (3) is considered too onerous.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance states that the national minimum space standards can only be applied through a policy in a Local Plan, where the Local Planning Authority has demonstrated through evidence that there is a need for space standards, and that viability is not compromised. Policy in the emerging Plan must be supported by clear evidence of need, viability and timing.</p> <p>One comment suggested that, should this policy remain, a degree of flexibility needs to be applied to the policy.</p>	The Council has prepared evidence to support this policy which is presented within the Housing Strategy. The Viability Statement supports the inclusion of the policy and ensures that the inclusion of the Nationally Described Space Standards will have minimal impact on the viability of the development. The Nationally Described Space Standards will be subject to viability testing through the planning application process with an open book approach between the Council and the developer.
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No	DP3: Sub-Division of Dwellings	Local Development Order's will enable custom-splitting at a scale without the need for express permission The policy is lenient and the restrictions should be handled with care.	Planning applications will need to comply with the Local Plan as a whole and not based upon one policy. The Council therefore feel that the policy is sufficient in promoting the sub-division of dwellings.
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No	DP4: Residential Annexes	A stricter policy needs to be provided to ensure all larger houses have to be designed so that they can	Extensions to new dwellings are currently permitted under permitted development rights. This is in compliance with the Town and Country Planning

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>be easily and cheaply subdivided as family circumstances change.</p> <p>A policy is needed to bring extensions back under planning control on new dwellings in order to maintain the supply of smaller dwellings and their thermal efficiency</p>	(General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
785705 826174	Mr Brian Rixon Mr Daniel Scharf	Sunningwell Parish Council				No No	DP6: Rural Workers Dwellings	<p>The response suggests that the policy should be more specific to avoid misinterpretation and provide more detail on how the policy will be enforced. Existing policies have not stopped development that do not fully respect the rural landscape, character and locality.</p> <p>One response refers to the need to plan for an increase in rural dwellings for agricultural workers. It is suggested that the plan should provide for a supply of dwellings in rural areas to meet what is referred to as a growing need. The response also references the importance of addressing soil quality.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the policy provides sufficient clarity. Planning applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan as a whole, including for example, consideration of national policy requirements. Enforcement is considered separately and does not affect soundness of the plan.</p> <p>The Council is seeking to meet the identified 'Objectively Assessed Need' for housing in full that has been informed by up to date and robust evidence, that has been subject to scrutiny at Examination for the Local Plan Part 1. DP6 provides guidance for how proposals for dwellings for 'Rural Workers' will be considered. However, the supply of housing in rural areas is not limited to DP6. The plan (both parts 1 and 2) makes provision for 24,748 dwellings, whilst providing a positive policy framework for development across the district, including for windfalls and development coming forward through Neighbourhood Planning.</p>
737350	Mr James Lonsdale	The Lonsdale Estate	722577		JPPC	No	DP7: Re-use, conversion and extension of buildings for dwellings in the open countryside - Development in rural settlements	<p>There are a number of comments made from one organisation regarding DP7: Re-use, conversion and Extension of Buildings for Dwellings in the Open Countryside. In particular, it is suggested:</p> <p>A positive development strategy for the redevelopment of rural buildings can make a positive contribution to the accomplishing the Local Plan objectives.</p> <p>The current policies limit the opportunities to develop in unallocated residential development</p> <p>If council are to maintain housing supply using windfall amounts, less restrictive policies need to be introduced and in particular, for rural areas.</p> <p>There are many established settlements classed as open countryside which restricts the opportunity for development.</p> <p>There is a need for housing in rural settlements which can enhance the setting of the area.</p> <p>This policy is against the NPPF which would like to see rural areas thrive whilst maintaining vibrant communities and businesses.</p> <p>The delivery of new homes in rural areas is fundamental in maintaining and enhancing rural areas.</p> <p>Current, used farm buildings are often several decades old and no longer meet required standards</p> <p>Changes in farming, particularly the</p>	<p>The Council is content that the Local Plan 2031: Parts 1 and 2 provide an appropriate policy framework to guide development and is consistent with national policy, guidance and legislation. Local Plan Part 1 has been subject to scrutiny at Examination and found to be soundly based. Development proposals will be informed by the Development Plan taken as a whole and also informed by national policy. Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs (Local Plan Part 1) provide guidance on how development in open countryside should be considered and includes reference both to the 'Development Plan' and 'National Policy' – this policy has been found to be soundly based through the Local Plan Part 1 Examination.</p> <p>Development Policy 7: provides additional guidance for proposals for 're-use, conversion, extension of buildings for dwellings in the open countryside' should be considered.</p> <p>Development Policy 7 provides provision to reuse, convert and extend existing buildings within the open countryside. This can provide suitable housing within the open countryside and make sure of redundant farm buildings</p> <p>Development Policy 7: Re-use, Conversion and Extension of Buildings for Dwellings in the Open Countryside caters to the redevelopment of redundant or disused farm buildings into dwellings. This will help contribute to the Districts Windfall</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>narrowing of profit margins, have seen fewer larger farms.</p> <p>The design of Utilitarian 'modern' agricultural buildings (post war) have a negative visual impact, however the use of these overweighed the impact. The presence of these buildings is becoming less justified as the buildings are becoming redundant. Sites with derelict and redundant farm buildings can be used to provide housing without the need to build on greenfield sites.</p> <p>They would like to see a policy included that supports the redevelopment of redundant or disused farm buildings and enhance the immediate setting should be created. This would be inline with the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy could assist in delivering new homes, enhancing and maintaining communities, facilities and economies whilst protecting existing setting. Other Amenity policies will provide safeguards in regards to local amenity and highway safety.</p>	requirement and will help to maintain the character and setting of the rural settlement
832469	George Lambrick					No	DP7: Re-use, conversion and extension of buildings for dwellings in the open countryside - Permitted Development Rights	<p>The circumstances in which development within the Green Belt can take place, needs to be mentioned within the policy. The policies within the NPPF needs to be strictly followed to protect the remaining land within the green belt.</p> <p>Permitted development rights are being used to justify development within the green belt to allow large scale extensions. Permitted development is not an exceptional circumstance supported by case law and so the Council must provide further weight to avoiding harm to the Greenbelt and expand on the existing core policy.</p>	<p>The NPPF and the Local Plan are considered when determining Planning applications within the Green belt. Core Policy 13 within Local Plan 2031 Part 1 provides policy guidance in protecting the Green Belt from harmful applications in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>Development within the green belt should not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. This includes development under permitted development rights.</p>
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	DP7: Re-use, conversion and extension of buildings for dwellings in the open countryside - Support Historic England	<p>Historic England welcomes and supports criterion iv of Development Policy 7 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment, and a clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment as required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	The Council note the support provided.
902309	NHS Oxfordshire CCG	Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	1142842	Mrs Anne Lankester		No	DP8: Community Services and Facilities - Health Facilities	<p>CCG would like to continue working with the Council to ensure appropriate health facilities are delivered alongside development.</p> <p>Guidance on how CIL will replace Section 106 funding and how it can be accessed in supporting primary care facilities would be welcomed.</p> <p>Housing growth will impact health provisions locally. Any expansion to existing facilities will need to be met through developer contributions</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with key stakeholders, including CCG to ensure appropriate health facilities are provided to cater to the new development.</p> <p>Site development templates makes provisions for necessary infrastructure developers are expected to comply with in order to deliver the site.</p>
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	DP8: Community Services and	<p>A couple of comments state that it is not acceptable to not build social infrastructure on housing development sites and access to these facilities should be accessible.</p>	The Council note the objections but feel that providing infrastructure on site helps to ensure the development is sustainable and helps to provide for the existing

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							Facilities - Objection		settlement. The Council acknowledge the importance of facilities being suitably equipped.
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No	DP8: Community Services and Facilities - Support	Development Policy 8: Community Services and Facilities We support the principle of this policy for the provision of new or extended community facilities and services which can assist in promoting social inclusion.	The Council note the support provided.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Education	The responses suggests that catchment areas for schools should be considered holistically, especially if they are altered by development proposals.	The Council works closely with Oxfordshire County Council who as Education Authority, have responsibility for planning for school catchment areas. The Council's priority is to ensure new school places are provided to meet any need arising from new development proposals, Oxfordshire County Council will advise what provision is needed and how it should be planned for. Infrastructure requirements are set out in the Development Site Templates.
737350	Mr James Lonsdale	The Lonsdale Estate	722577		JPPC	No	General	Local Plan Part 1 had a particular focus on the delivery of strategic sites. Although the spatial strategy identified the important role of rural settlements and the need to support their communities no detailed policies were provided to secure this. It is imperative the detailed policies of Local Plan Part 2 effectively provide for the support and enhancement of rural areas including the provision of new homes.	The Council is content the policies of the Part 1 and Part 2 plans make appropriate provision for supporting rural settlements. A number of sites are supported at Larger Villages, in both Parts 1 and 2 of the plan, furthermore, Core Policy 4 sets out provision for how the presumption in favour of sustainable development will apply to the existing built area of Larger Village (and Local Service Centres and Market Towns), thus providing a flexible policy framework to support development appropriate to the scale of these settlements.
850794	Ms Sue Holmes	Oxford Brookes University					General	This comment supports the policies within Local Plan 2031 part 2	The Council note the support provided.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Mission Statement	One comment suggested that the Part 2 plan does not elaborate on how the Council will achieve its aim to build healthy and sustainable communities. Comment suggested that this is an aspiration rather than the Council's intention and the Plan should set out the approaches and resourcing to achieve this policy aim. Comment recommend the inclusion of community worker(s) for a minimum of 5 years for major housing developments, to deliver the integration, building and development of social infrastructure element such as new communities. This would be essential to the successful development and integration of new housing developments within existing communities.	Topic Paper 3: Building Healthy and Sustainable Communities sets out the process the Council has undertaken to produce the housing policies and how they contribute to developing healthy and sustainable communities. The Council considers that's these policies and the inclusion of necessary infrastructure will help develop healthy and sustainable communities and therefore will help achieve the mission statement.
751493		McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	1145035	Ms Carla Fulgoni			Provisions for the elderly	There are a number of comments relating to providing provision for the elderly. These comments suggest: The council should plan for the projected growth for those over 65. Policies should be included to enable downsizing and enable the elderly population to move into other forms of residence.	Core Policy 26 of Local Plan 2031 Part 1 provides the provision for current and future needs of the ageing population. The Council require sites within Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and other suitable locations to provide homes suitable for the elderly which are located close to local facilities and transport links. This is to help cater to the projected increase in those over 65.
1022242	Dr David Illingworth	North Abingdon Local Plan Group				No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Policies should be included to reduce the amount of relationship breakdowns.</p> <p>Government guidance states the requirement for plan makers to cater for the growing elderly population.</p> <p>No allocations for the delivery of older person's accommodation nor is there any consideration of the sustainability of the sites detailed for such developments.</p> <p>If not planned for, there will be a significant shortfall of accommodation for the elderly.</p> <p>The Council should allocate sites to develop provisions for the elderly.</p> <p>It is unlikely that the majority of development sites will be suitable to catering to the needs of the elderly due to access to facilities being limited</p> <p>Local centres may provide appropriate locations for elderly accommodations.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the Housing in Later Life: Planning Ahead for Specialist Housing for Older People toolkit.</p>	
730017	Ms Ruth Cross	South Oxfordshire District Council					S OCD - Leisure Team comments	The South Oxfordshire District Council Leisure Team will continue to support the protection of existing community services and facilities.	Noted.
879120	Gow Family						Sustainability	This comment highlights that some communities have been healthy and sustainable in the past, however due to a lack of development, have not been able to maintain sustainability. This is more prominent in settlements within the Green belt. By not allocating land, the local plan is failing to promote thriving villages and rural communities whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character.	The Council are not proposing to allocate any sites within small villages in keeping with Core Policy 3 and 4 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The proposed allocations will provide appropriate infrastructure accessible to those within small settlements and rural communities.
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No	University Accommodation	<p>One comment from the University of Oxford states that the house prices are some of the highest in the Country, which makes it difficult for early career academics and University staff to find appropriate accommodation. The University proposes that subsidised housing is built for them, which would also release pressure off the Oxford housing market. Thus, they propose that planning policy in the City and surrounding areas is adjusted to allow the University to construct affordable private rented housing without incurring additional affordable housing requirements for social rent. The University is also promoting the need to construct further graduate housing for the same reasons as above.</p> <p>The University wishes to develop 1,000 undergraduate rooms, 2,000 graduate rooms and 2,000 affordable housing units on its land for its own use. They seek a planning policy framework that allocates key uses to specified locations but with a measure of flexibility to enable it to meet known priorities at the time it is proposing particular developments.</p>	The Council welcomes the positive and pro-active approach being taken by the University and would of course wish to be supportive of their ambitions. The Council considers that the existing policy framework provides flexibility for re-development of university sites. However, as this matter spans several authorities, it may be best addressed through preparation of the Oxfordshire Joint Spatial Plan, for which all Oxfordshire authorities are now committed to preparing. The JSP will provide a policy framework to inform future iterations of the Vale, and other Oxfordshire, Local Plans. This approach would allow the requirements of the University to be considered in the context of planning for housing need for Oxford City and Oxfordshire as a whole and for the future.

Economy

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144482	BAPT Ltd		724777	Mr Eric Hall		Yes	Economy - DP10 Object	There was one objection to Development Policy 10. This seeks additional flexibility for ancillary uses to come forward on land adjacent or in close proximity to existing employment sites.	Core Policy 28 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 supports new employment development on unallocated sites. The council consider this policy sufficiently addresses the point raised.
1097559	MEPC						Economy - DP10 Support	There was one comment of support for Development Policy 10. The comment stated a need for ancillary facilities such as restaurants and shops, particularly within employment sites including Milton Park, due to its location away from larger settlements. Such ancillary facilities ensure the sustainable development of employment sites, reducing the need and volume of travel. The Milton Park LDO also recognises the need for ancillary facilities, allowing for "other uses" which directly support the viability and sustainability of the business park and its staff, customers and visitors.	Comment of support is noted.
1144482	BAPT Ltd		724777	Mr Eric Hall		No	Economy - DP11 Object	There was one response raising concerns over the wording of DP11, in particular that reference to "all" development proposals is unreasonable and that the threshold for where a CEP may be required is too low as it may apply to schemes of only 10 dwellings and that development of this scale may have no employment consequences. Whilst the response states a preference for deleting the policy, a modification is also proposed that suggests adding the wording "where appropriate".	The Council is content that the policy provides sufficient flexibility. It is not considered unreasonable that development proposals should demonstrate how opportunities for local employment can be created and is considered to be highly consistent with the OXLEP priorities. The Council consider that the wording "may require" submission of a CEP provides flexibility. It is likely that only very large proposals will be required to provide a CEP, however, that setting an arbitrary threshold may preclude relevant smaller schemes. Further guidance has been published by the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership which provides additional guidance on when a CEP may be appropriate.
728736	Miss Sarah Beal	Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP)				Yes	Economy - DP11 Support	There was one comment of support for Development Policy 11, with a proposal to expand the policy or supporting text to make reference to agro-ecology, forest gardening and permaculture. One comment of support from OxLEP	Comment of support is noted. The Council considers the policy is sufficiently flexible as it makes reference to all forms of development although clearly only applies to proposals requiring planning permission.
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No			The council acknowledge the support from OxLEP for this policy
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No	Economy - DP12 Object	One comment raised concerns of the apparent lack of consideration in the plan for agro-ecology, forest gardening and permaculture. This seeks an amendment to the policy or supporting text to these matters that form an important part of rural diversification.	The Council does not consider that it is necessary to include references to agro-ecology, forest gardening and permaculture. The Council consider that the policy is sufficiently flexible to support all forms of rural diversification, including where they relate to existing agricultural and forestry industries.
727300	Ms Troth Wells	The British Horse Society				Yes	Economy - DP12 Support	There was one comment of support for Development Policy 12. In particular, the emphasis on equine businesses, on horse-riders and the enhancement and protection of Public Rights of Way network, as well as referencing the County's Rights of Way Management Plan is welcomed.	Comment of support is noted.
827932	Julie Mabblerley	Wantage and Grove				No	Economy - DP13 Object	There was one comment relating to Development Policy 13. This seeks an amendment to the updated primary and secondary shopping frontages in	The council does not consider it appropriate to designate a new retail unit where the development has not been completed. The council will consider

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
		Campaign Group						Wantage to include an additional retail unit granted under planning permission reference P15/V2490/FUL.	the site in question through a future review of the Local Plan.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Economy - DP13 Support	There was one comment of support from Historic England for Development Policy 13. In particular support is provided for the protection to the character and appearance of town centres by criterion I of Development Policy 13e as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment, and a clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment as required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework	Comment of support is noted.
1096672		Mays Properties Ltd	1096673		G R Planning Consultancy Ltd	No	Economy - DP15 Object	There were three objections and three comments of support to Development Policy 15 from two consultees. The objections predominantly relate to the first part of the policy. These seek to remove reference to the term 'bulky goods' as it is not defined by the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance or policies in Local Plan 2031 Part 1. These include suggested amendments to the policy, to make reference to 'large format retail units', and to recognise in the supporting text the recent food store commitment at Fairacres Retail Park. The final objection seeks the removal of the policy due to the longstanding existing consents at Seacourt Retail Park. The comments of support principally relate to the second part of the policy for the change of use of retail parks for convenience retail uses.	The council recognises the concerns raised in relation to Development Policy 15, and is keen to ensure the vitality and viability of existing town centres are retained, both within the district and in nearby locations such as Oxford, Didcot and Swindon. Comments of support for the second part of the policy are welcomed.
1144482	BAPT Ltd	724777	Mr Eric Hall		No				
1097559	MEPC		1097558	Laura Black			Economy - General	There were three general comments in relation to the employment policies. In particular, these highlight the VOWH priorities for ensuring a strong and sustainable economy and the priority for promoting Science Vale. For example Paragraph 3.57 specifically states: "The Local Plan 2031 plans for and supports a strong and sustainable economy with particular focus on promoting Science Vale as a world class location for science and technology-based enterprise, especially the Enterprise Zone sites at Milton Park and Harwell Campus". In December 2012, the Vale of White Horse District Council adopted the Milton Park Local Development Order (LDO). The purpose of the LDO is to simplify planning control and encourage economic growth. The LDO enables a vibrant business area, promoting employment-generating uses at the business park to maximise the success of the Science Vale UK Enterprise Zone.	Comments are noted.
850794	Ms Sue Holmes	Oxford Brookes University					Economy - Support	Two comments of support were made to the Development Policies supporting economic prosperity in the district (Development Policies 10 - 15).	Comments of support are noted and welcomed.
1097559	MEPC		1097558	Laura Black					
737350	Mr James Lonsdale	The Lonsdale Estate	722577		JPPC	No	Economy - Object	One comment seeks expansion of the policy to support development of small employment sites within the rural areas in order to give greater support to the rural economy and which could be particularly	The Council considers that sufficient flexibility is provided by Core Policy 28: New Employment Development on Unallocated Sites as set out within the adopted Local Plan 2031: Part 1.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								beneficial if delivered alongside residential development.	
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					General - Comment from Oxfordshire County Council	Oxfordshire County Council does not have any matters to raise regarding the Development Management Policies relating to economy	Noted

Transport

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1137748 1142989	Dr Saul Myerson Mrs Fiona Freeman					No No	A34	Two respondents commented specifically in relation to the A34. Their comments included: Concern with regard to the ability of the A34 to cope with increased housing numbers; The need for improvements to the A34 to be planned in advance of development taking place; A request to receive early notification of advised re-routing whilst roadworks are in progress; and A request for an update on the resurfacing of the A34. One comment suggested that there should be better planning to ensure infrastructure is in place before the new houses are built.	The Council continues to work collaboratively and proactively with Oxfordshire County Council, Highways England and other key stakeholders to investigate and mitigate against the impact of development on the A34, as detailed in Core Policy 34 of Part 1 of the Local Plan. The Highways Agency will publicise improvement schemes as appropriate. The Council is satisfied that appropriate highway improvements associated with development set out in the Part 2 plan have been identified and are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Site Development Templates.
1144164	Mrs J Gibbard Mr Daniel Scharf						Alternative modes of transport	Two comments related to alternative modes of transport. There was concern that the Plan has not adequately considered alternative ways to move people and traffic around, and also a view that the policies were inadequate in relation to a transition to an electricity based transport system with lower car ownership and use.	The Council is working proactively with Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant stakeholders to promote and actively seek sustainable modes of transport/travel, as set out in Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility and Chapter 3 of the Local Plan Part 2. This is consistent with the objectives of the NPPF and the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4. The Council has undertaken a detailed assessment process to identify sites for development which includes consideration of access to Public Transport, how sites will contribute to Public Transport improvements and has engaged with Public Transport providers. The approach to site selection is set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper. The Council have also commissioned and prepared a Sustainable Transport Study to help inform the preparation of the plan, particularly focused on opportunities for sites accessing Oxford.
1145054		Bike Safe	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No	Alternative transport scheme - B4044 Community Path	Suggestion that B4044 Community Path is safeguarded in the Local Plan and a Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan is developed. Bike Safe have suggested an amendment to the Part 2 plan to specifically identify the B4044 Community Path as safeguarded by Core Policy 12a: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. This would be in accordance with national policy and be effective in addressing transport impacts of planned strategic development and to promote a shift towards active travel. Scheme is considered in accordance with Core Policy 33 and 35 of the adopted Part 1 plan by: Supports improvements for accessing Oxford; Support the measures identified in the Local Transport Plan; Seeks to ensure the impacts on new development on the road network are minimised;	Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking in the adopted Part 1 Plan supports the provision of sustainable transport measures to promote the use of public transport, cycling and walking. The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other key stakeholders to support the provision of new cycling routes where proposals are consistent with other relevant policies in the Local Plan 2031.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Promotes and supports improvements to the transport network that increase safety, improve air quality and makes towns and villages more attractive</p> <p>Encourages use and a shift to sustainable modes;</p> <p>Ensures that new development encourages and enables cycling through the provision of cycle friendly infrastructure;</p> <p>Provides a new cycling route consistent with other policies in the plan</p>	
1095853	Dr Janet Banfield	Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No	Bus service provision - Dalton Barracks	<p>A number of comments have been made in relation to Dalton Barracks and bus service provision. These can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>The Plan should commit to the protection of local bus services;</p> <p>Provision for future residents should not be at the expense of existing residents; and</p> <p>Parts of the community will become socially excluded, with implications for both economic and cultural viability.</p>	<p>Core Policy 8b makes provision for the development of a Supplementary Planning Document to be developed for the Dalton Barracks site allocation. This work has already commenced. The Parish Council, Neighbourhood Plan Group and the local community will be involved in the development of the SPD and be able to comment as the SPD evolves. The SPD will consider how the site will be served by public transport to ensure that the potential for sustainable transport can be maximised. The SPD ensures the longer-term potential of development can be planned for comprehensively and holistically. However, the Part 2 plan also sets out a series of detailed policy requirements, within the Development Site Templates, relating to highways and public transport. The Council is committed to ensuring the development proposed within the Part 2 plan is connected to good Public Transport connectivity from the outset.</p>
827932	Julie Maberley	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No	Car Parking	<p>A suggestion was made that land should be safeguarded to improve the quality or quantity of parking in the Town and Local Centres and on the edge of Market Towns.</p>	<p>The Council considers that the safeguarding of land should only be used to safeguard the necessary infrastructure requirements to support the growth of the Local Plan, as to ensure that any future proposed development does not prejudice the future delivery of these sites, as required by national policy.</p> <p>This matter falls within the responsibility of the Highways Authority. With the exception of one highway scheme proposed by the District Council, all proposals for safeguarding for highway schemes set out within the plan are included at the request of the Highways Authority, for which District Council will seek to support as far as possible.</p> <p>Development Policy 18: Public Car Parking in Settlements supports proposals that improve the quality of town centre parking provision, particularly where they complement Core Policy 32 and also protects quality of car parks in appropriate settlements, e.g. town centres and local centres.</p>
1100194	Giles Hughes	West Oxfordshire District Council					Comment from West Oxfordshire District Council	<p>West Oxfordshire District Council highlighted major connections between Witney and Abingdon (A415) and between Witney and Faringdon (A4095), and the significant interaction between the economies of the two Districts. The Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan recognises that there will be a concentration of future economic growth in the Oxfordshire knowledge</p>	<p>Comments from West Oxfordshire District Council are welcomed and noted.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								spine and the A415 provides a key connection for West Oxfordshire to this future economic growth.	
756175 934607	Mr Robin Draper Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS				No	Comment on Development Policy 16	<p>A number of comments were received in relation to Development Policy 16. These can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>The policy should be strengthened to ensure that no occupation of a development is allowed until such time as the access has been updated to meet the requirements in Development Policy 16 and off-site requirements fully met</p> <p>Suggestion that this policy is too prescriptive and not required as it is adequately covered by LPP1 Core Policies 7, 33, 35 and 37.</p> <p>One comment suggested an additional criteria to Development Policy 16 as follows:</p> <p>NO OCCUPATION OF A DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE ALLOWED UNTIL (A) ANY IMPROVEMENTS TO THE SITE ACCESS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED; AND (B) THE OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE (INCLUDING TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES, CYCLEWAYS, PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY AND THE PUBLIC TRANSPORT NETWORK) ARE FULLY SECURED AND WORKING</p>	The Council is content the policy is soundly based and provides sufficient flexibility in accordance national policy and guidance.
934607 1094599 1095853	Mr Robert Love Mr James Proyer Dr Janet Banfield	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee				No	Comment on Development Policy 17	<p>A number of comments were received which relate to DP17. These can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>Excessive emphasis is placed on new developments as insular entities and new residents being able to access Oxford and Abingdon efficiently. Insufficient regard is given to the ways in which enhanced services for new developments might work to the detriment of services in existing settlements; and</p> <p>Suggestion that DP17 is either covered by local and national planning policy guidance or already covered by existing development plan policy e.g. Core Policy 35 of the adopted Part 1 plan, and therefore should be removed from the Plan.</p> <p>Suggestion that DP17 is unsound as it is not justified and not consistent with national policy. The requirement for all major development proposals to be supported by a Travel Plan should be considered on a site-by-site basis. The NPPF states that "All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a Travel Plan". As a minimum, a higher threshold for the need for a Travel Plan should be identified.</p>	<p>Work will be ongoing to ensure that allocated sites are adequately served by public transport, to ensure that the potential for sustainable transport can be maximised. This will include consideration of how any new services work with services for existing settlements.</p> <p>The Council considers that the policy provides additional detail to support relevant policies in the Part 1 Local Plan and is consistent with national policy and guidance.</p> <p>The policy requires that Transport Assessments and Travel Plans are prepared in line with Oxfordshire County Council guidance, including guidance on thresholds.</p>
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No		Two respondents provided comments relating to DP18. They can be summarised as follows:	All applications will be considered and determined alongside the Vale of White Horse Design Guide

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
827932	Julie Maberley	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No	Comment on Development Policy 18	<p>Suggestion that DP18 is amended so that town centre parking, and all other developments where parking is being proposed, will be required to privilege the parking of Electric Vehicles and severely limit the parking of other vehicles;</p> <p>Suggestion that DP18 is amended to include a requirement for any change of use in the Town Centres which is likely to encourage more cars, to contribute to the improvement of public parking provision;</p> <p>Suggestion that a policy is added to improve the quality and quantity of public parking in the Town and Local Centres and that land should be safeguarded to this effect; and</p> <p>Suggestion that long stay car-parks should be provided on the edge of the Market Towns.</p>	<p>SPD, Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards and the Local Plan, read as a whole. All applications will also be required to provide robust evidence in relation to parking as part of their Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council considers that the safeguarding of land should only be used to safeguard the necessary infrastructure requirements to support the growth of the Local Plan, as to ensure that any future proposed development does not prejudice the future delivery of these sites, as required by national policy.</p> <p>This matter falls within the responsibility of the Highways Authority. With the exception of one highway scheme proposed by the District Council, all proposals for safeguarding for highway schemes set out within the plan are included at the request of the Highways Authority, for which District Council will seek to support as far as possible.</p>
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No	Comment on Development Policy 19	A number of comments were received in relation to Development Policy 19. They can be summarised as follows:	<p>The Council considers that Policy DP19: Lorries and Roadside Services is sufficiently flexible and robust, and doesn't prevent additional uses or service sites coming forward if in line with other policies. For example hotel accommodation can come forward at Milton Interchange in line with Local Plan Part 1 Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor Economy, and Local Plan Part 1 CP28: New Employment Development on Unallocated Sites allows for new employment development on unallocated sites including on the edge of the built up area of Market Towns.</p> <p>The extent of the area at Milton Interchange covered by this policy, as amended for the Publication Version of the Plan, reflects recent planning permissions. The amendments that have been made are specifically to meet the needs for roadside services and lorry use. The use of the remainder of the site has already been established through planning permissions.</p> <p>The policy reflects sites that were already allocated through saved policy in Local Plan Part 1. The Council is currently not aware of any evidence to suggest that additional sites are needed on the A34 or A420 other than those included in the policy. The Council will continue to work with Highways England, Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant stakeholders in relation to the provision of additional service facilities.</p>
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler					No		As the Gateway to Science Vale, Milton Interchange is an inappropriate location for a lorry park. It should either not be provided or be small in size with limited stay periods (suggestions of allowing space for ten lorries and reducing by half the area currently shown);	
1096672		Mays Properties Ltd	1096673		G R Planning Consultancy Ltd	No		Support for the provision of a lorry park at Milton Interchange;	
1142539	Mr Frank Bailey	Minscombe Properties	872228	mr. Terence Gashe	Ferax Planning	No		Suggestion that the policy should be amended to read "The provision of additional service facilities (including facilities for refuelling, car and lorry parking, toilets, refreshment facilities, picnic areas, hotel accommodation, restaurants, drive-thru's, garage repair and small convenience uses) along the A420 and A34 will be permitted within the boundaries of the following sites identified on the proposals map: i Milton Interchange...";	
1145052	Mrs Hilary and Helen King-Thompson and Shorthouse		1096331	Mr Simon Handy	Strutt & Parker LLP	No		<p>Suggestion that the supporting text should be amended to reference the roadside services commitment (planning permission) at Milton Interchange.</p> <p>Suggestion that Appendix M is amended so that the Minscombe Properties land is re-instated in the Milton Interchange Services Area as part of the designation in accordance with saved Local Plan 2011 Policy TR10</p> <p>Suggestion that DP19 is not sound because (i) it makes a mockery of the Didcot Garden Town Policies as specified in the Garden Town Delivery Plan and (ii) there has been no cooperation with neighbouring landowners</p> <p>The Local Plan is unsound because it proposes an amendment to the Adopted Policies Map in relation to</p>	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>DP19, which has removed an area greater than Milton Park Enterprise Zone. This is shown on the illustrative map at Appendix M which has also excluded the Minscombe Properties land is not covered by a Local Development Order and would therefore be unallocated for any purpose should this amendment be confirmed. It is presumed that the Roadside services allocation is being removed from the Milton Park Enterprise Zone because that land is part of the Milton Park LDO. The Minscombe land is also part of an EZ (the Didcot Growth Accelerator EZ) but it does not benefit from LDO status. In previous representations Minscombe Properties sought a widening of the uses that would be acceptable on their land. This would seem to be entirely appropriate given the EZ status of the site and the resolution of the Council to grant planning permission for a range of 'B' class uses as well as roadside service uses. The planning application was in outline but a range of uses was indicated in order to establish the likely maximum traffic generation from the site. Permission awaits the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>Suggestion of an additional allocation of a roadside service area at Chilton.</p> <p>Suggestion that, in order for DP19 to be sound, evidence needs to be presented to justify the inclusion of the service facilities identified in the policy, along with robust reasons for discounting alternative sites.</p> <p>It is suggested that DP19 is amended as follows: "In line with Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy, the Council will continue to work with Highways England, the County Council and others on assessment of proposals for any new lorry and/or roadside service areas along the A34 and A420 in the Vale of White Horse. Proposals for new lorry and/or roadside service areas will only be supported where it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Council and any statutory highway consultees that the proposal would not result in an unnecessary proliferation of sites along the road in question. It must also be demonstrated that there is a demand for the new lorry and/or roadside service area."</p>	
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England					Comments from Highways England	Highways England welcome the opportunity to work with the council to mitigate any traffic impacts that could impact on the Strategic Road Network.	Comments from Highways England are noted. The Council also welcomes the opportunity to continue to work with Highways England.
1142369	Ms Harriet Sergent	Network Rail				Yes	Comments from Network Rail	Network Rail request that they are notified of any significant work undertaken in close proximity to the railway. They also provide information on general considerations when developing land near to the railway including drainage, keeping three meters from the overhead line equipment at all times, ground stability affecting the track, dust from works affecting	Comments from Network Rail and welcomed and noted.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								sight for workers/train drivers and the requirement for 24hr access to the rail infrastructure.	
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comments from Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Oxfordshire County Council made a number of comments relating to transport, which can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>A service of four buses per hour for Dalton Barracks is unlikely to be achievable;</p> <p>Concern that the Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI) work has been conducted too quickly and does not provide sufficient evidence for the County Council to make an informed decision on the transport impacts of the proposed allocations;</p> <p>Concern about the validity of the county's Oxfordshire Strategic Model in the Abingdon area;</p> <p>Until evidence can be provided to the contrary, the assumption is that any development at Dalton Barracks is reliant on the provision of Lodge Hill Slips to provide some capacity in the Abingdon area. This means that there should be no home occupations at Dalton Barracks before the Lodge Hill slips are open.</p> <p>The phasing of Dalton Barracks needs to be considered;</p> <p>More detailed work will be required regarding highway mitigation;</p> <p>Further and more detailed work will need to be conducted as development sites progress to understand localised impacts;</p> <p>Detailed comments in relation to measures included in the Oxford-Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study;</p> <p>Concern that the IDP appears to underestimate the infrastructure needs of the sites;</p> <p>Concerns relating to the deliverability of infrastructure;</p> <p>The County Council do not support the Oxford - Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study as an evidence base; and</p> <p>Further ETI work is needed in order to overcome soundness issues related to having a robust and credible evidence base;</p> <p>Until evidence can be provided to the contrary, the assumption is that any development at Dalton Barracks is reliant on the provision of Lodge Hill Slips to provide some capacity in the Abingdon area. This means that there should be no home occupations at Dalton Barracks before the Lodge Hill slips are open.</p>	<p>The Council has worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess the impact of development. The Council continues to work with Oxfordshire County Council on a number of areas of work relevant to the Local Plan Part 2. This includes refinement of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI) work, including consideration of how the Oxfordshire Strategic Model validates in the Abingdon area. In addition, OCC is a key stakeholder in the development of Supplementary Planning Documents for both Harwell Campus and Dalton Barracks. OCC were also involved in preparing the brief for the Oxford-Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study and commented on drafts of the report.</p> <p>In relation to the specific points:</p> <p>It is understood that OCC officers consider that 2 buses per hour is achievable for development of 1200 units at Dalton Barracks and 4 buses per hour for longer term and larger scale development. VOWH support this recommendation.</p> <p>The ETI has been commissioned and managed by OCC working in partnership with VOWH. The approach is consistent with the approach followed to inform the Part 1 plan and that is being progressed to support other Oxfordshire authorities. VOWH considers that the study is fit for purpose and proportionate. This matter is considered further with a Statement of Common Ground between OCC and VOWH.</p> <p>It is understood that OCC are undertaking more detailed work to assess this area of the network in more detail and that the site promoter for Dalton Barracks is using this work to inform a more detailed assessment of impact of Dalton Barracks. VOWH welcome the support from OCC on the validation of the ETI model for the remainder of the VOWH area.</p> <p>It is understood that the Lodge Hill upgrade will be delivered c. 2020/ 2021. It is understood that development will not commence at Dalton Barracks until 2022 and will then be phased through the remainder of the plan period. It is also understood that evidence to support the delivery of the Lodge Hill scheme has shown a wider benefit to the network around Abingdon.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>The Council has worked in partnership with all infrastructure providers throughout the preparation of the plan and has developed Statements of Common ground with many of these including Thames Water, Environment Agency, CCG, and OCC. VOWH has sought to include information provided by these infrastructure providers wherever possible and would welcome any additional information OCC would like to share. The IDP has been updated following the OCC Reg 19 responses and OCC have been given further opportunity to make any contributions they wish to. the IDP is considered to be fit for purpose, and consistent, in both approach, and some content, with the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy prepared by Oxfordshire County Council.</p> <p>The Council have prepared a viability assessment with a leading expert in the field and are content the sites are viable and deliverable in the context of national policy requirements.</p> <p>VOWH will continue to engage positively with OCC to support effective planning for highways and infrastructure to support Sustainable Development in accordance with the Adopted Local Plan Part 1, Local Transport Plan 4, Oxfordshire Strategic Employment Plan and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy for which the Council considers there is a high degree of consistency. This is considered further within the SOCG between VOWH and OCC.</p>
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments from Stagecoach	<p>Stagecoach make the following comments:</p> <p>Suggestion of an additional Park & Ride facility on the A338 north of Grove, particularly to integrate the existing built up area with the planned new developments e.g. Grove Airfield, Monks Farm, Charlton Village and Crab Hill</p> <p>Suggestion of 'local' P&R sites on A420, taking advantage of local facilities provided at a mixed-use hub; evidence on the A420 that informal Park and Charge takes place e.g. at Shrivenham and Southmoor. Dedicated purpose built facilities would serve to unlock a significant amount of existing suppressed demands and facilitating sustainable patterns of movement from new developments</p> <p>Outlines changes to Stagecoach services since the evidence base was prepared e.g. increased off-peak daytime frequency on service 66 every 20 minutes Monday to Friday; service 31 Wantage-Grove, Abingdon-Oxford (S8) now directly serves areas in Grove, west of the Letcombe Brook around Denchworth Road and Brereton Drive</p>	<p>The Council has worked with Oxfordshire County Council on the identification of sites with the potential to deliver a high quality public transport network for Oxford and Oxfordshire, having regard to strategy set out in Local Transport Plan 4. Considerable work has been undertaken by both Oxfordshire County Council and the Vale of White Horse District Council to identify the most suitable locations for Park & Ride facilities.</p> <p>The changes to Stagecoach services, which include some increased frequencies, are noted. The Site Development Templates ensure that the proposed allocations in the Part 2 plan provide contributions towards further enhancement and increasing the frequency of existing bus services in the area. In relation to the North-West of Grove allocation, the Site Development Template ensures contributions are made to improve bus services and associated infrastructure for the area and to explore opportunities for linking new bus services with neighbouring allocations at Grove Airfield and Monks Farm.</p>
1096018	Mr Tucker	Oxfordshire Cycling Network				No	Comments on Development	<p>Suggestion that DP 16 and/or 17 should make reference to developments: (a) Demonstrating that they will move the modal mix away from private cars</p>	<p>Work will be ongoing to ensure that allocated sites are catering for an appropriate mix of modes of travel and ensure that the potential for sustainable transport can</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1143360	Mr Robin Tucker	Oxfordshire Cycling Network				No	Policies 16 and 17	(b) Demonstrating that they will be linked to local sustainable transport networks, through the routes set out in the LCWIP (and any predecessor routes and plans).	be maximised. Transport Assessments and Travel Plans are prepared in line with Oxfordshire County Council guidance. The Council is working proactively with Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant stakeholders to promote and actively seek sustainable modes of transport/travel, as set out in Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility and Chapter 3 of the Local Plan Part 2. This is consistent with the objectives of the NPPF and the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4.
730190 1094885 1137748	Councillor Debby Hallett Mr Sonke Adlung Dr Saul Myerson	Oxford University Press				No	Comments on general infrastructure	A number of general comments were received relating to infrastructure. These can be summarised as follows: Existing infrastructure is over capacity, e.g. Milton Interchange and traffic congestion around Didcot, Sutton Courtenay, Drayton and Abingdon Infrastructure should be in place before new homes are built Existing residents will be negatively impacted by a delay in the provision of infrastructure for new development Existing transport network cannot accommodate growth e.g. Botley Road, Abingdon Road, Woodstock Road etc. within Oxford, the city centre of Abingdon, the A415 to Europa School and Culham Science Centre. Abingdon in particular lacks a modern system of bypasses.	Comments noted. The Council is working in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council as Highways Authority. This includes planning for new infrastructure. Infrastructure required as part of the proposed Part 2 sites will be phased during the life of the development schemes. Wider strategic infrastructure committed to within the Local Transport Plan 4 and Adopted Local Plan Part 1 and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy will be delivered in accordance with these wider strategies. These are not linked specifically to any Part 2 sites, although it is noted that development at Dalton Barracks will not come forward until after the Lodge Hill A34 Interchange upgrades have been built. It is also noted that Oxfordshire have an excellent track record of funding and delivering strategic infrastructure and note that many of the schemes identified in Local Transport plan 4 and set out within the part 1 plan are already funded, built, or under construction.
752742	Mr Malcolm Moor	SAFAG				No	Cycle Network	Cycling provision in Abingdon is very poor and not safe for less experienced cyclists to use. There needs to be stronger policies to ensure a continuous and safe cycle network, linking all parts of the existing town to schools and shops and new developments	The Council are continuing to work with Oxfordshire County Council and developers to ensure appropriate cycle provisions are provided within Abingdon. Core Policy 35 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 sets out cycling provisions
1094885	Mr Sonke Adlung	Oxford University Press				Office use only - blank	Cycle paths	Comment states that there are not enough cycle paths and there is a strong need to improve this, even before any additional houses are built. The Wootton Road between Abingdon and Oxford and the cycling path on the A415 are dangerous.	The Council note the comments and are committed to promoting safe alternative modes of transport.
826174 828782 872591 934607	Mr Daniel Scharf Mrs Emily Smith Miss Layla Moran Mr Robert Love	Liberal Democrats, Oxford West and Abingdon REDROW HOMES				No No	Electric / Low Emission Vehicles	Four comments were received relating to electric / low emission vehicles. These can be summarised as follows: Suggestion that Policy DP17 is too restrictive and should be amended to remove reference to Electric Vehicles (EVs); Suggestion that a policy on EV Charging Points is included and that cycling infrastructure should be improved; Suggestion that the Plan should positively encourage the take up of Electric Vehicles (EVs) and that Travel	The Council considers it important to encourage the use of electric and / or low emission vehicles. Development Policy 17: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans includes the requirement for opportunities to support the take up of electric and / or low emission vehicles to be considered, in particular if part of mitigation identified in line with Development Policy 25: Air Quality. The policy also allows for consideration to be given to the latest best practice in terms of electric / low emission vehicles, to allow for changes in national policy and guidance to be taken account of when implementing this policy.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1073310	Mr Andrew Wells	SOUTH MIDLANDS						Plans and Transport Assessments should require the provision of EVs, charging points, electric bicycles and visitor parking equipped with charging points; To be judged a sound the Plan should positively encourage the take up of EVs; and Suggestion that a policy should be included which ensures all housing, industrial and retail developments include facilities to support the take up of EV and/or low-emission vehicles, particularly where air quality issues in the area have been identified.	The Council is working proactively with Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant stakeholders to promote and actively seek sustainable modes of transport/travel, as set out in Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility and Chapter 3 of the Local Plan Part 2. This is consistent with the objectives of the NPPF and the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4.
730260 1144185 1144881	Mrs Taylor Mr Yoshi Nishio Ms Carol Fisher	Harwell Parish Council				No No No	Evaluation of Transport Impacts	Three comments were received in relation to the Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI). These can be summarised as follows: Commuter traffic from the proposed developments would feed onto trunk roads that are already heavily congested Concern that the ETI does not take account of the new slip roads at Chilton/A34 slip roads on the A4185 and A417 OCC is explicit that it does not have sufficient funding to deliver identified improvements IDP identifies essential requirements for Harwell Campus, but costs have yet to be confirmed Projected CIL receipts are indicative and will not be available before development commences Infrastructure improvements should not be reliant on developer funding; and Specific mention of the need for improvements to Rowstock Roundabout. Comments suggested that new transport modelling should be carried out to include the impact of slip roads at Chilton on surrounding areas. More investigations should be undertaken to secure alternative sources of funding.	The Council has worked in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to prepare technical evidence to support plan preparation, including an Evaluation of Transport Impact (ETI) Study. The ETI assessed the cumulative impact of growth on the strategic highway network. The Chilton slip roads are included in the Do Minimum model that was used to carry out the Evaluation of Transport Impacts, as is set out in section 3.3.1 of the ETI Stage 2 Report. In partnership with Oxfordshire County Council, the council will continue to explore funding opportunities whenever possible in order to deliver infrastructure in a timely manner. In relation to Rowstock Roundabout, land is safeguarded in the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 for improvements at this junction. The form of those improvements is not yet known.
1144881	Ms Carol Fisher					No	Funding for infrastructure	There was one comment that raised concerns in relation to the funding of infrastructure, including: Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that Vale is working with Oxfordshire County Council to achieve a sustainable transport network, but IDP is explicit that OCC does not have sufficient funding to deliver the identified infrastructure improvements Delivery of schemes set out in OCC's Local Transport Plan 4 are dependent on securing developer contributions from sites and any future Government funding secured from bids Costs of essential infrastructure requirements such as transport and utilities for sites e.g. Harwell Campus are yet to be confirmed	The Council has worked in partnership with all infrastructure providers throughout the preparation of the plan and has developed Statements of Common ground with many of these including Thames Water, Environment Agency, CCG, and OCC. VOWH has sought to include information provided by these infrastructure providers wherever possible and would welcome any additional information OCC would like to share. The IDP has been updated following the OCC Reg 19 responses and OCC have been given further opportunity to make any contributions they wish to. the IDP is considered to be fit for purpose, and consistent, in both approach, and some content, with the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy, prepared by Oxfordshire County Council. Infrastructure required as part of the proposed Part 2 sites will be phased during the life of the development schemes. Wider strategic infrastructure committed to

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Projected Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts are indicative and will not be available before development commences	within the Local Transport Plan 4 and Adopted Local Plan Part 1 and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy will be delivered in accordance with these wider strategies. These are not linked specifically to any Part 2 sites, although it is noted that development at Dalton Barracks will not come forward until after the Lodge Hill A34 Interchange upgrades have been built. It is also noted that Oxfordshire have an excellent track record of funding and delivering strategic infrastructure and note that many of the schemes identified in Local Transport plan 4 and set out within the part 1 plan are already funded, built, or under construction.
730231	Mrs Susan Blomerus	Appleton with Eaton Parish Council				No	Impact on Appleton village - A420 and A415	<p>One comment raised concerns in relation to the impact on the village of Appleton, in particular the A420 and A415. Specific comment raised the following:</p> <p>Part 2 plan fails to provide solution to the impact of traffic as a result of proposed sites on existing settlements within the Vale</p> <p>Concerns over volume of traffic through Appleton that runs parallel to the A420 due to proposed allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor</p> <p>Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI) suggests that traffic flows both east and west of Appleton is likely to increase as an alternative route to the A420</p> <p>Mitigation scenarios will have impacts on Appleton village and wider parish e.g. safety of pedestrians, school children and cyclists</p> <p>Increase in air quality due to congestion, contrary to Development Policy 26 of the Part 2 plan</p> <p>Part 2 plan does not offer any effective solutions other than improve public transport services; unlikely to deter drivers from the A415 through Appleton and to avoid congestion on A420 between Southmoor and Botley Interchange</p> <p>The following modifications/suggested were made to the Plan:</p> <p>Plan should address the impact of increased traffic on major routes e.g. A420</p> <p>Provide a policy/policies to ensure development proposals support existing settlements affected by traffic congestion and put in place measures that ensure prevention of re-routing traffic through villages</p> <p>Plan should ensure that proposals that result in increase of traffic along the A420 corridor include measures to improve A420 e.g. widening carriageways, traffic calming measures on Netherpton Road at junction of A415 and from junction of Abingdon Road and Appleton Road in Cumnor</p> <p>Plan should provide funding to re-instate bus services through Appleton</p>	The Council, in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council as highway authority, has prepared a comprehensive evidence base in order to understand the impact of development on the highway network. The Council will continue to work with stakeholders to mitigate the impact of development and ensure that opportunities for sustainable travel are maximised. Transport Assessments or Statements will also be required as part of the planning application process. These will also identify the impact of development on the highway network. Transport Assessments or Statements a required to be prepared in line with Oxfordshire County Council guidance, and will be accompanied by a Travel Plan which will comprise a package of measures and initiatives with the aim of reducing the number of car journeys made by people travelling to and from the site.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096844	Mr Guy Wilkin	Harwell Campus Bicycle Users Group				No	OCC Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan	Plan should make reference to Local Walking and Cycling Investment Plans, with suggested wording "OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL WILL ISSUE LOCAL CYCLING & WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN(S) (LCWIPS) DURING THE LIFETIME OF THIS LCOAL PLAN. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPDS) MAY BE ISSUED ACCORDINGLY. COMPLAINEE WITH ANY SUCH LCWIPS AND SPDS WILL BE A CONDIITON OF PLANNING APPROVAL" .	Comments noted. LCWIPs are tools to support the plan making process and as such the Council welcome the preparation of an LCWIP by Oxfordshire County Council. The Council supported Oxfordshire County Council in submitting an expression of interest to obtain further resource to develop Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plans for the central area of Oxfordshire where development of homes and jobs is currently focused. The Plan refers to the need for Transport Assessments and Travel Plans to take into account Oxfordshire County Council guidance, which will include LCWIPs if the County Council considers that appropriate. Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking in the Part 1 Plan supports the provision of sustainable transport measures to promote the use of public transport, cycling and walking. The Council will continue to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other key stakeholders to support the provision of new cycling routes where consistent with other policies of this plan. Reference to LCWIPs will be added to Topic Paper 5: Transport and Accessibility.
785705	Mr Brian Rixon	Sunningwell Parish Council				No	Oxford-Cambridge Expressway	A number of comments, including from Sunningwell Parish Council have been raised in relation to the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway. These can be summarised as:	The council continues to engage with all relevant partners, including Highways England, in order to be kept informed and aware of progress made in relation to the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway.
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No			
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No		Suggestion that the Plan should include more detail on the Expressway, particularly in relation to possible routes; the Plan is unsound as it fails to examine the full implications of the Expressway proposals on the Vale area and the LPP2 proposals	The council has reviewed the references to the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway included in the Local Plan and Transport Topic Paper, in light of the most up to date information available to the council. It is suggested that paragraph 2.126 should be amended as follows:
872819	Mr Gordon Garraway					No			
872941	Dr Andrew Turner	North Abingdon Local Plan Group				Yes		Expressway option S1 to improve the existing A34 would affect the whole A34 in Oxfordshire Expressway option S2 and S3 towards Bicester and Wheatley depart from the Lodge Hill area of the A34, removing Green Belt land adjacent to Bagley Wood and approach to Abingdon	THE GOVERNMENT SET OUT ITS COMMITMENT TO THE DELIVERY OF AN EXPRESSWAY BETWEEN CAMBRIDGE AND OXFORD IN THE AUTUMN 2017 BUDGET (INCLUDE FOOTNOTE WITH REFERENCE). THIS The announcement by the Department for Transport to explore an Oxford-Cambridge Expressway could have major benefits in relieving strategic traffic from the A34 and bringing further investment to the Science Vale area. A number of CORRIDOR route options have been proposed, with routes around Oxford linking with the A34 either to the north or south of Abingdon. IT IS EXPECTED THAT A CORRIDOR WILL BE SELECTED IN SUMMER 2018, FOLLOWED BY PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON ROUTES WITHIN THE SELECTED CORRIDOR AND THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF A PREFERRED ROUTE IN AUTUMN 2020. Outline costs have been produced, with value for money, environmental, transport and economic impacts feeding into a detailed study, including a Strategic Outline Business Case, which
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No			
1022242	Dr David Illingworth	North Abingdon Local Plan Group				No		Expressway option S4 starts south of Didcot and runs to east of Didcot and Dorchester towards Thame, grazes the south west edge of the Green Belt; diversion to M40 east of Oxford will reduce traffic along Abingdon to Oxford	
1096204	Mr Colin Thomas	Sunningwell Parishoners Against Damage to the Environment				No		Most routes will have an impact on the Vale's countryside; concerns for the scale and impact of development Suggestion that the Plan should set conditions for the development of the Expressway (e.g. its construction should not increase the number of houses or other development required in the district)	
1139063	Mrs Elizabeth Graham					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1142392	Mr Vic Johnson					No		<p>Suggestion that the Plan-making process should be delayed for developments along the corridor/route options</p> <p>Comments relating to the detail of possible route options</p> <p>Concern about the impact the Expressway would have on the environment and levels of congestion in the district</p> <p>Concern that the Expressway threatens the building and viability of the rail link</p> <p>Request for information detailing the full implications of the Expressway on the Plan and site allocations.</p> <p>Concern that, if this analysis is not available in the public domain, as it has not been conducted, then the plan is unsound.</p>	<p>will be published in 2017. The Council will continue to ENGAGE IN THE PROCESS TO ENSURE THAT MATTERS OF RELEVANCE TO THE DISTRICT ARE CONSIDERED APPROPRIATELY. liaise with the relevant organisations and stakeholders as the study continues to develop, in order to understand the impacts and opportunities it presents for the district. It is expected that any proposal will be included in the next Road Investment Strategy which falls within the plan period, 2020 to 2025. IT IS EXPECTED THAT CONSTRUCTION WOULD COMMENCE AT THE END OF THE NEXT ROAD INVESTMENT STRATEGY PERIOD (RIS2), IN 2025.</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/autumn-budget-2017-documents/autumn-budget-2017</p>
851026	Mrs Debbie Dance	Oxford Preservation Trust				No	Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OXIS)	<p>Comment raises concern that the Local Plan is being prepared before the completion of the Oxford Infrastructure Strategy (OXIS) so that it can inform the Plan preparation process. The Oxford Preservation Trust have concerns about the cumulative effect of the proposed developments on the transport infrastructure, Green Belt and green setting of Oxford. Consideration of these of a County-wide basis would be more appropriate than those studies carried out within the limited scope of the Vale of White Horse District. Planning conditions should be strengthened to ensure that development is not granted approval until infrastructure funding is in place and cannot proceed until it is implemented.</p>	<p>The Stage OXIS Report was published in November 2017 and was informed in part by local Plan IDP's from each of the Oxfordshire authorities. It is made clear that OXIS does not replace local plan IDP's but assist in planning for infrastructure delivery more strategically across Oxfordshire.</p>
850794	Ms Sue Holmes	Oxford Brookes University					Support for Development Policies and transport schemes	<p>Supportive of measures to provide transport infrastructure developments including public transport, roadways and cycle routes. Enhanced cycle routes will better connect employment locations, including Milton Park, to surrounding villages.</p>	<p>Comments of support from MEPC are welcomed and noted.</p>
1097559	MEPC		1097558	Laura Black					
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England				Yes	Support for Development Policy 16	<p>Highways England and Oxford Bus Company were supportive for Policy DP16: Access. Oxford Bus Company commented that Planning guidance should encourage developers to liaise with bus operators at early stages of development as well as the Local Planning Authority including bus operators into development if site specific or in relation to preparation of SPD's.</p>	<p>Comments from Highways England and Oxford Bus Company are noted and their support is welcomed.</p>
1051321	Mr Paul Walker	Oxford Bus Company				Yes	Support for Development Policy 17	<p>Highways England and Oxford Bus Company were supportive for Policy DP17: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.</p>	<p>Comments from Highways England and Oxford Bus Company are noted and their support is welcomed.</p>
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England							
827932	Julie Maberley	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No	Support for Development Policy 18	<p>Support for policy and suggestion that any change of use in town centres which is likely to encourage more cars should be required to contribute to the improvement of parking provision. Also, suggestion that land should be safeguarded to improve the quality or quantity of parking in the Town and Local Centres and on the edge of Market Towns.</p>	<p>All applications will be considered and determined alongside the Vale of White Horse Design Guide SPD, Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards and the Local Plan, read as a whole.</p> <p>The Council considers that the safeguarding of land should only be used to safeguard the necessary infrastructure requirements to support the growth of</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									the Local Plan, as to ensure that any future proposed development does not prejudice the future delivery of these sites, as required by national policy. The Council does not consider it prudent to safeguard land for parking in the Markets Towns as this could affect the town's future development potential and the economic viability and vitality.
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England					Support for Development Policy 19 from Highways England	Highways England were supportive of Policy DP19: Lorries and Roadside Services.	Comments from Highways England are noted and their support is welcomed.

Environment

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1145259	Mrs Julia Hammett	Oxfordshire Badger Group				No	Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>One consultee raised an issue relating to biodiversity and green infrastructure, which suggested that the Plan is contrary to paragraphs 109,117 and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity where possible and should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are resilient to current and future pressure.</p> <p>The comment was received that suggested the public consultation period was too short and that the proposals set out in the Part 2 plan will lead to a fragmentation of species and habitats and provides no realistic strategy to comply with the NPPF in relation to the natural environment.</p> <p>The comment questioned the objective in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) relating to improving and protecting the natural environment, including biodiversity, water and soil quality. It was suggested that the Local Plan should give more prominence to environmental impacts associated with the Plan's proposals and that there is limited evidence of joined up thinking in relation to habitats and wildlife corridors.</p> <p>The comment suggested that the Didcot Garden Town should focus on a mosaic of habitats or wildlife corridors and that proposals in the Local Plan will reduce the green spaces that separate settlements. It was suggested that brownfield sites at Dalton Barracks and Harwell Campus are rich in biodiversity species, and Part 1 plan allocations at North of Abingdon-on-Thames, Radley and Kennington, Wantage, Grove, Didcot, Milton Heights and Sutton Courtenay will lead to a large-scale net loss of biodiversity.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>Core Policy 46 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 provides policy guidance to preserving and enhancing biodiversity when considering development proposals, including achieving a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Core Policy 43 of the adopted Part 1 plan provides policy guidance on the Council's approach to minimising environmental impacts associated with development proposals, taking into account water quality and by ensuring that the land is of a suitable quality for development.</p> <p>Core Policy 45 of the adopted Part 1 plan provides policy guidance to ensure the appropriate provision of Green Infrastructure through new development, including achieving a net gain in Green Infrastructure, including biodiversity in line with the Green Infrastructure Strategy. Applicants are required to submit a statement alongside all major development proposals to demonstrate that they have taken into account the relationship of the proposed development to existing Green Infrastructure and will this will be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>These matters are also addressed in the Site Development Templates relation to the proposed allocations.</p> <p>Development Policy 29: Settlement Character and Gaps in the Part 2 plan ensures that proposals do not compromise important gaps between settlements, taking into account loss of environmental assets that individually or collectively contribute towards their local identity.</p>
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Comment from Oxfordshire County Council	Oxfordshire County Council does not have any matters to raise regarding the Development Management Policies relating to Environment.	Noted
902666 934607 1094599	University of Oxford Mr Robert Love Mr James Proyer	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS Persimmon Homes (Wessex)	1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No	Development Policy 20: Public Art	<p>There were a few comments received relating to Development Policy 20. Specific comments raised the following concerns:</p> <p>The policy is unnecessary as sufficient level of detail is set out within the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The policy is unjustified and inconsistent with national policy as the Council has not established within the</p>	The Council consider that this policy provides additional detail to support the principles set out in the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and updates the saved policy from Local Plan 2011.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144620	House Builders Federation		1144619	Mr Mark Behrendt				Plan or supporting evidence how public would assist in mitigating impacts. It is inappropriate to include a policy that requires public art on all site larger than 0.5 hectares. The policy should be amended to more closely align with the wording of Principle DG42: Public Art, as set out in the Council's Design Guide SPD to ensure a flexible approach as the provision of public art would only be considered at a detailed planning stage.	
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Development Policy 22: Advertisements - Support from Historic England	Historic England support Development Policy 22 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment, and a clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment as required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	Support from Historic England welcomed and acknowledged.
1094599	Mr James Proyer	Persimmon Homes (Wessex)					Development Policy 23: Impact of Development on Amenity	There were a few comments received relating to Development Policies 23 and 24 which suggest that it is unclear how these policies would be assessed and as currently written repeat other policies within the Part 2 plan e.g. Development Policy 25: Noise Pollution.	The Council considers that Development Policies 23 and 24 are consistent with national policy and are important to ensure any future applications will not cause undue harm to the amenities of neighbouring and/or nearby properties.
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No	Development Policy 24: The Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments	One comment supports the policy on The Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments but suggests that the first sentence of the policy is amended as follows to take into account development proposals located adjacent to landfill sites: Development proposals should be appropriate to their location and should be designed to ensure that the occupiers of new development will not be subject to adverse effects from existing or neighbouring uses- AND ESPECIALLY HISTORIC OR EXISTING LANDFILL SITES.	Core Policy 43 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 provides policy guidance for the Council's approach to minimising environmental impacts associated with development proposals, including ensuring that land is of a suitable quality for development. Furthermore, Development Policy 27 of the Part 2 plan requires developers to address all land contamination risks to the development, environment, controlled waters and adjacent land associated with the development. Paragraph 3.199 of the Part 2 plan recognises landfill sites as a source of land contamination which will be considered when applying this policy.
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS					Development Policy 26: Air Quality	One comment suggested that this policy's requirement for proposals in close proximity to existing or potential AQMAs to demonstrate measures/mitigation in the design of development, should be omitted from the policy as there may be circumstances where no mitigation measures are possible.	The concern is noted. The Council consider that the policy has sufficient flexibility.
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council					Development Policy 26: Air Quality - Support from South Oxfordshire District Council	South Oxfordshire District Council support the Air Quality policy	Support from South Oxfordshire District Council acknowledged and welcomed.
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No	Development Policy 27: Land Affected by Contamination	The policy should ensure that housing and other developments sensitive to pollution are kept apart from polluting uses and should not be erected on or adjacent to historic landfill sites unless pollution risks can be 100% mitigated, particularly relevant for developments located at or adjacent to landfill sites.	Core Policy 43 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 provides policy guidance for the Council's approach to minimising environmental impacts associated with development proposals, including ensuring that land is of a suitable quality for development.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								At present the policy undermines DP24: Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments. The following wording should be included as an addition to this policy: IN LINE WITH ITS GENERAL POLICY THE COUNCIL WILL KEEP APART HOUSING AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT SENSITIVE TO POLLUTION FROM AREAS WHERE THEY CANNOT REASONABLY CO-EXIST. IN PARTICULAR, ANY DEVELOPMENT ADJACENT TO, OR ON HISTORIC LANDFILL CELLS, WILL BE REJECTED UNLESS THE COUNCIL CAN BE TOTALLY ASSURED THAT THE POLLUTION RISKS CAN BE 100% MITIGATED.	Furthermore, Development Policy 27 of the Part 2 plan requires developers to address all land contamination risks to the development, environment, controlled waters and adjacent land associated with the development. Paragraph 3.199 of the Part 2 plan recognises landfill sites as a source of land contamination which will be considered when applying this policy. The Plan should be read as a whole and therefore Development Policy 24, Development Policy 27 and other relevant policies in the Local Plan 2031 will apply to all development proposals.
827932	Julie Maberley	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No	Development Policy 28: Waste Collection and Recycling	There were a few comments received relating to Development Policy 28, which suggested that the policy makes limited reference to the requirement for creating space for recycling and refuse collection on kerbside locations, which do not obstruct footpaths and cycleways. One comment suggested that this policy should be omitted from the plan as it is unnecessary and sufficient level of detail is contained with the Council's Waste and Planning Guidance.	Criteria vi and viii and in Development Policy 28 ensures that recycling and refuse provision is appropriately designed and located, whilst considering the need to provide and maintain safe and convenient access for occupants and the impact on health and amenity of neighbouring development and the proposed development. This policy also ensures that all development proposals are consistent with the Council's Waste Planning Guidance and provides additional detail to the principles set out in the Design Guide SPD.
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS							
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No	Development Policy 29: Settlement Character and Gaps	There were a number of comments received in relation to Development Policy 29. Specific comments raised the following concerns: The policy is too generic and restrictive, in particular providing opportunities to bring forward sustainable greenfield sites. The policy needs strengthening to ensure the maintenance of green gaps between settlements and on urban fringe and should more closely align with the wording in Saved Policy NE10 of the Local Plan 2011. The protection of green spaces and gaps should be shown on the Adopted Policies Map and clearly defined. The wording in the policy 'physical and visual separation' should be clearly defined.	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholder. Details of the site selection process is set out in the Council's Site Selection Topic Paper. Core Policy 16b in the Part 2 plan ensures development proposals within the Didcot Garden Town Masterplan Area can demonstrate a number of key principles that contribute towards the successful implementation of the Garden Town. To further support the delivery and implementation of the Didcot Garden Town initiative, further detail in respect of design, green infrastructure and landscape will be set out in a future Development Plan Document (DPD).
827932	Julie Maberley	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No			
829385	Mr John Wattam					No			
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No			
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No		One comment suggests that the policy on Settlement Character and Gaps is inconsistent with the proposed site allocations and the policies on Meeting Our Housing Needs and Didcot Garden Town The following wording was suggested for this policy: THE COUNCIL IS INTENT THAT THE SPECIAL LANDSCAPE OF THE VALE IS PROTECTED BY ENSURING THAT THE SEPARATE IDENTITY AND URBAN FRINGES OF SETTLEMENTS ARE SAFEGUARDED. TO THAT END, DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS THAT WOULD RESULT IN THE	The Council recognises the importance of safeguarding the separate identity and characteristics of individual settlements. This saved policy was prepared under a previous planning system, which has subsequently been updated by the NPPF. This policy has been updated to reflect national policy and guidance and evidence contained within the Landscape Character Assessment. It is also pertinent to note that Development Policy 29 in the Part 2 plan ensures that all development proposals do not compromise important gaps between settlements, taking into account physical and

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								PHYSICAL JOINING OR THE UNACCPETABLE NARROWING OF A COUNTRYSIDE GAP BETWEEN TWO SEPARATE SETTLEMENTS, OR ADVERSELY AFFECT THE URABN FRINGES OF A SETTLEMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED. IN PARTICULAR, THE GAPS BETWEEN VILLAGES AND TOWNS WILL BE COMPLETELY PROTECTED. RIBBON DEVELOPMENTS WILL ALSO BE REFUSED. IN SUCH CONSIDERATIONS, THE COUNCIL WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT BOTH THE INDIVIDUAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSAL AND THE CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF EXISITNG AND OTHER PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS.	visual separation both individually and cumulatively and the loss of environmental or historical assets that individually or collectively contribute towards their local identity. The saved policy of the Local Plan 2011 only applied specifically to urban fringe and countryside gaps as set out on the Adopted Policies Map. The addition of criteria in this policy and the Landscape Character Assessment provides sufficient flexibility and detail when considering planning applications.
1094599	Mr James Proyer	Persimmon Homes (Wessex)					Development Policy 29: Settlement Character and Gaps – Support	One comment was received in support of Development Policy 29.	Support for this policy is acknowledged and welcomed.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Development Policy 29: Settlement Character and Gaps - Support from Historic England	Historic England support Development Policy 29.	Support for this policy from Historic England is acknowledged and welcomed.
934607 1144188	Mr Robert Love Karen Davies	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS				No	Development Policy 30: Watercourses	There were a few comments received relating to Development Policy 30, which suggested that the minimum 10m buffer zone and the 20m threshold as required by the policy is too onerous and should be omitted from the plan. It was suggested that development proposals should be considered on a case by case basis as the appropriate threshold for a buffer zone is likely to vary depending on the proposal and/or site context. One comment suggested that the importance of the watercourse, in particular chalk streams are protected despite the size and nature of the development and recommended a 50m buffer zone where development occurs next to a chalk stream to maintain a corridor.	The Council has undertaken a Viability Study for the Part 2 plan to assess the Plan's policies and proposals. The Study concluded that the assumptions to unit numbers based on densities and net developable areas will not be adversely impacted by this requirement and the policy will not have an adverse impact on viability. Paragraph 3.244 provides sufficient flexibility as to the extent of the buffer, depending on the size and nature of the development. Environment Agency has not raised any particular concerns in relation to the threshold for a buffer zone as a requirement within Development Policy 30. Development Policy 30 applies to main rivers and ordinary watercourses, including chalk streams. Paragraph 3.238 recognises the importance of chalk stream to rare and protected species and their priority for conservation under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006).
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Development Policy 30: Watercourses - Comments from Historic England	Historic England suggested that "or its historical significance" is added after ".....biodiversity....." is included in the first paragraph of the policy on Watercourses as follows: Development of land that contains or is adjacent to a watercourse will only be permitted where it would not have a detrimental impact on the function or setting of the watercourse or its biodiversity, OR ITS	Whilst the Council does not consider that any amendments to the policy are required, a additional modification to the supporting text, at Paragraph 3.243 could improve clarity. On this basis the following is proposed: All development proposals adjacent to watercourses should aim to avoid damaging impacts on the watercourse, BIODIVERSITY OR ITS HISTORICAL

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE , or the detrimental impact can be appropriately mitigated.	SIGNIFICANCE , and provide mitigation for any unavoidable impacts.
1144989	Mrs Cathy Harrison	Environment Agency				Yes	Development Policy 30: Watercourses - Support from Environment Agency	<p>The Environment Agency support Development Policy 30, but and suggest a few amendments to the policy and supporting text, including the following: Paragraph 3.236 should be amended as follows: The term watercourse refers to both main rivers, (larger rivers, brooks and streams AS DEFINED AS THOSE PRESENT ON THE MAIN RIVER MAP FOR ENGLAND*) and ordinary watercourses (headwaters and smaller brooks and streams AND DITCHES)¹²². All types of watercourse AND THEIR CORRIDORS have a part to play in enhancing biodiversity across the district.</p> <p>Insert footnote as follows: *HTTPS://WWW.GOV.UK/GOVERNMENT/COLLECTIONS/MAIN-RIVER-MAP-FOR-ENGLAND-PROPOSED-CHANGES-AND-DECISIONS)</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.42 should be amended as follows: In line with these Part 1 policies, Part 2 sets out Development Policy 29 30: Watercourses.....Proposals should consider how access to watercourses can be improved for all user (DEPENDING ON BIODIVERSITY SENSITIVITIES) including provision for those with mobility impairments.</p> <p>The following wording should be included at the end of Paragraph 3.2.44: IF THE WATERCOURSE FLOWS THROUGH A DEVELOPMENT (RATHER THAN BEING ADJACENT TO OR ON THE BOUNDARY), THERE SHOULD BE A BUFFER ZONE ON BOTH SIDES OF THE WATERCOURSE.</p> <p>The wording of the second paragraph of Development Policy 30 should be amended as follows: Plans for development adjacent to or encompassing a watercourse should include a minimum 10m UNDEVELOPED buffer zone along both sides of the watercourse to create a corridor of land and water favourable to the enhancement of biodiversity.</p>	The Council acknowledges the Environment Agency's support and suggested amendments to the policy and supporting text. The Council consider the suggested amendments will help to improve the clarity of the plan.
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council					Development Policy 30: Watercourses - Support from South Oxfordshire District Council	South Oxfordshire District Council support Development Policy 30.	Support from South Oxfordshire District Council to this policy is acknowledged and welcomed.
727300	Ms Troth Wells	The British Horse Society				Yes	Development Policy 31: Protection of Public Rights of Way, National Trails	There were a few comments received in relating to Development Policy 31.	Support for this policy is acknowledged and welcomed.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Development Policy 31: Protection of Public Rights of Way, National Trails	The following amendment to the third paragraph of this policy was proposed by CPRE, to recognise other promoted routes such as the Oxford Green Belt Way, the d'Arcy Dalton Way and the Icknield Way Trail:	Development Policy 31 supports improvements to the Public Rights of Way Network and Open Access Areas, and to protect National Trails. Promoted routes such as the Oxford Green Belt Way and the D'Arcy Dalton Way are mapped on Oxfordshire

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							and Open Access Areas	Development will not be permitted where proposals remove, narrow or materially impair the approved line of the Thames Path or Ridgeway National Trails (INCLUDING THE ICKNIELD WAY TRAIL), OTHER PROMOTED ROUTES SUCH AS THE OXFORD GREEN BELT WAY AND THE D'ARCY DALTON WAY , key connecting routes, and/or public access to them. CPRE also suggested an amendment to the supporting text at paragraph 3.263 as follows: The Part 2 plan sets out Development Policy 31: Protection of Public Rights of Way, National Trails and Open Access Areas to ensure development proposals improve access to rights of way that are safe and attractive. Developers will also be encouraged to MUST consider how access to rights of way can be improved for all users, including provision for people with physical disabilities <i>(remainder of paragraph is unchanged)</i> .	County Council's Countryside Access Maps, as explained on paragraph 3.261 of the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan. The Council does not consider that further modifications are necessary.
730017	Ms Ruth Cross	South Oxfordshire District Council					Development Policy 32: Wilts and Berks Canal - Comments from Leisure Team	South Oxfordshire District Council Leisure Team supports the wording of paragraph 3.267 in "contributing to the local economy, promoting sustainable transport, including for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders, and providing an important element of the strategic GI network in the district"	Support acknowledged and welcomed.
1141615	Mr bob Sharples	Sport England				Yes	Development Policy 32: Wilts and Berks Canal - Comments from Sport England	Sport England suggest the third paragraph to Development Policy 32 is amended in order support sporting activities associated with canals such as fishing and canoeing, as follows: Proposals designed to develop the canal's SPORTING , recreational and nature conservation potential, in particular, the use of the old line of the canal for walking and cycling, will be supported.	The Council notes Sport England's suggestion, but would highlight that some sporting activities such as fishing, could have a detrimental impact on the biodiversity of the canal. On this basis the Council considers that the policy provides sufficient flexibility and that further modifications are unnecessary.
729140	Ms Jane Hennell	British Waterways South West					Development Policy 32: Wilts and Berks Canal - Support	Several comments were received, including from The Canal & River Trust, Wiltshire Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership and CPRE supporting Development Policy 32 relating to the long-term vision for the restoration of the Wilts and Berks Canal. In particular comments stated the benefits associated with the canal's restoration including attracting visitors to the Vale, contributing towards the local economy, promoting sustainable transport and providing an important element of the strategic GI network in the district.	Support for this policy is acknowledged and welcomed.
872112	Mr Ken Oliver	Wiltshire Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership							
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				Yes			
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Development Policy 32: Wilts and Berks Canal - Support from Historic England	Historic England welcomes and supports Development Policy 32 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment, and a clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment as required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	Support for this policy from Historic England is acknowledged and welcomed.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No	Development Policy 33: Open Space	There were a number of comments received relating to Development Policy 33. Specific comments raised the following concerns:	<p>Development Policy 32 in the Part 2 plan ensures major development proposals provide 15% of the residential area as public open space, to comprise of amenity green space and parks and gardens. This approach has been successful in securing open space for new major development proposals under the existing Saved Policy H23 of the Local Plan 2011. The Council has undertaken an Open Spaces Report in accordance with current best practice and national guidance, including the Fields in Trust national standards.</p> <p>The Council's approach to the provision of children's play and youth provision is consistent with national policy and the recommendations set out in the Open Spaces Report. Developers will be required to provide or contribute towards open space, including children's play and youth provision in line with the open space standards, in addition to the requirement for 15% of the residential area to be laid out as public open space. The Council considers this policy provides sufficiently flexibility when assessing development proposals.</p> <p>In relation to children's play and youth provision, the recommendations set out in the Open Spaces Report indicate that priorities for new provision should be guided by current network of facilities, new provision should be located in those areas where there are gaps between the catchment areas.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.68 of the Open Spaces Report sets out the approach towards the delivery of children's play and youth facilities. In particular, housing development fully within the catchment of an existing LEAP, NEAP or youth facility will require developer contributions to be sought towards their improvement and/or extension.</p> <p>For housing development located within 400m or more from a LEAP or 1000m from a NEAP or youth facility, the Council's approach should be to develop a new LEAP or NEAP and youth facilities on site in accordance with the local standards or if not possible, develop a new site immediately adjacent to the housing development.</p> <p>Core Policy 45 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 provides policy guidance to ensure the appropriate provision of Green Infrastructure through new development proposals. Future development proposals will be assessed against the Development Plan as whole.</p>
827932	Julie Maberley	Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No		The provision of good quality open spaces enhances development, but the use of standards may not necessary apply to all development proposals as there would not be of a sufficient size to provide meaningful quantities of the open space typologies.	
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No		Local Plan's approach to the integration of high quality, usable open space is too prescriptive. Open space standards set out in the Appendix does not allow for a flexible response to individual characteristics of each site and development proposal.	
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS						The level of contribution toward open space provision should be based on a demonstrable need depending on the aspirations of the local community and the level of existing provision.	
1094599	Mr James Proyer	Persimmon Homes (Wessex)						One comment stated that there are discrepancies in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and Open Spaces Report in relation to public open spaces at Wantage. It was suggested that the Green Infrastructure Strategy shows public open spaces at Letcombe Wildlife Corridor/Willow Walk Nature Reserve, Hamfield Play Area, Humber Close Playground, Chestnuts Play Area and Manor Road Memorial Park and includes play areas defined in Appendix K of the Part 2 plan. However, it doesn't include amenity open spaces shown in the Open Spaces Report.	
1142357	Mr Rob Stewart					No		One comment suggested that major development proposals disregard the need for children's play areas, by contributing to facilities elsewhere. It was suggested that the policy should include an additional requirement as follows: ALL MAJOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS ARE TO MAKE PROVISION FOR CHILDREN'S PLAY AREAS WITH THEIR BOUNDARIES OR PROVIDE THAT PROVISION WITH A YOUNG CHILD'S WALKING DISTANCES OF THEIR DEVELOPMENT.	
								One comment suggested that Development Policy 33 makes no reference to enhancing the connectivity between Green Infrastructure assets at both district and local level. It was suggested that without a link between the requirement for open space and the broader requirements set out in Core Policy 45 of the adopted Part 1 plan, there is a concern that the vision for the creation of interconnected, multifunctional GI networks will not be achieved.	
								It was suggested that Development Policy 33 should be amended as follows: Proposals for major residential developments will be required to provide or contribute towards safe, attractive and accessible open space in accordance	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>with the open space standards as set out in Appendix K AND THE GI PLANNING PRINCIPLES IN THE GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY.</p> <p>It was also suggested that an additional criteria should be include in part b of Development Policy 33 as follows: Development of open space will only be permitted provided that: THE CONNECTIVITY BETWEEN GI ASSETS IS NOT COMPROMISED, AND (<i>remainder of policy is unchanged</i>)</p> <p>One comment suggested that the Open Spaces Report should include Humpty Hill, which was recommended for addition to the Town Green Register in September 2015 and approved by Oxfordshire County Council on 30 November 2015.</p>	
1102921	Legal and General Homes		1144761	Mr Nathan McLoughlin			Development Policy 33: Open Space; Development Policy 34: Leisure and Sports Facilities	<p>One comment questioned whether Development Policies 33 and 34 apply to only new development proposals. The comment stated that the supporting text should make clear that these standards only apply to new development proposals for which site are yet to be consented, and to not be retrospectively applied in the determination of reserved matters applications where there has already been significant discussion and consideration of the standards through the viability process.</p> <p>One comment suggested that the application of standards in the determination of reserved matters application could add an additional financial cost to the development, which has already been the subject of detailed negotiations with the Council in the S106 agreement.</p>	Any extant outline applications which were approved prior to the adoption of the Local Plan will not require modification to comply with the adopted policies as set out in Local Plan 2031 (Parts 1 or 2). Any subsequent reserved matters applications would be expected to reflect the details established as part of the outline permission.
934607 1094599	Mr Robert Love Mr James Proyer	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS Persimmon Homes (Wessex)					Development Policy 34: Leisure and Sport Facilities	<p>There were a number of comments received relating to Development Policy 34. Specific comments raised the following concerns:</p> <p>Approach to this policy should recognise each site should be considered independently in terms of the level of meaningful contribution can make to leisure and sports facilities.</p> <p>Level of contribution to leisure and sports facilities should be based on demonstrable need depending on the aspirations of the local community and the level of existing provision.</p> <p>Unclear how this policy advises on the likely need for new sports facilities and how a financial contribution may be calculated.</p> <p>It would be appropriate to incorporate such infrastructure projects into Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Regulation 123 List.</p>	<p>The Council's Regulation 123 List to support the Community Infrastructure Levy, is a live document that sets out a list of infrastructure projects that will be funded through CIL contributions, Section 106, Section 278 or alternative measures. The Regulation 123 list will be updated to reflect the Part 2 plan sites.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an extensive audit and assessment of the District's Local Leisure Facilities, Leisure and Sports Facilities, Open Spaces and Playing Pitches within the District to inform the development of the Local Plan. The studies have been used to inform the development of Development Policy 34 and the Council's Open Space and Leisure and Sports Facilities Standards.</p>
730017	Ms Ruth Cross	South Oxfordshire District Council					Development Policy 34: Leisure and Sport Facilities	<p>The Council's Leisure Team suggested the following amendment to paragraph 3.289: The provision of leisure and sports facilities will be determined in accordance with Development Policy</p>	The Council agrees that this suggested amendment will provide useful clarity.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							- Comments from Leisure Team	34: Leisure and Sports Facilities, ANY PROPOSALS ARISING FROM THE STUDY'S HIGHLIGHTED IN PARA. 3.288 and the application of the local standards contained in Appendix L APPENDIX K.	
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council					Development Policy 34: Leisure and Sport Facilities - Support from South Oxfordshire District Council	South Oxfordshire District Council support Development Policy 34.	Support from South Oxfordshire District Council to this policy is acknowledged and welcomed.
1141615	Mr bob Sharples	Sport England				Yes	Development Policy 34: Leisure and Sport Facilities - Support from Sport England	Sport England support Development Policy 34.	Support from Sport England for this policy is acknowledge and welcomed.
1141615	Mr bob Sharples	Sport England				Yes	Development Policy 35: New Countryside Recreation Facilities - Comments from Sport England	Sport England suggest amending the title of Development Policy 35 to ensure the inclusion of sports such as climbing, mountain biking and sailing, as follows: Development Policy 35: New Countryside SPORT and Recreational Facilities	The Council acknowledges Sport England's suggested amendment to this policy but would highlight that sporting activities associated with new countryside and recreational facilities is sufficiently covered within Development Policy 34: Leisure and Sports Facilities. Development Policy 35 particularly supports small scale countryside recreational facilities such as walking, cycling, riding and fishing. The Council would highlight that the provision of sporting activities such as climbing, mountain biking and sailing are sufficiently covered by Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor Economy in the adopted Part 1 plan, which provides policy guidance to support the visitor and tourism sector across the district.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Development Policy 35: New Countryside Recreation Facilities - Support from Historic England	Historic England support Development Policy 35 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment, and a clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment as required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	Support from Historic England for this policy is welcomed and acknowledged.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Development Policy 36: Heritage Assets - CPRE	CPRE raised the following concerns in relation to Development Policy 36: There is no policy to designate or conserve locally listed buildings, parks and gardens and other heritage assets, which fails to meet the expectations of national policy in terms of positive and effect planning for the historic environment and the Council's existing practice. Several heritage assets have been locally listed resulting from Council's proactive approach to engagement with the public .	Core Policy 39: Historic Environment in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ensures that new development conserves, and where possible enhances designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislation. Criteria vi. of Core Policy 39 ensures the Council works with landowners, developers, the community, Historic England and other stakeholders to identify criteria for assessing non-designated heritage assets and to maintain a list of such assets as Locally Listed Buildings.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Reference to historic routes is welcomed, but would be more appropriate to acknowledge their contribution to wider historic character and extended to historic waterways e.g. Wilts and Berks Canal, River Thames and surviving historic railway infrastructure e.g. international significance of Brunel's Great Western Railway.</p> <p>Based on the concerns raised above, CPRE has suggested the deletion of paragraph 3.325 as it is identical to paragraph 3.324, as well as the following amendments to this policy and supporting text: Before paragraph 3.304 insert the following text: IN ADDITION TO NATIONALLY DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS THE COUNCIL HAS ALREADY INSTUTUTED A LOCAL HERITAGE LIST, WHICH IT WILL CONTINUE TO DEVELOPMENT WITH INPUT FROM THE PUBLIC. OVER THE COURSE OF THE PLAN PERIOD THE COUNCIL WILL ALSO EXPLORE THE DESIRABILITY OF DEVELOPING A HERITAGE PLAN TO ENSURE PRACTICAL DELIVERY OF THE BENEFITS TO BE DERIVED FROM THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, FOLLOWING HISTORIC ENGLAND'S GUIDANCE AND LEARNING FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF OTHER AUTHORITIES.</p> <p>The wording to Development Policy 36 to be amended as follows: Development Policy 36: Heritage Assets THE COUNCIL WILL CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN AND DEVELOP A LIST OF HERITAGE ASSETS OF LOCAL IMPORTANCE TO WHICH THE SAME HERTIAGE MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES WILL BE APPLIED AS THOSE FOR DESIGNATED ASSETS BELOW (POLICIES 37-9), TAKING ACCOUNT OF THEIR RELATIVE IMPORTANCE AND THE SEQUENTIAL TESTS SET OUT IN NATIONAL POLICY.</p> <p>Proposals for new development that may affect heritage assets (designated and non-designated) must demonstrate that they conserve and enhance the special interest or significance of the heritage asset and its setting in accordance with Core Policy 39 (Local Plan 2031: Part 1), and particularly where they:</p> <p>Make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (ESPECIALLY IF IDENTIFIED AS SUCH BY COUNTY AND LOCAL LANDSCAPE AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISATIONS); and/or ii. make a positive contribution towards wider social and economic benefits; and/or</p>	<p>Core Policy 39 has been subject to scrutiny through a Local Plan Examination process and found to be soundly based.</p> <p>Historic England has raised no particular concerns with this policy.</p> <p>Development Policy 39: Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments provides policy guidance for the conservation and enhancement of Scheduled Monuments, nationally important archaeological remains and other non-designated archaeological sites. This policy also applies to canals as indicated at paragraph 3.326 of the Part 2 plan. However, the Council considers that the addition of historic waterways in the supporting text will improve the effectiveness of this policy in relation to the Wilts and Berks Canal and the River Thames.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>iii. provide a viable future use for a heritage asset that is consistent with the conservation of its significance; and/or</p> <p>iv. protect a heritage asset that is currently at risk, SAFEGUARDING OR RESTORING ITS HISTORIC INTEREST IN A SUSTAINABLE, NON-DAMAGING USE.</p> <p>THIS POLICY INCLUDES HISTORIC ROUTEWAYS, WATERWAYS AND RAILWAY INFRASTRUCTURE.</p> <p>WITHIN 5 YEARS OF THE ADOPTION OF THE PART 2 PLAN THE COUNCIL WILL EXPLORE THE DESIRABILITY OF DEVELOPING A FORMAL SPD HERITAGE PLAN IN LINE WITH HISTORIC ENGLAND GUIDANCE TO ENSURE THAT THE POSITIVE BENEFITS THAT THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT BRINGS TO RESIDENT COMMUNITIES AND VISITORS ARE DELIVERED.</p>	
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No	Development Policy 36: Heritage Assets	<p>One comment questioned the necessity of this policy as the Plan includes specific policies in relation to heritage assets e.g. Development Policy 37: Conservation Areas and Development Policy 38: Listed Buildings. Comment stated that national policy is clear that enhancing the significance of a heritage asset is not a requirement and consider the policy is amended to make it clear, in accordance with the NPPF, that proposals for new development should conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets.</p>	The Council consider that this policy provides additional detail to support Core Policy 39: Historic Environment in Part 1 plan and is consistent with national policy, guidance and legislation. Historic England did not raise any particular concerns in relation to this policy.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Development Policy 36: Heritage Assets - Support from Historic England	<p>Historic England welcomes and supports Development Policy 36: Heritage Assets both as a strategic policy to deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment as required by paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment, and a clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment as required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the Framework.</p>	Support from Historic England for this policy is welcomed and acknowledged.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Development Policy 37: Conservation Areas - Support from Historic England	<p>Historic England supports the Conservation Area policy as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment, and a clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment as required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	Support from Historic England for this policy is welcomed and acknowledged.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Development Policy 38: Listed Buildings	<p>CPRE has suggested that this policy is not sound as it is not a positive policy and combines a number of policies, which has omitted a number of different circumstances, e.g. between an application for listed building consent and a planning consent that affects the setting of listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.</p>	Paragraph 3.315 of the Part 2 plan ensures that applications involving listed buildings should describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, proportionate to the asset's significance and the proposal. Heritage Statements, Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments should be produced in line with current best practice and relevant national guidance. The Council may require

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Comment suggests that several points referred to in the supporting text are not reflected in the policy, including:</p> <p>The process does not require any form of assessment or analysis of heritage significance and impact.</p> <p>Retention of features of special architectural or historic interest is not a pre-requisite</p> <p>Policies and principles apply to mainly urban contexts. possibility for enhancement, repair, restoration etc. is very restricted and/or not a significant consideration, and</p> <p>Historic character of both the building(s) and surroundings is not much of a consideration, contrary to national policy.</p> <p>Based on the points raised above, CPRE has suggested an amendment to this policy as follows:</p> <p>Proposals for additions or alterations to, or the demolition of, a Listed Building (including partial demolition), or for development within the curtilage of, or affecting the setting of, a Listed Building must demonstrate, USING BEST PRACTICE BASED ON RELEVANT NATIONAL GUIDANCE, EXACTLY WHAT FEATURES OR ASPECTS OF HISTORIC OR ARCHITECTURAL INTEREST WOULD BE ALTERED BY THE PROPOSALS AND that WHAT IS PROPOSED will:</p> <p>Conserve or enhance THEir heritage significance and setting OF THE LISTED BUILDING(S) ON AND ADJACENT TO THE SITE.</p> <p>ii. RETAIN, respect AND AS APPROPRIATE RESTORE any features of special architectural or historic interest, including, where relevant, STRUCTURES AND TREES, the historic curtilage or context, such as burgage plots, PARKLAND OR FIELDS AND PADDOCKS, or its value within a group and / or its setting, such as the importance of a street frontage or traditional shopfronts, DESIGNED LANDSCAPES OR HISTORIC FARMYARDS, INCLUDING HOW THE HISTORIC CHARACTER OF THE AREA CONTRIBUTES TO THEIR SIGNIFICANCE .</p> <p>iii. THROUGH APPROPRIATE DESIGN, IN ACCORDANCE WITH CORE POLICY 37 AND THE DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT, be sympathetic to the Listed Building(S) and its/THEIR setting(S) in terms of its siting , size, scale, height, alignment, materials and finishes (including colour and texture), ARCHITECTURAL design and, form, AND CHARACTER, in order to retain their special interest that justifies its designation through appropriate design, in accordance with Core Policy 37 and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document; AND</p>	<p>further surveys and analysis prior to an application being determined.</p> <p>Criteria i. of Development Policy 38 ensures that proposals for additions, alterations or the demolition of a Listed Building or development within the curtilage or affecting the setting of a Listed Building conserve or enhance their heritage significance and setting.</p> <p>Core Policy 39 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 also ensures that new development proposals conserve and enhance designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national guidance and legislation.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>IV. WHERE DESIRABLE AND REASONABLY PRACTICAL, WILL RECTIFY PAST HARM.</p> <p>Proposals for the change of use of a Listed Building or building within its curtilage will be viewed favourably where it can be demonstrated that the new use WILL ENSURE THE SUSTAINABLE SURVIVAL OF THE BUILDING IN A MANNER APPROPRIATE TO ITS HISTORIC CHARACTER AND can be accommodated without any adverse effect on the special architectural or historic interest of the building and its appearance or character.</p>	
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Development Policy 38: Listed Buildings - comments from Historic England	Historic England support Development Policy 38.	Support from Historic England welcomed and acknowledged.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Development Policy 39: Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments	<p>There were a few comments received in relation to this policy. CPRE suggested that this policy is mostly sound, but raised the following concerns:</p> <p>Policy is not sound as it only applies methods of investigation and recording to monuments and sites, whereas paragraph 141 of NPPF applies to all types of heritage asset including listed buildings, conservation areas, park and gardens etc. Paragraph should be amended and either included under Development Policy 36 or included as a new policy.</p> <p>First and final sentence of the last paragraph is not in accordance with paragraph 141 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The phrase 'exceptional cases' in the policy suggests that the whole of this paragraph only applies as an exception, not indicated within the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy fails to mention the Historic Environment Record as a primary source of information.</p> <p>policy makes no provision for deposition of archive which are often vital for future research.</p> <p>Based on the concerns raised above, CPRE has suggested the deletion of the last paragraph of Development Policy 39 and the following paragraph to be added to the end of Development Policy 36 or as a new policy:</p> <p>In exceptional cases, Where, IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL POLICY, harm to or loss of significance to ANY HERITAGE ASSET IS CONSIDERED TO BE OUTWEIGHED BY OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS, the harm should be minimised; AND WHERE NEVERTHELESS VALUABLE EVIDENCE WOULD BE LOST, SUCH</p>	The Council considers that this policy provides additional detail to support Core Policy 39: Historic Environment in the adopted Part 1 plan and is consistent with national policy and guidance. Neither Oxfordshire County Council or Historic England raised any particular concerns with this policy. Paragraph 3.332 of the Part 2 plan refers to the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER). Proposals will need to demonstrate that development would not have a detrimental impact on the site and/or its setting, through an assessment, taking into account Oxfordshire County Council's Historic Environment Record (HER).

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>LOSS SHOULD BE mitigated by a programme of archaeological APPROPRIATE investigations, including excavation RECORDING AND ANALYSIS . Planning permission will not be granted until this programme has been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority, and development should not commence until these works have been satisfactorily undertaken by an appropriately qualified organisation. DEVELOPERS WILL BE EXPECTED TO REPORT THE RESULTS OF ANY INVESTIGATIONS INTO HERITAGE ASSETS OCCASIONED BY THEIR PROPOSALS TO THE RELEVANT LOCAL AND COUNTY AUTHORITIES AND RECORDS, INCLUDING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD; TO DEPOSIT THE ARCHIVE OF RECORDS AND FINDS ARISING FROM SUCH INVESTIGATIONS IN A PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE REPOSITORY AS A RESOURCE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH; AND TO ENSURE THAT THE RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS ARE PUBLISHED IN AN APPROPRIATE FORM.</p> <p>CPRE has also suggested the following text to be included at the end of Development Policies 37, 38 and 39:</p> <p>PROVISION FOR RECORDING, ANALYSIS, REPORTING, ARCHIVING AND PUBLISHING EVIDENCE ARISING FROM INVESTIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN TO ASSESS THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ASSET OR TO MITIGATE HARM ARISING FROM THE LOSS OF EVIDENCE WILL APPLY AS SET OUT IN POLICY 36 (OR 40).</p>	
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Development Policy 39: Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments - Comments from Historic England	Historic England support Development Policy 39 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment, and a clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment as required by paragraphs 126 and 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework	Support from Historic England welcomed and acknowledged.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	External Lighting and Dark Skies	<p>The Local Plan should include a Dark Skies Policy to reduce light pollution. This should include identifying existing dark areas that need protecting. A strong presumption against new lighting in existing dark areas, unless essential as part of a new development or for public safety reasons that have been clearly demonstrated. Street lighting policy to include Environmental Lighting Zones to ensure that the appropriate lighting levels with very strict requirements applying in identified dark areas. Adoption of part-night lighting schemes (e.g. switching off between midnight and 5am) or dimming. Careful consideration (in conjunction with Highways authorities) to the type of Light Emitting Diodes (LED) lighting allowed and the potential impacts that higher</p>	<p>Development Policy 21: External Lighting in the Part 2 plan sets out measures to ensure that development involving external lighting is appropriately designed and located, taking into account effect on the character of the area or on local biodiversity. Paragraph 3.149 ensures that development proposals located within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or its setting seek to avoid and reduce light pollution that threatens the integrity of dark night skies, with reference made to the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, Core Policy 44: Landscape in the adopted Part 1 plan ensures the protection of the Vale's key landscape features from harmful</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								temperature blue rich lighting has on ecology and on human health. Targets (in conjunction with Highways authorities) for replacing all their street and road lights with less light polluting types. Testing in situ of any new street lighting before being rolled out across a wider area. Adopt monitoring procedures that include collaboration with the Institution of Lighting Professionals/LANTERNS research project which aims to quantify any effects of changes to street lighting on road traffic accidents and crime.	development and where possible enhanced. Criteria vi. ensures the protection and enhancement of tranquillity and the need to protect against intrusion from light pollution. Core Policy 44 provides high priority to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the North Wessex Downs AONB. In deciding on planning applications, the Council will consider both Development Policy 21 and Core Policy 44 and relevant policies of the Local Plan 2031 read as a whole.
1143299	Ms Marie Monaghan					No	General Objection	This comment raised general objection to Development Policies 25 to 35.	Objections are duly noted.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Green Infrastructure	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust support the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Support from Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) to the Green Infrastructure Strategy acknowledged and welcomed.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				No	Heritage policies - Comments from Historic England	Historic England consider that the Local Plan should have a more robust evidence base to support the heritage policies, and would like to see more Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans as well as character assessments of the historic towns within the Vale and a historic strategy for the district as a whole.	The Council is working to update Conservation Area Appraisals on an ongoing and annual basis. The Council is however satisfied that assessments undertaken to assess the proposed development sites is sufficient to inform the Local Plan. The Council understands that Historic England have confirmed that they do not consider any of the proposed development sites would leave to any harm to the historic environment.
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Heritage policies - Comments from Historic England - Historic Environment Record	Historic England welcomes the references to the Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project and the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record in Development Policy 36, both important components of the evidence base for the plan.	Support from Historic England welcomed and acknowledged.
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No	Lack of Climate Change Policies	One comment was received in relation to the lack of policies in the Plan related to climate change. This comment raised the following concerns: Development Policies identified in the 'Protecting the Environment and Responding to Climate Change' theme are important to the planning of the district, but avoids a response to climate change. There are no policies relating to regenerating local food systems for which there is growing demand. There is an absence of support for co-housing, community led housing or community land trusts and the reservation of sites in the Plan to support these initiatives. Sustainability Appraisal noted the absence of mitigation policies in the Plan, but indicated that the adaptation policies set out in the Part 1 plan would be sufficient, contrary to section 19 of the Planning and	Responding to climate change is one of the Council's Strategic Objectives (SO12) in the adopted Part 1 plan. Core Policy 40: Sustainable Design and Construction encourages developers to incorporate climate change adaptation and design measures in all new development proposals. Core Policy 41: Renewable Energy (excluding wind energy) encourages schemes for renewable and low carbon energy generation and Core Policy 43: Natural Resources encourages developers to make provision for the effective use of natural resources, including maximising passive solar heating and water and energy efficiency. Paragraph 175 of the Inspector's Report into the Part 1 plan placed a significant emphasis in accordance with the Housing Standards Review and Written Ministerial Statement for the Council to encourage rather than require climate change adaptation measures.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 or the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Development Policies included in the Part 2 plan do not respond to climate change.</p> <p>Plan should either not claim that it is responding to climate change, or should be modified to include policies that mitigate against climate change.</p> <p>Plan lacks evidence of the need to regenerate local food systems or choosing not to accept the findings of the Green Infrastructure Strategy and following the Garden City principles in terms of local food production.</p> <p>Evidence in relation to low carbon transport is missing or being ignored; Plan does not refer to the 4th or 5th carbon budgets and makes no attempt to play an active role in meeting them</p> <p>The Plan is not effective as it does not: Have sustainable development as its purpose. Follow the advice at section 10 of the NPPF in respect of climate change. Meet the duty under s19 of the Planning and Compensation Act to mitigate against carbon emissions.</p> <p>Therefore, the Plan is not compliant with NPPF para 50 or the Housing and Planning Act 2016 or Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 in respect of planning positively to meet the demand for serviced plots.</p>	<p>In light of the Inspector's conclusions and taking into account current national policy and guidance, the Council consider that the Spatial Strategy and district wide policies that support the adopted Part 1 plan provide a strong policy framework to address climate change within the Vale</p> <p>Core Policy 33: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility and Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking seek to support key improvements to the transport network and supporting the provision of sustainable transport measures. Furthermore, Development Policy 17 provides additional guidance on the information required with Transport Assessments or Statements and Travel Plan, including considering opportunities to support the take up of electric and/or low emission vehicles.</p>
1142659	Mrs Cynthia Warmington					No	Loss of agricultural land	<p>One comment is concerned that the loss of farmland and food production is not legally compliant. The comment supports the Sunningwell Parishioners Against Damage to the Environment (SPADE) and Sunningwell Parish Council consultation responses to the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and informal engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper, including taking into account the grading of agricultural land.</p> <p>Core Policy 43: Natural Resources of the adopted Part 1 plan makes provision for the effective use of natural resources including avoiding the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Minerals and Waste - Comments from Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Oxfordshire County Council does not have any matters to raise in respect of soundness in relation to Minerals and Waste Planning on this plan.</p>	Noted

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1101804 1144368	Alex Chandler Ms Rachel Farrell					No No	North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	There are two comments which state that the Council should consider being exemplar to the rest of the UK in working with the AONBs to retain their beauty. This will be achieved by using more cost-effective land outside of the AONB.	The Council is committed to protecting the AONB and as member of the North Wessex Downs AONB Board is committed to continue to work positively with the Group. The Council considers that the adopted Core Policy 44: Landscape provides sufficient guidance relating to protecting landscape features.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Saved Policies of the Local Plan 2011	<p>CPRE has commented that the inappropriate deletion of Saved Policies of the Local Plan 2011 raises the following concerns:</p> <p>Removal of greenfield land under the Local Plan 2031; it is incumbent on the Council to give no less a protection to its landscape and to its historic buildings as was given in the Local Plan 2011.</p> <p>There were a number of policies in the Local Plan 2011 that gave specific reference to vital protection for specific location and types of landscape and to historic buildings and sites.</p> <p>It is not accepted in Topic Paper 6 that Core Policy 44 of the Part 1 plan and the emerging Landscape Character Assessment will provide sufficient level of detail.</p> <p>In order for the Plan to be justified and consistent with Statutory obligations/duties and National Policy, Policies NE7 and NE9-NE12 (inclusive), all consistent with the NPPF and all Saved Policies in Appendix G of Local Plan 2031: Part 1, should be added to Section 3.2 'Landscape' of the Part 2 Plan.</p> <p>CPRE has proposed policies for addition or as a modification to those contained in Chapter 3.</p> <p>An additional policy should be included in the Part 2 plan, that replaces Saved Policy NE6 of the Local Plan 2011, in relation to the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as follows:</p> <p>IN DETERMINING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WITHIN THE NORTH WESSEX DOWNS AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB) AND PROPOSALS WHICH WOULD AFFECT ITS SETTING, GREAT WEIGHT WILL BE GIVEN TO CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE AREA'S NATURAL BEAUTY, LANDSCAPE AND COUNTRYSIDE, INCLUDING ITS WILDLIFE, HISTORIC CHARACTER AND HERITAGE ASSETS. THE NORTH WESSEX DOWNS AONB MANAGEMENT PLAN AND GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS ARE MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS IN DECISION MAKING RELEVANT TO THE AONB. MAJOR DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED WITHIN THE AONB UNLESS IT</p>	The Council is satisfied that the adopted Core Policy 44: Landscape provides sufficient guidance relating to protecting landscape features, including designated areas such as the AONB and where there are important views and visually sensitive skylines. In all the policy sets out 8 criteria.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>SATISFIES THE EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES SET OUT IN NATIONAL POLICY AND GUIDANCE. PROPOSALS THAT SUPPORT THE ECONOMY AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING OF COMMUNITIES LOCATED IN THE NORTH WESSEX DOWNS AONB, INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING SCHEMES AND SMALL SCALE RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT, WILL BE SUPPORTED, PROVIDED THEY ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE GREAT WEIGHT THAT MUST BE GIVEN TO CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE LANDSCAPE AND NATURAL SCENIC BEAUTY OF THE AREA.</p> <p><i>(CPRE consider it is important that a specific AONB policy should be included, but the last section of the original wording is unsound because it restricts the scope of 'major development' and does NOT refer to NPPF tests but proposes its own. This is demonstrably in need of replacement as suggested above)</i></p> <p>An additional policy should be included in the Part 2 plan, that replaces Saved Policy NE8 of the Local Plan 2011, in relation to the setting of Oxford, as follows:</p> <p>IN CONSIDERING PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING THE LANDSCAPE SETTING OF OXFORD, ESPECIALLY IN AREAS WITHIN VIEW OF AND FROM THE CITY, PARTICULAR REGARD WILL BE GIVEN TO THE CONTRIBUTION THAT THE SURROUNDING LANDSCAPE MAKES TO OXFORD'S SETTING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 1990 LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS ACT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL POLICY ON HERITAGE SETTINGS AND HISTORIC ENGLAND'S GUIDANCE ON SETTING. DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED IF IT WOULD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HARM THE LANDSCAPE SETTING AND CHARACTER OF OXFORD; OR • HARM THE SETTING OF THE INTERNATIONALLY AND NATIONALLY IMPORTANT LISTED BUILDINGS, CONSERVATION AREAS AND REGISTERED PARKS AND GARDENS THAT FORM THE ICONIC SKYLINE OF OXFORD, INCLUDING EFFECTS ON VIEWS OUT FROM AND ACROSS THE CITY AND ON THE HISTORIC CHARACTER OF ITS SURROUNDING LANDSCAPE. <p>OXFORD CITY COUNCIL'S HERITAGE PLAN DOCUMENTS AND POLICY ON THE LANDSCAPE SETTING OF OXFORD AND VIEWS IN RELATION TO OXFORD'S SKYLINE WILL BE TREATED AS MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS IN DETERMINING PROPOSALS TO WHICH THIS POLICY APPLIES.</p>	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p><i>(This policy is considered by CPRE as not sound because it does not accord with the current concept of setting as defined in national policy, official guidance and many court judgments, that 'setting' is not an asset in its own right but concerns how the surroundings of a place contributes to its significance. In this instance, the place is an internationally important group of heritage assets whose setting comes within statutory obligations. Great weight national planning issues have been reinforced in relation to this (including not considering setting too restrictively) by several court judgments since 2011. The revised wording above addresses these shortcomings)</i></p> <p>An additional policy should be included in the Part 2 plan that replaces Saved Policy NE7 of the Local Plan 2011, in relation to the North Vale Corallian Ridge as follows:</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD HARM THE PREVAILING CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE NORTH VALE CORALLIAN RIDGE, AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS THERE IS AN OVERRIDING NEED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND ALL STEPS WILL BE TAKEN TO MINIMISE THE IMPACT ON THE LANDSCAPE.</p> <p>An additional policy should be included in the Part 2 plan that replaces Saved Policy NE9 of the Local Plan 2011, in relation to the Lowland Vale, as follows:</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT IN THE LOWLAND VALE WILL NOT BE PERMITTED IF IT WOULD HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE LANDSCAPE, PARTICULARLY ON THE LONG OPEN VIEWS WITHIN OR ACROSS THE AREA.</p> <p>(CPRE consider that the 'long open views' are an essential characteristic of the rural Vale and should be specifically protected)</p> <p>An additional policy should be included in the Part 2 plan that replaces Saved Policy NE10 of the Local Plan 2011 and Development Policy 29, in relation to urban fringes and important open gaps between settlements, as follows:</p> <p>IN THE URBAN FRINGES AND IMPORTANT OPEN GAPS BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS, AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, DEVELOPMENT OR CHANGES OF USE WHICH WOULD HARM THEIR ESSENTIALLY OPEN OR RURAL CHARACTER WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.</p> <p>(CPRE consider it is essential that the open gaps between settlements be specified on a proposals map, and that they are protected by a Policy stronger than 'unacceptable narrowing')</p> <p>An additional policy should be included in the Part 2 plan that replaces Saved Policy NE11 of the Local</p>	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Plan 2011 in relation to damaged or compromised landscapes, as follows:</p> <p>PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN OR AFFECTING AREAS OF DAMAGED OR COMPROMISED LANDSCAPE, IN PARTICULAR THOSE AREAS DEFINED FOR LANDSCAPE ENHANCEMENT ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, MUST PROVIDE A LANDSCAPING SCHEME WHICH ENHANCES THE APPEARANCE OF THE AREA. DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD FURTHER ERODE OR DAMAGE THE CHARACTER OF THE LANDSCAPE WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.</p> <p>(A proposals map should specify damaged or compromised landscapes where enhancement should be a priority)</p> <p>An additional policy should be included in the Part 2 plan that replaces Saved Policy NE12 of the Local Plan 2011 in relation to the Great Western Community Forest, as follows:</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE COMMUNITY FOREST, AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, MUST, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE CREATION OF A DIVERSE WOODLAND ENVIRONMENT APPROPRIATE TO THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER OF THE AREA. PROPOSALS WHICH WOULD PREJUDICE THE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE GREAT WESTERN COMMUNITY FOREST WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.</p> <p>(A proposals map should specify protected environments)</p>	
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Saved Policy NE7 of the Local Plan 2011	<p>There were a number of comments received, including from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council in relation to Saved Policy NE7 of the Local Plan 2011, the loss of specific landscape character policies from the Local Plan 2011 and the absence of new policies in the Plan related to landscape character. Specific comments raised the following concerns:</p> <p>The loss of Saved policy NE7 of the Local Plan 2011 will result in harm to the North Vale Corallian Ridge and surrounding villages; this policy and other similar policies related to landscape character should be restored.</p> <p>Policy NE7 has protected the important feature of the landscape, without it the parish of Fyfield and Tubney has been vulnerable to inappropriate developments e.g. proposed Part 2 plan allocation within Fyfield and Tubney Parish.</p> <p>The absence of Development Policies related to Landscape Character fails the tests of positive planning and therefore the Plan is not sound.</p> <p>A stronger policy should be included in the Plan to protect the Vale's outstanding natural features.</p>	<p>The Council consider that the character of the landscape is sufficiently protected by Core Policy 44: Landscape of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and other relevant policies of the Local Plan 2031 including Development Policy 29: Settlement Character and Gaps.</p> <p>In applying Core Policy 44, the Council will take into account the district wide Landscape Character Assessment and the most up-to-date evidence and landscape studies available from Natural England, the District and County Council and from the North Wessex Downs AONB. The Landscape Character Assessment provides an assessment of the landscape context of the Vale and sets out Landscape Types and specific Character Areas, such as the Corallian Limestone Ridge.</p>
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					No			
1142099	Mr Terence Palmer					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>The evidence documents are based on statistics and not real life; the Sustainability Appraisal contains no reference to real life impacts.</p> <p>CPRE has proposed policies for addition or as a modification to those contained in Chapter 3.</p> <p>An additional policy should be included in the Part 2 plan that replaces Saved Policy NE7 of the Local Plan 2011, in relation to the North Vale Corallian Ridge as follows:</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD HARM THE PREVAILING CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE NORTH VALE CORALLIAN RIDGE, AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS THERE IS AN OVERRIDING NEED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND ALL STEPS WILL BE TAKEN TO MINIMISE THE IMPACT ON THE LANDSCAPE.</p>	
828637	Mr Malcolm Moor	SAFAG				No	Water Quality	<p>One comment was received, which suggested that planning policies related to water quality should refer to the Ock Catchment Water Environment Improvement Plan prepared by the Freshwater Habitats Trust and River Ock Catchment Partnership.</p>	<p>The Council considers that Development Policy 30 provides effective protection for the Ock and other watercourses. The Green Infrastructure Strategy provides further detail in relation to the River Ock catchment.</p>
1144989	Mrs Cathy Harrison	Environment Agency					Water Quality - Comments from Environment Agency	<p>The Environment Agency commented that the supporting text should be amended to provide further clarity that a Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment is a quantitative assessment of water bodies, including flow and hydrological regime, as well as an assessment of water quality and ecology.</p> <p>The supporting text at paragraph 3.184 should be amended as follows:</p> <p>The Water Framework Directive (WFD) requires that all 'water bodies' including rivers, lakes, estuaries, coastal waters and groundwater, achieve a good ecological status. Under the WFD, all water bodies are classified by current and future water quality, ecological, HYDROMORPHOLOGICAL and chemical status. It is therefore important that future development, including the provision of supporting infrastructure, in the Vale is carefully planned to help achieve the objectives set out in the WFD.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes the Environment Agency's support. EA's suggested amendments to the supporting text will help to provide further clarity.</p>

Chapter 4

Core Policy 47a: Delivery and Contingency

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Economic growth	<p>Several comments raised concern that the monitoring outlined in Core Policy 47a is not effective as it only applies to the forecast level of economic growth, and does not consider the possibility of not meeting this expectation. The absence of phasing of the proposed development programme and a balanced approach to monitoring implementation is ineffective and unsound. Comments raised concern that if development exceeds forecast figures for economic growth, or if there is an economic downturn causing a slowdown in sales, there is a risk that developments will be left incomplete or under-occupancy. Comments raised concern regarding this related to the site allocation East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.</p> <p>A mechanism needs to be in place for calling a halt to premature development if the expectation of job growth is not fulfilled.</p> <p>Some comments specified that the modification to the Plan should be the removal of the Fyfield site from Core Policies 4a and 8a.</p>	<p>Core Policy 47a outlines the framework for monitoring the policies in the Local Plan Part 2. Core Policy 6 in the adopted Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) provides the Council's overall approach and targets in regards to economic development in the district. Core Policy 47 in the LPP1 sets out the monitoring framework for this policy. Core Policy 15a and 15b relate to housing and jobs growth at Harwell Campus, as part of the comprehensive development framework. These policies, once adopted, will be monitored on an annual basis as part of the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). If development is not progressing as planned, the possible responses as outlined in Core Policy 47a are appropriate.</p> <p>Core Policies 4a and 8a allocate additional sites. As is expressed in Core Policy 4a, the reason for the additional housing allocations is to meet housing need arising in other areas of the housing market area, expressly the quantum of unmet need from Oxford City, to be addressed in the Vale. These site are therefore not based solely on the Vale's economic performance or housing need. If the housing need for the housing market area changes significantly then Core Policy 47 in LPP1 and 47a in LPP2 contain appropriate mechanisms to respond effectively.</p>
757957	Mr Mark Baker	CPRE				No			
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No			
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					No			
1142760	Mr Fergus Cable-Alexander					No			
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	Environmental impact	<p>CPRE comments to emphasise the urgency to establish frequent formal audit of job growth against housing with an ability to stop approvals if job growth falls short of expectation.</p> <p>The following textual changes are suggested to paragraphs 4.1 – 4.7 of the Plan and Appendix N, and Core Policy 47a:</p> <p>4.3. We will continue to work jointly with stakeholders to deliver Local Plan 2031 objectives. This will include partnership working with both public agencies and the private sector and is necessary to ensure development progresses AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL BENEFITS ARE DELIVERED in a manner consistent with the strategy identified in this plan AND THE THREE CORE STRANDS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.</p> <p>4.5. The Council will publish information at least annually to show progress with Local Plan implementation INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL POLICIES in its Authority Monitoring Report.</p> <p>4.6. The Council has included a Monitoring Framework at Appendix N, which identifies how the</p>	<p>Jobs growth in the district will be monitored on an annual basis, the results will be published in the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR).</p> <p>The wording of paragraphs 4.3, 4.4 and 4.6 does not need to specifically highlight environmental or social policies. The statements that these paragraphs are making concern the monitoring of the whole plan and each policy, including environment and social policies.</p> <p>There is no need to add a further point relating specifically to the environment in Core Policy 47a. The steps outlined in this policy are sufficient to address issues if development is not in line with the strategy outlined in the LPP2.</p> <p>The Council is confident that the monitoring indicators outlined in the monitoring framework are appropriate and proportionate to ensure that the policies detailed in LPP2 are monitored effectively.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Council will monitor the effectiveness and implementation of the Local Plan 2031: Part 2 for each policy. The Council recognises that appropriate action will need to be taken if implementation of the plan OR ITS ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL POLICIES is clearly off track.</p> <p>Core Policy 47a: Delivery and Contingency</p> <p>v. ADOPTING APPROPRIATE PREVENTATIVE OR REMEDIAL MEASURES OR (IF IRREVERSIBLE) COMPENSATORY IF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IS LESS EFFECTIVE THAN IT SHOULD BE.</p> <p>Appendix N</p> <p>Insert following environmental monitoring measures:</p> <p>OVERALL ENVIRONMENT: NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS APPROVED CONTRARY TO EXTERNAL AND/OR INTERNAL TECHNICAL ADVICE</p> <p>LANDSCAPE GREEN BELT AND DARK SKIES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AONB: NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS PASSED CONTRARY TO ADVICE OF N WESSEX DOWNS AONB PARTNERSHIP; NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS AFFECTING NWD AONB THAT ARE SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT UNDER EIA REGULATIONS AND NUMBER OF SCREENING OPINIONS ISSUED; NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS CLASSED AS 'MAJOR DEVELOPMENT' IN NWD AONB AND PROPORTION APPROVED • GENERAL LANDSCAPE: AREA OVER WHICH DEVELOPMENT-BASED LANDUSE CHANGE WOULD LEAD TO ALTERATION OF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) LANDSCAPE CHARACTER TYPE BOUNDARIES AND b) HISTORIC LANDSCAPE CHARACTER TYPES; EXTENT OF CHANGE TO OR LOSS OF PRE-19TH CENTURY HLC TYPES • DARK SKIES: NUMBER OF DARK SKIES DESIGNATIONS (DISCOVERY SITES, AREAS, COMMUNITIES ETC.) RECOGNISED WITHIN OR PARTLY WITHIN THE COUNCIL'S AREA; CHANGES TO CPRE DARK SKIES QUALITATIVE MAPPING; EXTENT OF LIGHT POLLUTION REDUCTION MEASURES INTRODUCED ON ROADS AND HOUSING AREAS; NUMBER OF DARK SKIES COMMUNITY EVENTS; ASTRONOMERS' MONITORING OF VISIBILITY OF KEY STAR CLUSTERS ON CLEAR NIGHTS • GREEN BELT: NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS APPROVED THAT TRIGGER THE TEST OF 	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>'VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES'; NUMBER OF CASES WHERE THE TEST OF 'VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES' RELATES TO SO-CALLED 'FALL-BACK' POSITIONS ARISING FROM PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS OR POTENTIAL OPTIONS</p> <p>Development Policies 36 to 39 (Historic Environment):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CONSERVATION AREAS: NUMBER OF CONSERVATION AREAS AND PROPORTION WITH UP-TO-DATE APPRAISALS; NUMBER OF CA APPLICATIONS THAT ENHANCE A CA; NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS THAT DETRACT FROM CA CHARACTER OR RESULT IN LOSS OF OPEN SPACE THAT CONTRIBUTES TO CHARACTER; NUMBER OF CASES AFFECTING THE SETTING OF A CA BY DEVELOPING COUNTRYSIDE IMMEDIATELY BORDERING HISTORIC SETTLEMENT. • LISTED BUILDINGS AND LOCALLY LISTED BUILDINGS: NUMBER OF LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATIONS INVOLVING LOSS OF FABRIC AND/OR CHARACTER NOT OFFSET BY BENEFICIAL CHANGES; NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS NOTIFIABLE TO HISTORIC ENGLAND AND AMENITY SOCIETIES; NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS INVOLVING HARM ONLY JUSTIFIABLE ON BASIS OF BEING CLEARLY OUTWEIGHED BY SUBSTANTIAL PUBLIC BENEFITS; NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS IN WHICH SETTING ISSUES ARE AN ADVERSE MATERIAL CONSIDERATION; • REGISTERED PARKS AND GARDENS: NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS INVOLVING LOSS OF FABRIC AND/OR CHARACTER NOT OFFSET BY BENEFICIAL CHANGES; NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS NOTIFIABLE TO HISTORIC ENGLAND AND AMENITY SOCIETY; • SCHEDULED MONUMENTS AND ARCHAEOLOGY: NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS REQUIRING SCHEDULED MONUMENT CONSENT FOR LOSS OF FABRIC; NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS REQUIRING DESK STUDIES, FIELD EVALUATION/SURVEY AND FULL INVESTIGATION; NUMBER OF EXCAVATIONS OVER 20M² • RECORDING AND INVESTIGATION: NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS INVOLVING RECORDING AND INVESTIGATION ACCORDING TO HERITAGE ASSET TYPE; VOLUME OF STORAGE SPACE IN PUBLIC REPOSITORIES REQUIRED FOR INVESTIGATION ARCHIVES; NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS PUBLISHED (BY TYPE OF PUBLICATION) 	
827932	Julie Maberley	Wantage and Grove				No	Monitoring Framework -	One comment suggests that the wording for the Monitoring Framework has been written in the passive	The actions set out with the Monitoring Framework to support the Part 2 plan are consistent with the actions

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
		Campaign Group					comments on style of text	tense, and should be changed to be line with other actions in the framework: Comment has suggested an amendment to the actions, in relation to Development Policies, as set out in the Appendix N: Monitoring Framework as follows: "Liaise with relevant stakeholders to determine challenges around the PROGRESS delivery of policy"	contained in the Monitoring Framework for the adopted Part 1 plan.

Appendices

Appendix A – Site Development Templates: General Requirements

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Consistency of wording	The response highlights a minor inconsistency in language between the Introduction to Appendix A and Core Policies 8a and 15a in relation to stakeholder engagement in the master planning process. It is suggested that wording is made consistent and that the words " AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS " are added to the Appendix A introduction.	Noted. The Council agrees that this Additional Modification is helpful to provide internal consistency and clarity. The words " AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS " are proposed to be added to the third paragraph on page 1 of Appendix A. This is described within the Additional Modifications Schedule.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Ecological Surveys	It is suggested that the proposed allocations have not been informed by baseline ecological surveys. These are needed to help determine the sustainability and capacity of the proposed developments. The NPPF states that policies within a local plan must be based upon adequate up-to-date evidence. A lack of ecological surveys means the allocations within the Local Plan are not compliant with the NPPF.	Baseline Ecological Surveys have been undertaken by the Site Promoters and reviewed by Council officers. The Council is not aware of any constraints that would preclude development coming forward. Within the general requirements in appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, there is a requirement for developers to produce an Ecological Impact Assessment to accompany any planning applications. They will be considered in further detail to inform the final proposals.
1099907	Liz Pickering	Education & Skills Funding Agency					Education	The Education and Skills Funding Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Local Plan. They aim to work closely with planning authorities and local education departments to meet the need and demand for new school places and new schools. They hope the comments submitted are helpful in finalising the Local plan with specific regards to the provision of land for new schools. They would like to continue working with the Council in developing a sound Local Plan which will aid in the delivery of new schools within the area. Their specific comments include: The idea of developers contributing to educational facilities is supported A planning for schools topic paper should be produced to demonstrate pupil growth within the proposed allocations The Council should consider the Agencies proposals for forward funding schools to make up the delay in receiving CIL funding. They support the provision for education within the policies and the site development templates. They would like to continue working with Oxfordshire County Council and the Vale of White Horse District Council They would like to be consulted on any updates to CIL.	The Council note the support for the wording within the policies and the site development templates. Oxfordshire County Council are the Education authority within the County and the Council will continue to work with them and other key stakeholders to ensure education facilities and services are made available to accommodate the expected growth. The County Council have prepared up to date evidence to inform planning for pupil places across Oxfordshire and this has been used by the County Council to inform their responses to the emerging plan.
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England					Highways England - Support	Highways England recognise that impacts to the SRN have been qualified by the Development Template within Appendix A of the Local Plan which requires a transport assessment to be submitted with any planning application in order to identify "the measures	The support is duly noted

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for any harmful transport impacts". Highways England is supportive of the use of the Development Template which aligns with the principles of NPPF, its soundness requirements, and Circular 02/2013. Highways England's other policy comments remain unchanged.	
634166	Mr Martin Small	Historic England				Yes	Historic England - Support	Historic England welcome the General Requirements for all housing site allocations for Historic environment and cultural heritage set out within the Introduction to Appendix A. Historic England consider that, in principle, these requirements provide sufficient protection for heritage assets close to the proposed housing site allocations. However, it is suggested that Character Appraisals should be prepared for the East Hanney and Kingston Bagpuize Conservation Areas.	The Council welcome the support from Historic England and their positive approach to supporting the protection of Local Heritage. The Council is committed to updating the Conservation Area Appraisals across the district and are working through these on an incremental basis. The Council will consider prioritising the appraisals for East Hanney and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Management of Green Infrastructure	There is no mention of long term management of existing and new green infrastructure. It is recommended that a requirement for Landscape and ecological management plans and ongoing long term management is included either within the General requirements within Appendix A or in the development Management policies within the main document.	The Council welcomes the comments from the Wildlife Trust and is committed to continue to protect and enhance biodiversity within the district. Whilst the Council does not consider that specific reference to ongoing maintenance is necessary within the Site Development Templates and do not consider this affects the soundness of the plan, the Council has no particular objection to making an Additional Modification to provide additional clarity, should this be considered necessary.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Master planning	It is suggested that developers consider the identified dwelling numbers within local plans as a given number and not a maximum and so may not give appropriate regard to any constraints that affect sites. It is noted that some site templates include the words 'subject to master planning' and it is suggested that this should be consistent for all sites. The site development templates are welcomed, however they provide limited detail such as the proposed sites not specifying the distribution of housing and green infrastructure nor having any mention to long term management of existing and proposed green infrastructure.	The Site Development Template wording 'subject to master planning' is consistent for all sites with the exception of two sites that may deliver further housing beyond the plan period. The total quantum of development will be determined by a combination of master planning and further assessment, including for example, wider infrastructure requirements to support development at the site. In relation to Dalton Barracks, this site is also informed by Core Policy 8b which requires a comprehensive approach to planning for the site as a whole. The Council are committed to preparing an SPD for this site to ensure the master planning and planning for the site are considered comprehensively and holistically. The specific details regarding the distribution of housing and green infrastructure will be informed within the detailed master planning process for individual sites.
756175	Mr Robin Draper					No	Objection	The Local Plan Part 2 is not sound as it makes no attempt to analyse the cumulative impact of the housing provision on top of that already allowed for in Part 1. This repeats the failure in Part 1 to properly analyse the risks across all the infrastructure requirements.	The Local Plan is informed by a comprehensive suite of technical evidence for which the Council considers is fit for purpose and proportionate. Many of the studies and the analysis they inform do consider cumulative impact, including for example, the HRA, SA, and ETI.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Oxfordshire County Council - Biodiversity	The County Council welcome the inclusion of biodiversity within the site development templates, however believe the wording is not strong enough to achieve a net gain as required by national and local policy.	Noted. The Council considers that the Development Template wording, when considered alongside the wording of CP46: Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity, is sufficiently robust, whilst retaining appropriate flexibility. The Development Template

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>They recommend changing the bullet points regarding biodiversity with the following:</p> <p>Important ecological assets should be retained where possible. If loss is unavoidable then appropriate mitigation, or as a last resort, compensation measures should be provided.</p> <p>Development should achieve a net gain in biodiversity, for example, by incorporating natural habitats into development and designing buildings with integral bat boxes and bird nesting opportunities, in appropriate circumstances. WHICH WILL NEED NOT BE DEMONSTRATED E.G. THROUGH THE USE OF AN ACCEPTED BIODIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT CALCULATOR SUCH AS THE DEFRA METRIC.</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT IS EXPECTED TO ENHANCE THE BIODIVERSITY, for example, by incorporating natural habitats AND TREE PLANTING into development and by designing buildings with GREEN ROOFS AND WALLS and integral bat boxes and bird nesting opportunities for birds AND BATS in appropriate circumstances.</p>	<p>wording is consistent with the Part 1 plan wording. Both the Part 1 plan and CP46, contained within it, are adopted (December 2016). However, the Council would not object to minor modifications to improve the wording of the Development Template, should that be considered appropriate.</p>
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No	Oxfordshire County Council - CIL and IDP	<p>Oxfordshire County Council highlighted a number of concerns regarding the IDP and CIL. These are:</p> <p>The IDP is missing a number of necessary infrastructure items that are needed to ensure the development is sustainable. This could make development seem more viable than it actually is. It should be clear that the IDP seeks only to list the forecasted infrastructure. The key rationale for the IDP should be to identify broad infrastructure needs for the purpose of assessing the viability of the development.</p> <p>The IDP needs to be updated to take into account the recent work undertaken by the ETI</p> <p>Due to the urgency to submit the local plan, key infrastructure elements have not been adequately investigated or reflected within the IDP</p> <p>The County Council faces frequent funding shortfalls in regards to strategic transports and education infrastructure due to the limitations of CIL and S106.</p> <p>There should be a spending strategy for CIL to ensure all appropriate infrastructure has funding.</p> <p>There is no agreement for how CIL funding is split between the County Council and the District Council.</p> <p>County Council cannot be certain that funds will be forthcoming in supporting the provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>The regulation 123 list needs to be revised to make provisions for the allocations within the Local Plan Part 2.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council is committed to work positively with Oxfordshire County Council and is grateful for their support. VOWH acknowledge the County Council's comments, although many of them do not relate to the soundness of the Part 2 plan. The Council is undertaking a review of CIL to ensure it is updated to reflect the proposals set out in the Part 2 plan, however this is timetabled to be in place to coincide with the adoption of the part 2 plan, following examination. It is not considered necessary, or appropriate, to adopt any CIL updates, until the Part 2 examination is completed.</p> <p>The Council is also committed to develop a spending strategy for CIL and to ensure the County Council are able to fully participate in its preparation. However, this does not directly affect the Soundness of the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>The IDP is a live document and will continue to be updated. VOWH consults with all infrastructure providers, including Oxfordshire County Council, and seeks to ensure that the IDP is based on the best information available at the time. The Council is content the IDP is fit for purpose for the purposes of informing the Part 2 plan process and demonstrate the sites are deliverable.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								The 123 list is not yet in the process of being amended, however planning applications for sites which are subject to draft allocations may be lodged. Although the CIL process is outside of the Local Plan process, a consideration needs to be shown as to how money from CIL and S106 will be contributed for infrastructure to ensure the site is deliverable.	
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Oxfordshire County Council - Health Impact assessment	<p>A Health Impact Assessment should be required as part of a planning application for major development. This will help to meet the strategic objectives for building healthy and sustainable communities. Consider amending the introduction to the Appendix A: General Requirements by including the following in the bulleted list:</p> <p>A HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENT THAT IDENTIFIES AND TAKES ACCOUNT OF THE HEALTH STATUS AND NEEDS IN THE AREA AND PROVIDES INFORMATION ABOUT HOW TO IMPROVE HEALTH AND WELLBEING</p>	<p>The Council agrees that this Additional Modification is helpful to provide further clarity. It is proposed the following is added to the bulleted list within Appendix A: General Requirements under the heading Social and Community:</p> <p>A HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENT THAT IDENTIFIES AND TAKES ACCOUNT OF THE HEALTH STATUS AND NEEDS IN THE AREA AND PROVIDES INFORMATION ABOUT HOW TO IMPROVE HEALTH AND WELLBEING</p>
730017	Ms Ruth Cross	South Oxfordshire District Council					SODC Leisure Team comments	<p>The South Oxfordshire District Council propose the following amendments to the text in Appendix A: "General Requirements for Housing sites Contribute towards health care, leisure provision, and other community services and facilities where appropriate, in accordance with the requirement of the IDP AND THE STANDARDS SET OUT IN THE VALE OF WHITE HORSE REPORTS ON; OPEN SPACES, PLAYING PITCHES, LEISURE FACILITIES STUDY AND LOCAL LEISURE FACILITIES STUDY".</p>	<p>The Council considers that these matters are adequately addressed within Development Policies, that apply to all development, and that no further amendment to the Development Site Templates are required.</p>
725553	Mr Chris Gaskell	Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE)					SSE - Electricity Infrastructure	<p>SSE made a number of comments which include:</p> <p>The scale of development may affect the electricity network. If so, this could be overcome within two years and will not impede on the delivery of the sites. To minimise costs, overhead powerlines may stay and be incorporated into greenspace. Where this is not practical, developers will need to propose a new route and will need to work with SSE.</p> <p>If there are any cases of 132kV OTL's on site, these should be retained. The removal of these are costly and time consuming and should be prevented.</p> <p>Development of land should be designed to allow OTL's to remain undisturbed.</p> <p>Development beneath overhead lines or diversion/undergrounding of the overhead lines may not be possible which could potentially stop the development taking place.</p> <p>Any conditions imposed to divert/underground overhead lines must be placed upon the developers and not the distribution Network operators.</p> <p>Developers must work with SSE to determine contractual agreements, costings, and practicalities.</p>	<p>The Council note the comments made by SSE and will continue to work with key stakeholders to ensure any concerns are resolved. The Development Site Templates set out policy requirements for each proposed allocation relating to utilities. The practicalities and costings in overcoming issues with the electricity network will be discussed and agreed at the planning application stage.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>This should be done before a planning application is submitted.</p> <p>Costs should be placed upon developers and not Distribution Network Operators.</p> <p>There has been a lack of cooperation between planning authorities and SSE in regards to a number of sites across southern England.</p>	
902309	NHS Oxfordshire CCG Oxfordshire CCG	Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	1142842	Mrs Anne Lankester		No	Support	Oxfordshire CCG welcomes the requirement for developers to contribute towards improved health care provisions.	The support is duly noted
1101890	Richard Hill	Thames Water	1056377	Ms Katherine Jones	Savills		Thames Water - Rewording	<p>Thames Water would like the part 2 plan to make reference to Core Policy 7 which specifically relates to water and waste water infrastructure.</p> <p>Consider rephrasing the term 'upgrade the sewer network' to 'UPGRADES TO THE SEWER NETWORK MAY BE REQUIRED AHEAD OF OCCUPATION.'</p> <p>Thames Water are unable to confirm what upgrades if any are definitely required.</p>	The Council agrees that this Additional Modification is helpful to improve clarity. Rephrase the following in each of the Development Site Templates: ' upgrade the sewer network ' to 'UPGRADES TO THE SEWER NETWORK MAY BE REQUIRED AHEAD OF OCCUPATION.'

Site Selection

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096701 1144552	Merton College	WebbPaton	737353 1144555	Mr Nathan McLoughlin Mr Davies	McLoughlin Planning	No	Assessing sites	<p>There are a number of concerns over the assessment of sites for the inclusion within Local Plan 2031 Part 2. These include:</p> <p>The factors for discounting sites close to Oxford should be considered holistically and balanced against the positive impacts of locating housing close to the city</p> <p>The costs for allocating sites away from oxford should be compared to allocating sites close to oxford</p> <p>Evidence that has been submitted through the reg 18 consultation has been ignored and therefore sites have not been tested accurately</p>	<p>The Council have undertaken detailed testing of sites to find the most suitable and sustainable sites for allocation within the Local Plan. The process is set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper detailing the Council conclusions upon the sites proposed.</p> <p>All comments received to consultation, including the Regulation 18 stage have been reviewed and considered.</p>
1145259	Mrs Julia Hammett	Oxfordshire Badger Group				No	Biodiversity	<p>Proposed sites have been selected without regard to the wildlife and habitats residing on the sites. Concern has been limited to SACs and SSSIs and not the actual site.</p> <p>The Council should produce a comprehensive Environmental Impact report and audit of species before proposing to allocate the sites. Without this, the Local Plan is not compliant with para 109 of the NPPF</p>	<p>Whilst the Council has worked with consultants to produce a Habitat Regulation Assessment which considers impacts associated with designated sites affected by the HRA Regulations, the Council also expects detailed site specific ecological impact assessments to be prepared by the site promoters. These are reviewed by Council ecologists and form part of the evidence used to demonstrate the suitability and deliverability of the sites. Wider ecological impacts are also considered in the context of the site selection process that is summarised within the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council require developers to carry out habitats and species surveys through the planning application process to identify the ecology and biodiversity of the site. These should be in line with the guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment as set out within Local Plan policies and the Development Site Templates.</p>
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) raised concerns in relation to the quantum of development proposed in the district and the impact on wildlife even if the most ecologically-rich areas are avoided. BBWOT consider it essential that it is not only located in places where it causes least environmental impacts but is also of a layout and design that allows for green infrastructure and biodiversity to be integrated into the development creating diverse and high quality environments.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>Core Policy 46: Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity in the adopted Part 1 plan ensures the protection and enhancement of biodiversity across the district. The policy ensures development proposals achieve a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure of the adopted Part 1 plan ensures the appropriate provision of Green Infrastructure through new development, including taking into account the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy, to achieve a net gain in GI, including biodiversity through on-site provision or off-site contributions.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Site Development Templates set out site specific and general requirements to support the proposed allocations in the Part 2 plan and ensure Green Infrastructure is integrated within the design of the development proposal and is connected to GI on</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									neighbouring sites. The Site Development Templates also ensure that development carry out habitat and species surveys and retain important ecological assets and for development to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					Comments from Stagecoach	<p>Stagecoach has raised concerns in relation to the site selection process. Specific concerns included:</p> <p>The A338 between Grove Green and East Hanney is anticipated to benefit from 8 buses/hour by the end of plan period, and 6 buses/hour at peak times, this is a reasonable assumption within the period to 2026</p> <p>It is suggested that best case scenario for the corridor along the proposed North West Grove Link Road would be 3 buses/hour at peak times</p> <p>Omission of site to the East of the A338 at Grove, and certain options at East Hanney is a concern and they are considered sustainable options that have been ruled out of the Plan</p> <p>Submission Plan is not legally compliant and is unsound on basis that it is not robustly and appropriately justified</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Site Development Templates to support the proposed site allocations in the Part 2 plan ensure that contributions are provided towards future enhancements to existing bus services in the area.</p>
741313 1144620	House Builders Federation	Radley College	1145366 1144619	Mr Craig Pettit Mr Mark Behrendt	Barton Willmore		General	<p>There are two general comments regarding site selection. One comment explains the process in which the sites are selected, including releasing land from the green belt in accordance with para 83 of the NPPF. The other comment is from the House Builders Federation which state they do not comment on the individual merit of the sites proposed within the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>This evidence included an assessment of how any potential development sites located within the Oxford Green Belt contributed to the purposes of the Green Belt. Taking this evidence into account and undertaking site specific assessments of all available sites, including beyond the Green Belt, the Council has concluded that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing from the Green Belt on additional parcel of land at Dalton Barracks. The change to the Green Belt at Dalton Barracks has been informed by a detailed Green Belt Study of the site and its surroundings.</p>
1144185 1145537	Mr Yoshi Nishio Ms Clare Arnold	Ashbury Parish Council				No	HELAA - Ashbury	<p>There are two comments which raises concerns over the sites tested within Ashbury. They state:</p> <p>ASHB01 has been tested for 127 dwellings which is a 50% increase of the current number of dwellings in the entire parish</p> <p>This would be in contradiction of what is deemed as appropriate for a small village as classified within Core Policy 3</p>	<p>The HELAA forms the initial step in assessing sites for possible allocation within the Local Plan. It does not in itself identify sites for allocation, but instead provides an initial and high level assessment of the suitability of sites for more detailed testing only. The Councils approach to site selection is set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper. The approach to preparing the HELAA includes land adjoining settlements and so considers sites that have been promoted and sites that have not been promoted for development.</p>
1073314	Ms Kim Dandridge						HELAA - Childrey	<p>One comment objects to the building of a large number of new dwellings (HELAA reference CREY01, CREY02, CREY03) due to:</p>	<p>The Council has considered the comments received in relation to the HELAA.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>the increase in volume of road traffic and negative potential impact of road traffic on pedestrian safety</p> <p>the negative impact on the AONB</p> <p>the negative impact on the adjacent Childrey Conservation Area</p> <p>the potential adverse impact to the setting of the village and it's listed buildings</p> <p>The comment suggests that the only development worth consideration is that area to the south of West Street, but consideration to additional traffic past the school needs to be acknowledged in terms of safety.</p>	<p>The HELAA is a technical evidence base document that informs the local plan. It is a high-level audit of developable land across the district and preliminary assessment which helps us to consider the possible options in relation to meeting future needs for housing development. It has been prepared in accordance with National Guidance. National Guidance requires an assessment of sites in the district where they have been submitted to the Council through a call for sites process and which are capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings.</p> <p>The sites suitable for consideration should not be taken to imply that the Council will allocate them for housing development, nor that they would be approved if submitted as a planning application. This is further detailed in the main HELAA report and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The Council has revised these documents to provide further explanation in response to these comments.</p>
1143993	Mr Marc Rawcliffe					No	HELAA - Error	<p>There are a number of issues regarding errors within the HELAA. These include:</p> <p>SUCT06 is stated as not being promoted for development, when it has been.</p> <p>SUCT07 is noted as being within 13m of the proposed Kelart's Field Ecology site and it is not.</p> <p>SUCT08 is states as not being promoted for development, when it has been. It is also notes as being within 133m of the proposed Kelart's Field Ecology site and it is not.</p> <p>Site known as Matthews Nursery, to the east of Harlow Road has not been considered when it has been promoted for development. The site is available and deliverable and should have been considered.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council has considered and assessed the land in question, referred to as South-East of Sutton Courtenay as part of this site selection process. The Council's approach, including an assessment of this site can be found in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>A list of corrections has been prepared to accompany the HELAA to clarify where any corrections are needed. This will also be addressed in a future iteration of the HELAA document. This reflects land promoted through planning applications e.g. P16/V0646/O.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the evidence and consider that the data provided for SUTC07 and SUTC08 is accurate in relation to its proximity to the proposed Kelart's Field Ecology site.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1142381 1143289	Ms Lynn Mander	Lagan Homes Limited	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No	HELAA - General	<p>There are two responses that make general comments relating to the HELAA. These include:</p> <p>Including the Land east of the A338 in any future review of the HELAA</p> <p>It is concerning, that although sites have not been promoted, the Council are still testing the land for suitability. Development is not wanted on the rural fields of Faringdon as it will destroy the rural town.</p>	The HELAA forms the initial step in assessing sites for possible allocation within the Local Plan. It does not in itself identify sites for allocation, but instead provides an initial and high level assessment of the suitability of sites for more detailed testing only. The Councils approach to site selection is set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper. The approach to preparing the HELAA includes land adjoining settlements and so considers sites that have been promoted and sites that have not been promoted for development.
1143359	Dr John Guy Morgan					Yes	HELAA - Kingston Bagpuize	<p>HELAA References KBAG01, 11,12 and 13 should be regarded as undesirable due to the following reasons:</p> <p>It would result in the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land in the open countryside</p> <p>Housing placed on these sites would be distant from facilities in village centre</p> <p>Additional housing would overload the existing primary school</p> <p>Additional capacity would be needed at nearby secondary schools</p> <p>The medical centre at Faringdon is already stretched to point of collapse</p> <p>The existing sewage work is at capacity</p> <p>The additional traffic movements onto and off the A420 would raise safety issues at the badly designed junction adjacent to KBAG 11 and 12</p>	<p>The Council have undertaken extensive testing in regards to selecting sites for allocation within the Local Plan. The Council is satisfied that KBAG0 1 is a suitable and sustainable site and are therefore proposing to allocate the site within the Local Plan part 2. Appropriate infrastructure will be provided as set out within Appendix A of the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>KBAG11,12 and 13 have also been tested through the site selection process, however have not been proposed for allocation for a number of reasons. These reasons are set out within the site selection topic paper.</p>
849982	Mr Vijay Srao					No	HELAA - Typographical error	<p>There are inaccuracies within the proforma for WOO29 within the HELAA in regards to the location of Broom Hill Copse and Blagrove Copse:</p> <p>Appendix 58: Wootton and on page 26 WOOT29 is INCORRECTLY stated as lying adjacent to the Ancient Woodland of Broom Hill Copse. Broom Hill Copse is actually located on of Lincombe Lane. WOOT29 is not adjacent to the part of Blagrove Copse which is Ancient Woodland</p> <p>The triangle of land in Blagrove Copse which is NOT Ancient Woodland is located next to WOOT29.</p>	<p>The Council has reviewed the evidence and consider that the data provided for WOOT29 needs updating. The Council recognises that the majority of the ancient woodland is not adjacent to the site, however it does share part of the boundary with this woodland.</p> <p>A list of corrections has been prepared to accompany the HELAA to clarify where any corrections are needed. This will also be addressed in a future iteration of the HELAA document. This includes deleting the reference to Broom Hill Copse.</p>
849982	Mr Vijay Srao					No	HELAA – Wootton	The comment states that WOOT29 is not located adjacent to the Ancient Woodland of Broom Hill Copse, as stated in the HELAA appendices.	
1073307	Mr David Owen-Smith						HELAA – Uffington	There is an error in the HELAA with regards to the allocation of a site between the Parishes of Baulking and Uffington; the Uffington Trading Estate (HELAA reference UFF113) is in Baulking Parish.	Noted.
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning		Housing White Paper - Green Belt Testing	One comment highlights the new test within the Housing White Paper when proposing to allocate sites within the green belt. The Council have selected 5 non-green belt sites without assessing them as reasonable alternatives to the sites within the green belt. The Council are rejecting sites within the green	The Council consider that they have tested all reasonable alternative sites irrespective of whether they are located within the Green Belt or not and have conducted a Green Belt review of all potential Green Belt sites to consider how they contribute to Green Belt purposes.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								belt against sites not in the green belt as reasonable alternatives. This fails the Housing White Paper.	The Housing White paper states that: "Therefore we propose to amend national policy to make clear that authorities should amend Green Belt boundaries only when they can demonstrate that they have examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting their identified development requirements". The Council is only proposing to make one change to the Green Belt, which is a predominantly Brownfield site that would lead to minimal impact on the Green Belt. The Council has identified an appropriate strategy having considered all options. Selecting sites that are predominantly outside the Green Belt is considered to be consistent with the Housing White Paper.
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd					Inconsistency within Evidence	There are a number of comments which highlight the inconsistency with evidence. There comments include: There is inconsistency within the testing of sites being proposed as allocations and those that have not. For example, the reasoning to remove a site as a potential allocation is not upheld for those that are being proposed for allocation. There is inconsistency in delivering strategic infrastructure improvements. Land is not safeguarded and there has been little work completed to assess the deliverability or viability for the Grove Northern Link road or the link road between A420 and A415 The Site Selection Topic Paper states that no detailed feasibility work has been undertaken on how the West Wantage Link road will be delivered despite the land being safeguarded in LPP1 and detailed design and costing work being submitted to the council by a developer.	The Council have conducted a detailed, robust site selection process that concluded the sites proposed are suitable and deliverable. The methodology is stated within the Site Selection Topic Paper and was used consistently when testing each site. The Council are working with developers and the County Council to ensure appropriate strategic infrastructure is delivered. The Grove Northern Link Road will be planned through detailed master planning with the three strategic sites. There is no identified need to deliver the West Wantage Link Road during the plan period. However, delivery of strategic highway infrastructure is a matter for the Highways Authority for which the District Council seek to support. This matter may be considered in a future update to the Local Transport Plan and this can in turn, inform a future iteration of the Local Plan if required.
758199	John Richards	Dandara Ltd					Infrastructure delivery	There are a number of proposed allocations within LPP2 that will not benefit from key services required to support the level of growth being proposed. An example includes the primary school in Marcham. It is currently being expanded but that will only accommodate the existing need and not the future growth planned. The secondary school near Kingston Bagpuize does not have the capacity to expand to support the planned growth, and the proposed allocation does not enable a new school to be built. Despite the constraints, the allocation is coloured green in the site selection topic paper appendix B. LPP2 is unsound as it does not state how local infrastructure constraints can be overcome to allow the proposed allocations to be sustainable.	The Council are working with Key stakeholders to ensure the timely delivery of key infrastructure to support the proposed site allocations. The Council are working with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure education provision is provided for development at Marcham and Kingston Bagpuize. Infrastructure required is set out within Appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. Kingston Bagpuize falls within the secondary school catchment of Faringdon, Botley and Abingdon, for which there is sufficient capacity to cater for the proposed growth. A new Secondary School will be provided at Dalton Barracks to provide further capacity for this catchment in the longer term.
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council					Oxfordshire County Council - Site	OCC have not reviewed the topic papers in detail, however it is noted that in some cases the sites has been assessed positively although they are not proposed allocations. This does not restrict comments	Noted

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
							Selection Topic Paper	from OCC in future should sites be proposed for allocation or have planning applications.	
1095180	Mr Mark Baker					No	Reliability of Evidence	<p>There is one comment which raises concern over the reliability of the evidence. They believe that:</p> <p>The evidence base is flawed and biased.</p> <p>The reliability and accuracy of the traffic studies are questionable.</p> <p>The District Council staff have worked with consultants to show that the Fyfield site is a front runner rather than to establish whether it should be a candidate in the first place.</p>	<p>The Council has produced an extensive evidence base to support Local Plan 2031 Part 2. The Council considers that this evidence is robust, fit for purpose and proportionate. The approach is consistent with the approach taken to support the submission and adoption of the Local Plan Part 1.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken extensive testing to identify the sites to be included within Local Plan 2031 Part 2. The Council tested all sites in accordance with the methodology as set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper. The process is consistent when testing all sites.</p>
1095989	Mr and Mr J and W Duffield and Cumber	Mr J Duffield and W Cumber and Son (Theale) Limited	1142270	Mr Jon Alsop	Savills	No	Removal of Site proposed	<p>There is one comment which states the plan is not justified due to the lack of robust and credible proportionate evidence to support the omission of the previously proposed allocation of land to the North East of Marcham. There has been a lack of evidence to support the removal of the site on air quality grounds as stated in a Scrutiny Cabinet report. The site is close to the centre on Marcham, with access to schools and public transport. Sites close to the removed site have planning permission and therefore relates well to the existing and future built up edge of Marcham. The developers and land owners are working together to bring the site forward for development. This includes producing their own appraisals of traffic generation and air quality impacts and looking into the options of contributing to the educational needs of the settlement.</p> <p>It is understood that 400 dwellings may not be appropriate for the site, however the site should not be ruled out for any development</p>	<p>The decision to remove the site North East of Marcham site was a result of a number of reasons. The Council received a high number of objections towards the inclusion of this site within the Local Plan including a response from Oxfordshire County Council and Highways England. It is noted that both of these key stakeholders have revised their opposition for this aspect of the plan.</p>
1096815 1142784	Mr Brian Cooper	CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning	No	Site Allocation Process Parts 1 and 2	<p>One comment suggests that it would be more sustainable to allocate more new sites to expand existing market towns such as Abingdon</p> <p>One comment suggests that differences of opinion between developers and land owners should be resolved in order that the Council can concentrate on delivering large sites since relying on smaller developments in rural villages places too much strain on resources and communities.</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by detailed technical evidence and informal engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council is required to make provision for sufficient housing to meet the identified needs of the district and to contribute to the unmet housing need of Oxford City within the plan period up to 2031. The Council has undertaken a comprehensive approach to site selection, including the consideration of alternatives. It is important the plan makes provision for a range of sites of different size, type and geography to assist in providing appropriate choice, meeting different housing needs, and giving consideration to housing delivery. The provision of smaller site allocations within the plan is also important and necessary to ensure housing is delivered throughout the plan period.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1143288	Mr and Mrs Kauert		872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No	Site Selection - Alternative site at East Hanney	One objection was received in relation to the site selection process in particular assessment of an alternative site at East Hanney and the update to the windfall figures.	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and is consistent with the approach followed to inform the adopted Part 1 plan and with national guidance.
902666	University of Oxford		1097195	Mr Mark Owen	Barton Willmore	No	Site Selection - Alternative Sites at Botley and University of Oxford	One comment raised a concern for the role of smaller scale proposals on suitable and deliverable site and that they have been discounted for inclusion with the Part 2 plan, which can assist in meeting the Vale's proportion of Oxford City's unmet housing need.	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman	Bovis Homes Limited				Yes	Site Selection - East Challow	<p>One comment was received that suggested the Plan is not positively prepared or justified. Specific concerns included:</p> <p>Plan's approach to the apportionment of housing need, including Oxford City's unmet need in an incremental way does not fully represent the issues delivery issue associated with the large number of site allocated in the South-East Vale should have been examined at the time of the Part 1 plan and would provide the appropriate forum for examining appropriateness of the sub-area boundaries</p> <p>20% buffer necessary across the additional housing number in the Part 2 plan to ensure realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply, pertinent given historic under-delivery within the district</p> <p>Greater certainty on ability to deliver 1,200 dwellings at Dalton Barracks by 2031 should be demonstrated or a readjustment of the trajectory for this site and allocation of additional, deliverable sites</p> <p>Parts of the Western Vale Sub-Area should be recognised as capable of providing additional housing, e.g. East Challow which is a sustainable settlement excluded from the arbitrary boundaries</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Sub-Area Boundaries were found to be soundly based through Examination into the Part 1 plan. The Council considers that the Part 2 plan is fully consistent with the Part 1 plan, including the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>The Council are seeking to ensure that the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford, to be addressed within the Vale, is met within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and that at least 2,200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford. The Council does not consider that the Western Vale Sub-Area is sufficiently close or accessible to Oxford to be a suitable location for housing to meet the Oxford need. This approach, and the sites proposed as allocations within the Part 2 plan, are all considered to be fully consistent with both the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>Having updated the completions and commitment figures for inclusion in the Submission Part 2 plan, the housing requirement for the Western Vale Sub-Area is fully met, without the need for any further allocations within the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>Core Policy 20 was found to be soundly based at Examination for the Part 1 plan, which also makes provision for the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, to ensure the policy and plan provides flexibility.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the proposed allocation is deliverable within the plan period and has provided further evidence from DIO to demonstrate this.</p> <p>The matter of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale is discussed elsewhere. The Oxfordshire SHMA has been scrutinised at Local Plan Examination for Vale, Cherwell and West Oxfordshire and the proposed apportionment of</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									unmet need has been agreed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board.
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS					Site Selection - Land at Hobbyhorse Lane	Agent on behalf of client's site at Hobbyhorse Lane; can support Vale's growth strategy for housing supply.	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
1144552	Merton College		1144555	Mr Davies		No	Site Selection - Merton College	Agent on behalf of client's site - Merton College; can support delivery of Plan.	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
741313		Radley College	1145366	Mr Craig Pettit	Barton Willmore		Site Selection - Radley College	One comment suggested that a number of sustainable and deliverable sites within proximity to Oxford have been discounted from the Plan.	The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence and engagement with key stakeholders. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning		Site Selection and Capacity	The Publication version and supporting papers show no explanation as to the list of sites stated in Core Policy 4a and the capacity of these sites. The comment then continues by quoting para 2.44 of the Local Plan	The Council have undertaken detailed testing of sites to find the most suitable and sustainable sites for allocation within the Local Plan. The process is set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper detailing the Council conclusions upon the sites proposed for allocation. The capacity of the sites have been considered against the constraints of the site and Local Plan 2031 Part 1 policies. These are subject to master planning to ensure the development is sustainable and in accordance with Local and National Policies.
879508 1096069	Ms Jones	Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd Redcliffe Homes Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning	No	Site Selection Process	<p>One general comment was received in relation to the site selection process/methodology. Specific comment raised the following concerns:</p> <p>Plan is not positively prepared as it is based on a strategy where the needs of the Housing Market Area have not been met</p> <p>Plan is not justified as it is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives and site selection is arbitrary</p> <p>Plan is not effective as it will not deliver sufficient housing over the plan period</p> <p>Plan is not consistent with national policy as the plan does not realistically reflect content of NPPF or the Housing White Paper</p> <p>One comment promoted an alternative site at East Hendred for inclusion in the Part 2 plan. Key comments included:</p> <p>Land at East Hendred has not been subject of any detailed assessment under Stage 3 due to impact on AONB which has been unassessed</p> <p>Allocation of land at East Hendred would be part of a more appropriate and reasonable alternative strategy to the proposed allocation at Harwell Campus</p>	<p>The Council has followed a comprehensive approach to site selection informed by technical evidence, including Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and engagement with key stakeholders and has considered reasonable alternatives. The Council's approach to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council is seeking to ensure that the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford, to be addressed within the Vale, is met within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and that at least 2,200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford.</p> <p>Although the Council are proposing two additional site allocations within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, these are for site specific reasons. One of the two sites (North West Grove) is not expected to deliver until later in the plan period.</p> <p>Overall, the Council is content that the proposed supply set out in the Part 1 and Part 2 plans are deliverable and is consistent with national policy. However, the plan already provides flexibility within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, in the event that some sites deliver more slowly, as provided by Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring Fence. This approach was</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Land has not been considered in the Site Selection Topic Paper or the Landscape Capacity Study or the Sustainability Appraisal Land is a more suitable location for housing as it is not in the Green Belt, does not amount to major development in the AONB and would focus sustainable growth on a site that relates well to Oxford and the Science Vale area	found to be soundly based through the Part 1 plan examination.
1022426 1100261		ptarmigan Land Ltd Catesby Property Group	1022427 1096086	Mr Robin Shepherd Taylor Cherrett	Barton Willmore Turley	Yes	Support	There are two comments which supports the conclusions within the Site Selection Topic Papers. This includes the testing of sites surrounding Harwell Campus and the proposed allocation at South East of Marcham	The Council acknowledge the support.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1095954	Prof J.H. Cobb					No	Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	One comment discusses the merits of Core Policy 45: Green Infrastructure and alludes to Core Policy 46: Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity. In particular it is stated: 1. To recognise that building on a green-field site is not sustainable; 2. To recognise that it is not sustainable to site urban developments in rural areas to the detriment of the local communities; 3. To recognise that it is not sustainable to create isolated commuter dormitories distant from places of employment; 4. To recognise the negative environmental impacts that such dormitory settlements would have, including an unnecessary increase in greenhouse gas emissions, and 5. To remove the Fyfield site from the list of LPP2 allocations.	Core Policies 45 and 46 form part of the adopted Part 1 plan that have been found to be soundly based and subject to scrutiny at Examination. The Council considers that GI and Biodiversity is adequately planned for through existing policies and the Development Site Template requirements. It is not thought the comments made relate to the HRA process.
1096948	Haidrun Breith	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust				No	HRA - BBO Wildlife Trust	<p>Comments have been received by Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) in relation to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>BBOWT raise concern about the potential indirect and cumulative effects on Cothill Fen SAC as a result of growth in the district, and in particular at Dalton Barracks. They note that they are guided by Natural England's response on this particular matter.</p> <p>BBOWT welcome the HRA recognition that the SANG proposed at Dalton Barracks must also be of a nature that is likely to attract visitors to utilise it rather than the nearby SAC.</p> <p>BBOWT raise concern that the planned growth will result in a recreational impact on nature reserves in the vicinity of Dalton Barracks, including a number which are currently managed by them.</p>	<p>Comments from BBOWT are noted. The Council would like to respond as follows:</p> <p>The Council recognises the concerns raised by BBOWT. The HRA has been updated to add clarity in relation to the hydrological studies undertaken to date which demonstrate that it is unlikely that flows would impact the catchment of the SAC and nearby SSSIs. Work to date indicates that there will not be harmful impacts in air quality, however additional work is also being undertaken, at an Oxfordshire level, to consider traffic flows and cumulative impacts - this is an ongoing process. The HRA has been updated to reflect this ongoing work and is addressed within a Statement of Common Ground with Natural England.</p> <p>The Council welcome the support for particular sections of the HRA.</p> <p>The HRA does not consider in detail the impact on the other nature reserves around Dalton Barracks, including SSSIs, although the HRA has been updated to include reference to these designated sites and what, if any, impacts may result from the proposed development. However, the Council recognise the issues raised. Mitigation measures are set out in the Site Development Template for Dalton Barracks (Appendix A of Local Plan 2031 Part 2). In addition to this, the Council will engage with BBOWT as part of work informing the Dalton Barracks Comprehensive Development Framework to discuss this matter further and identify opportunities to address this through the emerging SPD.</p>
1022361	Ms Rebecca Micklem	Natural England					HRA - Natural England	Comments have been received by Natural England in relation to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). These are summarised as follows:	<p>Comments from Natural England are noted. The Council would like to respond as follows:</p> <p>The Council recognises the concerns raised by Natural England. Additional work is being undertaken</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								<p>Concerns are raised in relation to Air Quality and Hydrology at Cothill Fen SAC. Natural England suggest that additional modelling should be undertaken to determine whether there will be an increase in traffic flows by more than 1000AADT on the smaller roads around this site. Natural England also note the reference to Hydrology studies within the HRA, which demonstrate that it is unlikely that surface or shallow sub-surface flows from the development footprint would occur into the catchment of the SAC and nearby SSSIs. Natural England would like to see these studies presented in the HRA in order to support the conclusions.</p> <p>Natural England highlight the recent engagement with the Oxfordshire authorities to find an appropriate approach to in-combination assessments of air quality at Oxford Meadows SAC in their Local Plans. Natural England note that work for this is ongoing to determine if there is a likely significant effect from the in-combination effects of planned growth across the County on Oxford Meadows SAC, and how this can be mitigated. Natural England note that it cannot currently be assumed that the current plan level measures will be sufficient to mitigate the impact.</p> <p>Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) raise concern about the potential indirect and cumulative effects on Cothill Fen SAC as a result of growth in the district, and in particular with Dalton Barracks.</p>	<p>on traffic flows on the smaller roads surrounding Cothill Fen SAC. The HRA has been updated to add clarity in relation to the hydrological studies undertaken to date which demonstrate that it is unlikely that flows would impact the catchment of the SAC and nearby SSSIs.</p> <p>The Council recognise the potential for in-combination effects on Oxford Meadows SAC as a result of cumulative growth across Oxfordshire. Local Plan 2031 Part 1 set out a number of measures which sought to ensure that any potential effects could be mitigated, subject to more detailed work on this matter. The Council has worked with Natural England and Cherwell District Council to assess this potential impact in more detail. The HRA has been updated to reflect the most recent position in relation to this.</p> <p>These matters have been addressed in further detail through the Statement of Common Ground between Vale of White Horse District Council and Natural England and the Statement of Common Ground with Cherwell District Council also.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096915	Mr and Mrs Kauert	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No	SA - Ab/Ox – EHAN	<p>A number of comments have been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) where it relates to development in East Hanney. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>The SA is deficient for its failure to consider reasonable alternatives and should consider a new site not previously tested at East Hanney.</p> <p>A couple of sites at East Hanney has not been considered in detail through the SA as they are unable to deliver more than 50. This approach is not considered to be justified.</p> <p>The SA is deficient in its assessment of landscape for the proposed allocation North East of East Hanney, and has little regard to the strengthening of the northern and eastern boundaries.</p> <p>The SA has discounted the site "East of East Hanney" principally on landscape grounds. This is contrary to the findings of the inspectors report on the planning appeal for this site. Stagecoach are also supportive of the East of East Hanney site.</p>	<p>The reasons for arriving at the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives are presented within Chapter 6 ("Establishing the reasonable alternatives") of the SA Report. Sections 6.4 explains that account was taken of the Council's site selection process, when determining which 'smaller site options'. Section 6.5 (in particular Para 6.5.9) explains which small sites should be a 'constant' and which should be a 'variable' across the reasonable alternatives. The Councils justification for applying a threshold of 50 dwellings is set out in paragraph 3.11 of the Site Selection Topic Paper 2.</p> <p>The appraisal of landscape matters through the SA has been consistent, having regard to the outcomes of the Landscape Capacity Study and subsequent Addendum which represent the most up to date evidence. These specifically relate to the capacity of each site to accommodate development. The Site Development Templates (Appendix A of Local Plan 2031 Part 2) identified specific landscape mitigation measures where required for the sites proposed to be allocated.</p>
1143288			872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No			
1143289		Lagan Homes Limited	872479	Mr Paul Slater	Edgars Limited	No			
1096915		Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No			
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council	1096331	Mr Simon Handy	Strutt & Parker LLP	No	SA - Ab/Ox - KBAG	<p>A number of comments have been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) where it relates to development at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>Comments from the site promoter of land to the south of Spring Hill disagree with the outcomes of the SA when compared with the proposed allocation to the east of the village. These relate to ecology, proximity to services, and transport.</p> <p>Comments from Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council which consider that the SA ignores the impact of development on the nearby settlement of Fyfield village and its conservation area, including unsubstantiated claims that the site will deliver a new school and road improvements in the area.</p> <p>The SA has not given proper consideration of the impact of development on the setting of Kingston Bagpuize House and its associated conservation area.</p> <p>Development of the proposed allocation will have negative impacts on a number of Sustainability Objectives, including Objective 4 (improve the health and well-being of Vale residents), Objective 7 (Improve and protect the natural environment) and Objective 8 (to protect cultural heritage and enhance archaeological and heritage access). The Sustainability Objections as a whole have therefore</p>	<p>The SA has been prepared based on the most up to date evidence available, and consultation responses received. The Council has worked with Historic England, Natural England, Highways England, Oxfordshire County Council and other key stakeholders to ensure that constraints to development have been appropriately identified and assessed through the SA.</p> <p>Sites are required to be delivered in accordance with their respective development templates as set out in Appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. For the proposed site to the east of Kingston Bagpuize, these include the provision of a new primary school on site as well as a link road between the A415 and A420.</p> <p>The Council has had regard to the outcomes of the SA before recommending which sites are to be allocated to meet the specific requirements of Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p>
1096329	Blanchard Enterprises	No							
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No			
1097660	Mr Tim Dougall	No							

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								not been considered in a balanced manner. The Council have favoured certain Objectives over others.	
879508		Arnold White Estates (AWE) Ltd	879505	Mr Geoff Gardner	Gardner Planning		SA - Ab/Ox - RADL	A comment has been made in relation to the SA by the site promoter for land to the south of Radley. It states that the SA has not appropriately considered sites within the Green Belt as the report only introduces Green Belt as a landscape criterion under Objective 8. This is erroneous as the Green Belt serves quite a different purpose.	The Site Selection Topic Paper 2 and SA have considered in detail a range of alternative sites in the Green Belt. The SA has tested a number of site options, including one which seeks to allocate additional sites within the Green Belt. The Council consider that the approach taken to site selection, including through the SA, is robust.
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No	SA - Ab/Ox - STEV	A comment has been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) where it relates to the settlement of Steventon. The comment from site promoters for land in Steventon note the issue relating to school provision identified in the SA report. It notes that additional development in the village can assist with this issue, in addition to providing a number of other benefits including pedestrian/cycle improvements, the provision of extra care housing and enabling facilities such as a 'walking bus' to benefit existing pupils.	The Council has noted the comments made with respect to the issue of education provision in Steventon, which is appropriately addressed through the SA report.
1022473		Rosconn Group	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning		SA - Ab/Ox - WOOT	A number of comments have been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) where it relates to the settlement of Wootton. These are summarised as follows: Land at Pages Farm, Wootton was scoped out of the final Sustainability Appraisal as the Interim SA concluded that greenfield, Green Belt sites should be sieved out in favour of Dalton Barracks, a brownfield Green Belt site. Additional sites need to be allocated in this sub area to reflect a more realistic delivery trajectory for Dalton Barracks, and the land at Pages Farm would make a positive contribution to this. A site in Wootton (HELAA Ref: WOOT21) has not been considered in detail through the SA as it is unable to deliver more than 50. This approach is not considered to be justified and the site should be considered further for allocation within Local Plan 2031 Part 2. The SA should have considered the implications of not having Dalton Barracks in the Plan (i.e. it should not be a constant) Option 3 of the SA identifies that the allocation of 150 dwellings at Wootton represents the best option in terms of 'homes' and 'movement'. Land to the west of Lashford Lane, Wootton, should be considered further.	The reasons for including only certain sites as variables across the reasonable alternatives are presented within Chapter 6 ("Establishing the reasonable alternatives") of the SA Report. South of Wootton is included as a variable, across the reasonable alternatives and was not 'scoped out' of the report. The Council considers that the sites proposed to be allocated in Local Plan 2031 Part 2 are most appropriate to deliver the specific requirements of the plan. The reasons for arriving at the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives are presented within Chapter 6 ("Establishing the reasonable alternatives") of the SA Report. Sections 6.4 explains that account was taken of the Council's site selection process, when determining which 'smaller site options' to include as a 'variable' across the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives. The Councils justification for applying a threshold of 50 dwellings is set out in paragraph 3.11 of the Site Selection Topic Paper 2. The reasons for including Dalton Barracks as a 'constant' across the reasonable alternatives are explained across Chapter 6 ("Establishing the reasonable alternatives") of the SA Report. Sections 6.3 (plus the associated appendix) and 6.5 (in particular, Paragraphs 6.5.3 to 6.5.7) explain how some large sites should be a 'constant' and which should be a 'variable' across the reasonable alternatives.
1143092	Mrs Sian Keeling	David Wilson Homes Ltd (Southern)	1143090	Mrs Sophie Horsley	Strutt & Parker	No			
1145100	Vortal Properties	Vortal Properties	724654	Mr Douglas Bond	Woolf Bond Planning	No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									A reference is made to Option 3 of the SA, which relates to the Interim SA Findings (March 2017) and has been superseded by the SA Report (September 2017).
826174	Mr Daniel Scharf					No	SA - Climate change	<p>A small number of comments have been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) where it relates to the impact of climate change. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>The SA does nothing to mitigate against the effects of climate change.</p> <p>The reliance on the Core Policies in Local Plan 2031 Part 1 is flawed as the relevant policies are about generation and adaptation, not mitigation.</p>	The Council notes the comments on the SA where they relate to climate change and mitigation. The Council considers that climate change mitigation and adaptation are given appropriate consideration within the SA report. For example, the SA Framework includes two objectives relating to climate change addressing both adaptation and mitigation.
874560	Ms Helen Marshall	Campaign to Protect Rural England				No	SA - CPRE	<p>A small number of comments have been received from CPRE in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>The SA does not comply with SEA regulations in that it does not predict the actual likely effects on the environment (Regulation 12(3) and Schedule 2), and in particular for landscape quality or character, dark skies and light pollution, loss of tranquillity, loss of species or habitats; historic landscape and character, loss or harm to heritage assets and their settings; loss of archaeological sites and the implications for local resources to access and curate resultant materials. These factors are both predictable and capable of being monitored to a reasonable degree.</p> <p>The SA has not considered the cumulative effects of Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and Part 2 allocations, as well as other plans in the region. Particular reference is made to in-combination impacts on the North Wessex Downs AONB, where major developments have been approved in Berkshire and Wiltshire. The SA should include 'an estimate of the overarching cumulative impact of proposed site allocations on the AONB objectives, and taking account of developments in adjacent areas, such as the wider Didcot area.'</p>	<p>The SA framework is presented within Chapter 4 ('What's the scope of the SA'). Messages from the context review are presented within Appendix II of the SA Report. The Scope of the SA was subject to formal consultation with Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency, to ensure that the Sustainability Objectives were appropriate for Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p> <p>The SA scope was updated in 2017 by splitting objective 8, which deals with "heritage and landscape" in order to give standalone consideration to both heritage and landscape. This reflected understanding of the emerging plan, and the relevant sensitivities/issues.</p> <p>The SA has had regard to all of the issues/objectives identified by CPRE when developing and appraising alternatives, in addition to appraising the plan as a whole</p> <p>Paragraph 11.1.6 of the SA report deals with the matter of cumulative effects on the AONB.</p>
928815	Patrick Blake	Highways England					SA - Highways England	A general comment has been received from Highways England in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The comment notes the outputs of the Evaluation of Transport Impacts assessment which has informed Local Plan 2031 Part 2, and that measures to mitigate the impact of transport on the strategic road network are set out in the Development Templates contained in Appendix A of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2. Highways England note that the SA states that 'all sites are broadly supported from a transport perspective'.	The Council has noted the comments made by Highways England in relation to the SA.
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No	SA - Interim Report	A small number of comments has been received in relation to the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (ISA), which was published alongside the Preferred Options Consultation (March 2017).	The Publication Version of Local Plan 2031 Part 2 is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA - October 2017) and is justified on the basis of the consideration of reasonable alternatives presented within Part 1

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								The comments raise the question as to how the Council reached its conclusion that Option 4 within the ISA represents the most sustainable solution when it scored the lowest for access to services and facilities and for pollution.	("What has plan-making / SA involved up to this point?") of the SA Report.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	SA - Objectives	A comment has been received in relation to SA Objective 5 of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The comment supports this objective but would like see it expanded beyond educational achievement and skills levels, namely to "address the aspects of endeavouring the individuals to flourish, and start to break the cycle of low expectations".	The Council have noted the comment and welcome the support in principle for this particular objective of the SA.
879120 1096701	Gow Family	WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning		SA - Reasonable Alternative SA - Reasonable Alternative	<p>A small number of comments have been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the approach take to determining reasonable alternatives. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>The SA should have considered the implications of not having Dalton Barracks in the Plan (i.e. it should not be a constant)</p> <p>Sites have not been considered in detail through the SA where they are unable to deliver more than 50 dwellings. This approach is not considered to be justified, and recommend that smaller sites should be considered in more detail.</p> <p>The plan fails to consider a more dispersed strategy for development as a reasonable alternative.</p>	<p>The reasons for including Dalton Barracks as a 'constant' across the reasonable alternatives are explained across Chapter 6 ("Establishing the reasonable alternatives") of the SA Report, with a key concluding statement made at para 6.5.4.</p> <p>The reasons for arriving at the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives are presented within Chapter 6 ("Establishing the reasonable alternatives") of the SA Report. Sections 6.4 explains that account was taken of the Council's site selection process, when determining which 'smaller site options' to include as a 'variable' across the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives. The Councils justification for applying a threshold of 50 dwellings is set out in paragraph 3.11 of the Site Selection Topic Paper 2.</p> <p>Local Plan 2031 Part 1 was taken into account when arriving at the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives for Local Plan 2031 Part 2. Chapter 6 of the SA presents "outline reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with".</p>
1096069	Ms Jones	Redcliffe Homes Ltd				No	SA - SouthEast - EHEN	<p>A small number of comments have been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) regarding development in the AONB at East Hendred. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>The SA has ruled out the HELAA site EHEN01 at too early a stage, on the basis on unknown assumptions and little or no evidence. The site would not constitute major development in the AONB and should be considered as a reasonable alternative to Harwell Campus.</p> <p>The same site has not been considered in detail through the SA as it is unable to deliver more than 50. This approach is not considered to be justified and the site should be considered further for allocation within Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p>	<p>In accordance with the Regulations, Chapter 6 ("Establishing the reasonable alternatives") of the SA presents "an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with." A 'staged' approach to examining site options was undertaken, with a view to identifying a shortlist of site options that should be a 'variable' across the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives. The Council considers that development of this greenfield site would constitute major development within the AONB and was therefore discounted at Stage 3 of the site selection process, prior to detailed testing, including SA.</p> <p>The site is currently being promoted for around 35 dwellings. Sections 6.4 of the SA explains that account was taken of the Council's site selection process, when determining which 'smaller site options' to include as a 'variable' across the reasonable spatial</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>strategy alternatives. The Councils justification for applying a threshold of 50 dwellings is set out in paragraph 3.11 of the Site Selection Topic Paper 2.</p> <p>The Council consider that the site would not deliver a scheme comparable to the live-work style campus which will meet the particular needs of the Campus, including a tailored mix of housing.</p>
1097646	Ian Hepburn	North Wessex Downs AONB				No	SA - SouthEast - Harwell Campus	<p>A small number of comments have been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) regarding development in the AONB at Harwell Campus. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>The SA has not considered the cumulative effects of Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and Part 2 allocations, as well as other plans in the region. The SA should include 'an estimate of the overarching cumulative impact of proposed site allocations on the AONB objectives, and taking account of developments in adjacent areas, such as the wider Didcot area.'</p> <p>Site promoters for the land south of Harwell Campus has not been considered as a reasonable alternative to the proposed allocation at Harwell Campus and should be subject to detailed testing.</p>	<p>Paragraph 11.1.6 of the SA report deals with the matter of cumulative effects on the AONB. This analysis was supplementary to the analysis presented within the earlier (March 2017) Interim SA Report, reflected concerns raised through consultation responses.</p> <p>The Council does not consider the land to the South of Harwell Campus to be a site option for the purposes of detailed testing, including through the SA. The Council's justification for this is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p>
1097815		Gallagher Estates and The Crown Estate	1097816	Hannah Bowler	Turley				
1022346	Mrs Victoria Trotman	Bovis Homes Limited					SA - Spatial Strategy	<p>A small number of comments have been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which propose a different strategy to those which were already tested. This is summarised as follows:</p> <p>The Local Plan 2031 Part 2 should increase its unmet housing need figure by at least 7,000, and provide a 20% buffer to ensure a realistic prospect of achieving a supply. This would better reflect the positives associated with the SA Objective for homes, as demonstrated by Option 3 tested within the SA report. Certain parts of the Western Vale sub area, such as East Challow, should be considered as capable of providing additional housing sites.</p> <p>A comment considers the development plan is unsustainable when related to the objectives set out by the SA Framework, highlighting that the plan does not meet any of the objectives. A general suggestion is made to move development to an area where it meets the sustainability requirements and not where it will destroy traditional and historical villages and surrounding areas permanently.</p>	<p>The Council consider that the preferred option chosen represents the most suitable and sustainable approach to delivering the specific needs of Local Plan 2031 Part 2. While a significant increase in allocations to accommodate 7,000 dwellings for Oxford City may result in positives to one SA Objective, it would likely result in significant negatives for a number of other Objectives within the report. Chapter 8 of the SA presents the Council's response to the alternatives appraisal and the Council's reasons for developing the preferred approach.</p> <p>There is a sufficient supply of housing within the Western Vale to meet the districts own housing requirements up to 2031. The SA has considered this matter in section 6.2 of the SA Report (Paragraphs 6.2.14 and 6.2.15). It is not considered necessary or appropriate to allocate additional sites in this sub area due to the projected supply of housing which already exceeds the requirement. The exception to this is where the Council has tested in detail land in the Parish of East Challow where it is adjacent to Wantage, a market town within the South-East Vale sub area.</p> <p>The Council considers that the SA has appropriately assessed the strategy including reasonable alternatives against the Sustainability Objectives and has been informed by a robust set of evidence which underpins the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p>
1096701		WebbPaton	737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning				
1144456	Mr Graham Francis					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									The Council does not consider the options tested to be flawed due to the weakness of individual sites. The preferred option is a package of sites, to which the SA needs to test 'reasonable alternative' packages of sites. This is explained in more detail in Section of the SA.
725596	Mr Nicholas Small	Stagecoach Oxford					SA - Stagecoach	A comment has been received from Stagecoach in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). It states that evidence on the existing and potential public transport serving the sites in the appraisal is inaccurate	The Council note the comment made by Stagecoach. The Council have given careful consideration to accurately examining this matter, including through the SA process, taking account of detailed consultation responses received from bus operators in the area, including from Stagecoach.
1100261		Catesby Property Group	1096086	Taylor Cherrett	Turley		SA - Support	A number of comments of support have been received by the site promoters for the proposed allocation to the South East of Marcham where it is referenced in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	The Council welcomes these comments of support and has noted them.
1096915		Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd	1022452	Mr Fenwick	WYG Planning & Environment	No	SA - Upper Thames Reservoir	One comment objects to the lack of testing of alternatives through the SA in relation to the safeguarded land for the Upper Thames Reservoir. There is no explicit justification for why this site is a preferred option.	The council note the suggestion that the approach to safeguarding land for the Upper Thames Reservoir should be given explicit consideration through the testing of reasonable alternatives. Chapter 5 of the Sustainability Appraisal ("Introduction to Part 1") explains the decision to focus on 'spatial strategy alternatives' in order to discharge the requirement to examine 'reasonable alternatives'. Land is safeguarded until a decision is made on the most appropriate solution to addressing water resource and supply for the region. This will be made through the examination of Thames Water's Water Resource Management Plan 2019 (WRMP19) in due course. The WRMP19 will be required to test a range of options, having regard to Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment.
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley		SA - Wantage/ Grove - Tulwick Farm	A number of comments have been received from the site promoter of land to the East of Grove in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). These are summarised as follows: Consider the reasons for rejecting the site to the east of Grove (Tulwick Farm) in the SA are flawed, and consider the site to be a reasonable alternative to those sites proposed for allocation with Local Plan 2031 Part 2. Particular attention is given to the potential uncertainty surrounding the deliverability, including the allocations North-West of Grove and Dalton Barracks, and reference is made to the evidence set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper 2 relating to the site which is also incorrect. Comments also state that the alternative sites for a future train station at Grove has not been tested through the SA. The methodology informing the SA is also flawed. An independent appraisal of the sustainability	The uncertainty about the deliverability of the proposed allocation North-West of Grove relates to when exactly the site will come forward for development (i.e. the year in which building will commence on this site). There is greater clarity on the trajectory of delivery of this proposed allocation following the grant of permission for the existing allocation Grove Airfield in 2017. The Council also consider that there is now greater clarity on the ability for the proposed allocation at Dalton Barracks to deliver houses within the plan period. The safeguarding of land for a future train station at Grove currently identifies a number of options for this scheme, having regard to the most up-to-date evidence available. It does not preclude the possibility that other options coming forward in due course, should future evidence demonstrate this. The

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								performance of the site to the east of Grove is also presented. No evidence is presented which identifies the potential market capacity issues in the area, which are referenced in the SA.	removal of safeguarded land to the east of the A338 for a future station as identified through Local Plan 2031 Part 1 is a response to updated information provided by Network Rail. They confirm that this land is no longer a suitable option due to the electrification works that have taken place.
758199 1096101	John Richards Mr Randal Joseph Pakeman	Dandara Ltd Drivewalk Ltd	832055	Mr Paul Butt	Paul Butt Planning	No	SA - Wantage/ Grove - West of Wantage	<p>A number of comments have been received from two sites promoters of land to the west of Wantage in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) where it relates to development at Grove and Wantage. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>The site promoter for the land to the west of Wantage, north of the A417 and south of the canal (HELAA Ref: EACH06) considers this land is more sustainable, unconstrained and a reasonable alternative to the sites proposed for allocation in Local Plan 2031 Part 2. They consider that the site has not been tested robustly through the SA, as it forms part of a larger and 'merged' site that comprises the whole of the land between Wantage and East Challow. Some reference is made to where this site performs well against specific Sustainability Objectives. The site is not in the green belt and would not constitute major development in the AONB. Comments also state that the site relates well to Oxford in terms of public transport due to its location on the edge of Wantage. The site promoter for the land to the west of Wantage, south of Downsview Road and north of the canal (HELAA Ref: EACH08) provide a number of comments on the SA in relation to ecology, the Wilts and Berks Canal, market saturation in Wantage and Grove, landscape capacity and some of the preferred site options such as East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor. The comments object to the SA on the grounds that there is no clear reason why the site has been excluded from District wide reasonable alternatives as set out in Table 6.3 of the SA.</p>	<p>The Council has had particular regard to ensuring that, following the Preferred Options Consultation, the evidence supporting the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 was updated where necessary to reflect the two sites being promoted to the west of Wantage. This included an Addendum to the Landscape Capacity Study (October 2017), updates to the SA. and reflected in the Site Selection Topic Paper 2.</p> <p>Some of the comments for the site EACH06 where they relate to the SA refer to the Interim SA Report (March 2017) rather than the SA Report (September 2017), which recognises that two separate sites are being promoted in this area, rather than the singular 'merged' site.</p> <p>The justification for not including the West of Wantage sites as a 'variable' within the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives is presented across Chapter 6 ("Establishing the reasonable alternatives") as a whole, with the concluding statement presented at para 6.5.11. Section 6.3 (plus the associated appendix) of the SA explains how a number of large sites should be a 'constant' and which should be a 'variable' across the reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The sites have been tested in detail and have been subject to a number of evidence base studies and consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, including statutory and prescribed bodies. The Council considers that the recommendations made for these sites, as set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper 2 (Appendix B) are based on robust and up-to-date evidence. The Council considers that the SA adequately reflects the evidence prepared to support Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p> <p>The Council considers the sites proposed for allocation represent the best strategy for delivering the specific requirements of Local Plan 2031 Part 2.</p>
1021077 1022346 1096069	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire Mrs Victoria Trotman Ms Jones	Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire Bovis Homes Limited Redcliffe Homes Ltd	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd	Yes No	SA - Western	<p>A number of comments have been received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which seek the plan to consider additional allocations in the Western Vale sub area as an alternative which should be tested.</p>	<p>There is a sufficient supply of housing within the Western Vale to meet the districts own housing requirements up to 2031. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to allocate additional sites in this sub area. The exception to this is where the Council has tested in detail land in the Parish of East Challow where it is adjacent to Wantage, a market town within the South-East Vale sub area.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1096854		RH Systems	1144378	Mrs Sarah Kasparian	Bell Cornwell LLP	No		<p>Certain parts of the Western Vale sub area should be considered as capable of providing additional housing sites. The SA should consider additional growth in this sub-area as an alternative.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to growth in Swindon.</p>	<p>The Council consider that the SA adequately takes account of adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 which sets the strategy for delivering growth across the district. The reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with are presented in Chapter 6 of the SA report, as part of which there is an explanation of why 'no allocation within the Western Vale' can reasonably be assumed to be a constant across the reasonable alternatives. The merits of nil allocation in the Western Vale are also explored within Chapter 10 of the SA Report (as they were within Chapter 10 of the earlier Interim SA Report).</p> <p>The Council has engaged with Swindon on matters of strategic, boundary-significance and consider that the duty to cooperate has been successfully discharged in relation to this.</p>
1098047	Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey	1097568	Neil Mantell	LRM Planning Ltd				

Miscellaneous

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
832469	George Lambrick					No	Additional Green Belt policy	<p>One comment suggested a new policy was required relating to development in the Green Belt to provide additional guidance on what types of development are inappropriate.</p> <p>The circumstances and issues arising from recent decisions reflect how developers seek to maximise the scale of development in the Green Belt and have found a means of circumventing the policy set out in the NPPF. It is suggested that case officers have taken previous cases as setting generally applicable precedents rather than having to explain (or require applicants to substantiate) in detail the 'very special circumstances' in each case.</p>	<p>The Council considers that Core Policy 13: Oxford Green Belt of the adopted Local Plan 2031 part 1 provides guidance on inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Comment about the Council DM process is noted, although this matter is not thought to affect the soundness of the Part 2 plan.</p>
872091	Mr Tony Lee					No	Breach of human rights	<p>One respondent suggest that the plan is in breach of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) due to proposed construction traffic, pollution and noise and will cause the Council to be in breach of Health and Safety Executive (HSE) policy because of resulting stress in the workplace to public sector staff.</p>	<p>The Local Plan has been subject to a Equalities Impact Assessment to ensure that human rights will not be impacted by the policies and proposals as set out in the Part 2 plan.</p>
1028150	Ms Allison Chippendale	HSE Nuclear Installation Inspectorate					Comments from Health and Safety Executive	<p>HSE would be grateful if the Council could provide them with the land allocation GIS data for the plan.</p>	Noted.
728849		Marine Management Organisation					Comments from Marine Management Organisation	<p>Automated response from the Marine Management Organisation outlining their purpose and the necessary processes required should a Local Plan impact upon marine environments and species.</p>	Noted.
1097646	Ian Hepburn	North Wessex Downs AONB					Comments from North Wessex Downs AONB Management Board	<p>The North Wessex Downs AONB Management Board welcome adjustments made to the Part 2 plan to reflect earlier comments and recommendations made at the Preferred Options consultation. However, the North Wessex Downs AONB Board have raised concerns with matters related to the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>This is discussed more in relation to proposed development at Harwell Campus.</p>	<p>Noted. Support is acknowledged and welcomed. The Council's response to specific matters raised by the North Wessex Downs AONB Board are covered in more detail in relation to proposed development at Harwell Campus.</p>
1100197	Mr Peter Canavan	South Oxfordshire District Council					Comments from South Oxfordshire District Council	<p>South Oxfordshire District Council expressed support for the close working of the two councils on Didcot Garden Town and the Green Infrastructure and Leisure Facilities Strategies.</p>	<p>Support from South Oxfordshire District Council is acknowledged and welcomed. The Council will continue to work with South Oxfordshire District Council on cross-boundary matters including the delivery and implementation of the Didcot Garden Town.</p>
785705	Mr Brian Rixon	Sunningwell Parish Council				No	Comments from Sunningwell Parish Council	<p>Sunningwell Parish Council raised a number of concerns in relation to the consultation process. Specific comments included:</p> <p>There were a number of late changes made to the Part 2 plan</p> <p>Consultation has been hastily arranged and residents affected by the Plan have not had sufficient time to engage in this process</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken an extensive consultation programme in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Further details on the Council's consultation programme for the Part 2 plan is available in the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Evidence base documents to support the Part 2 plan are technically complex and difficult to comprehend Council could have proactively sought to engage directly with Sunningwell Parish Council	
729061	Ms Laila Bassett	West Berkshire Council, Planning and Transport Policy				No	Comments from West Oxfordshire District Council	West Berkshire District Council have no comments on the Local Plan 2031 part 2.	Noted.
1142392	Mr Vic Johnson					No	Comparison with Local Plan 2011	One comment suggested that policies from Local Plan 2011 should be reinstated.	Where appropriate, the Council has updated a number of Saved Policies of the Local Plan 2011 in the Part 2 plan. The Council's assessment of the Saved Policies of the Local Plan is available to view in the relevant Topic Papers to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan. This assessment has considered whether policies remain appropriate and consistent with national policy and guidance and if they should be replaced or updated by new policies within the Part 2 plan.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Comparison with Local Plan part 1	One comment noted that there has been no change in Plan from Part 1, except projected housing numbers.	Noted. The Part 2 plan complements the adopted Part 1 plan and sets out: Policies and locations for new housing to meet the Vale's proportion of Oxford's housing need, which cannot be met within the City boundaries Policies for the Part of Didcot Garden Town that lies within the Vale of White Horse District Detailed development management policies to complement the strategic policies as set out in the Part 1 plan, and where appropriate replaces the Remaining saved policies of the Local Plan 2011, and additional site allocations for housing.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Comparison with the Regulation 18 version of Local Plan part 2	One comment noted that there has been no changes to policies and that the Local Plan part 2 does not address the deficiencies of Part 1 in that it does not endeavour to boost the self-confidence or attainment levels of children from families of low attainment or the break the cycle of low expectations.	Noted. The Council considers this matter falls outside the remit of the Local Plan process.
730255	Dr Stephen Fraser	Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council				No	Consultation process	A number of comments have been received concerned with the consultation process. Specific comments raised the following concerns: They had not been consulted properly Advertising the public consultation was insufficient Public events were poorly conducted Evidence documents became available during the consultation process. Experienced difficulties in viewing or making comments on the Plan online, The length of the consultation period was too short	The Council has undertaken an extensive consultation programme in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Further details on the Council's consultation programme for the preparation of the Part 2 plan is set out in the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan. Appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan provides a summary of the consultation responses received from public consultation on the Preferred Options version.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)			No				
871494	Mr Noel Newson				No				
1095527	Mr John Bradley				No				
1098082	Phillip Carder				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1141744	Mr Derek James					No		<p>Their views had not been taken into account in revising the Plan between the Regulation 18 and 19 consultations</p> <p>The needs of their communities had not been given consideration</p> <p>The details of the Local Plan part 2 was a 'done deal' prior to their involvement</p> <p>Community engagement has not been undertaken in compliance with the Vale of White Horse District Council's Customer Service Standards</p> <p>The preparation of the Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2031, Part 2 has not been undertaken in compliance with the Vale of White Horse District Council's Statement of Community Involvement.</p>	<p>Changes made to the Plan were clearly set out in the relevant Topic Papers to support the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan.</p>
1143225	Mr Graham Sloper				No				
1144097	Mr Joseph Taylor				No				
1144151	Mr Brian Monnery				No				
1144318	Mr Simon Berry				No				
1144544	Ms J Russell				No				
1144867	Mr Steven Greenwood				No				
1144869	Mr Dudley Grimwood				No				
1144871	Mr William Hailey				No				
1144924	MR Michael Millard				No				
1144927	Mr William King MClachlan				No				
1144972	Mr John Fisher				No				
1144984	Dr Leslie Russell				No				
1145006	Mr Terry Stacey				No				
1145009	Mrs Frances Stacey				No				
1145019	Mrs Roberta Wheeler				No				
1145022	Mr David Wheeler				No				
1145040	Mrs Ellen Krier				No				
1145331	Mrs Margaret Harte				No				
1145346	Mr Edward Harte				No				
1101804	Alex Chandler				No				
1145340	Mr Peter Krier				No				

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
874315	Mr Anthony Mockler					No	Consultation process - impact on North-West Valley Park Part 1 allocation	One comment raised concern that there has been insufficient consultation regarding changes to site allocations which could affect other allocated sites (e.g. North West Valley Park)	The Council has undertaken an extensive consultation programme in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Further details on the Council's consultation programme for the preparation of the Part 2 plan is set out in the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan. North West Valley park is allocated within the Local Plan part 1. The Local Plan Part 2 does not propose any changes to this allocation.
1095676	Mrs Rebecca Dougall					No	Consultation Process - Legality and transparency of plan - Fyfield and Tubney	One respondent raised a concern that the Parish Council of Fyfield and Tubney was not consulted regarding the proposed allocation at Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor (within Fyfield and Tubney Parish) and that the exhibition was held in a neighbouring parish and that the Council failed to engage explicitly and directly with the affected parish. Concerns are also raised that the director of the company lobbying for the development is also a local Conservative Councillor and that this is a conflict of interest.	The Council has undertaken an extensive consultation programme in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Further details on the Council's consultation programme for the preparation of the Part 2 plan is set out in the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.
1142663	Mr Sean Quiggin					Yes	Consultation process – support	One respondent states that the Council has discharged its responsibilities regarding consultation fairly and openly.	Support is acknowledged and welcomed.
1050211	Mrs Anne Lankester	Oxfordshire CCG					Comments from Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	Oxfordshire CCG state that any large scale housing growth has implications on the delivery of primary care services across the District. The CCG would expect to be consulted on large scale housing growth, in particular anything over 200 units. The CCG would also like to be able to negotiate either Section 106 funds or Community Infrastructure Levy funds to support expansion and growth of existing GP practices to continue to deliver primary care services to the new population.	The Council has worked closely with the CCG throughout the preparation of the plan to ensure appropriate provision is made for planning for health. The Council has signed a SOCG with CCG.
1097677		David Wilson Homes (Southern)	1097679	David Murray-Cox	Turley		David Wilson Homes	David Wilson Homes provided an introductory section to the representation for the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan.	Noted.
1142381	Ms Lynn Mander					No	Difficulty with online system	The consultee has struggled to use the online system and indicates that this could put people of from commenting.	The Council note the comment regarding the difficulty with the online system, however highlight that it was made clear during the publicity period, that other forms of representations were acceptable. The Council responded promptly to address any identified issues with the online system.
872583	Mrs Sarah Church						Education	Development Policy 7: Community Services and Facilities, and indeed the whole plan, make no explicit mention of the educational facilities to support residential housing growth. This may or may not be appropriate under DP7, but it seemed the nearest policy type. The growth of larger villages is placing considerable stress on local education provision, particularly in Faringdon. Village schools have expanded where possible, but in some cases children are unable to	The Council are working with the County Council to ensure appropriate education provision is provided within the district. The Site development templates sets out the appropriate infrastructure needed to ensure the development is sustainable and the existing need is meet including provision for primary, secondary and other education requirements. Development proposals should also comply with Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								attend school in the village where they live; this is ok for children whose parents are able to drive, but the public transport linkages have been terminated by Oxfordshire County Council. Education is a County Council responsibility but it is one that must be developed in complete coherence with the District Development Plan. The villages around Farindon with their own primary schools are sending children to Faringdon Community College which is expanding to a 9-form entry. Whilst welcome, this expansion can only go so far to meet the need. There is a growing need to consider another secondary school in the Western Vale to accommodate the number of new houses. This cannot just be a requirement for the developers and must be actively pursued by the Vale of White Horse and County Council together.	Services which sets out very clear requirements for development to contribute towards infrastructure delivery informed by the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
850794 1096815	Ms Sue Holmes	Oxford Brookes University CEG	1096817	Ian Gillespie	Igloo Planning		General Support	One comment expressed their support for their working relationship with the Council in relation to planning application for the adopted Part 1 allocation to the North of Abingdon-on-Thames. Oxford Brookes University expressed their support for the Local Plan 2031 part 2.	Support is acknowledged and welcomed.
1101804 1145040	Alex Chandler Mrs Ellen Krier					No No	Glossary	Several comments were made concerning the Glossary definition of the term AONB. A suggested amendment was made to the definition as follows: "AN AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB) IS LAND PROTECTED BY THE COUNTRYSIDE AND RIGHTS OF WAY ACT 2000 (CROW ACT). IT PROTECTS THE LAND TO CONSERVE AND ENHANCE ITS NATURAL BEAUTY."	The Council is satisfied that the definition of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is consistent with the definition as set out in the adopted Local Plan 2031 part 1 and with national policy and legislation.
1145032	Mr D Bond					No	Green Belt	One comment suggested that the submissions proposals map should be amended so that the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area no longer show the proposed changes to the green belt at North Hinksey, as this is outside the remit of a Local Plan., but should show the Green Belt as shown on the adopted policies map of part 1 of the Local Plan 2031.	Noted. This was an administrative error. The Policies Map will be updated to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.
730190	Councillor Debby Hallett						Green Belt and Local Plan part 1	One comment objects that land was taken out of the Green Belt in Part 1 plan that was not necessary, and suggest that the Part 1 plan was therefore unjustified.	The Inspector's Report for the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 concluded that exceptional circumstances existed to release four strategic sites allocations around Abingdon-on-Thames, Kennington and Radley from the Oxford Green Belt. The Inspector's Report did not preclude the Council from releasing further land from the Green Belt through the Part 2 plan if the necessary exceptional circumstances were to be demonstrated. The Council is not aware of any reason why the four sites removed from the Part 1 plan are not still expected to deliver housing, indeed at the time of plan submission, one site has planning permission

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									and three sites have submitted or are expected to submit planning applications.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Housing density	One comment is concerned that high density housing could adversely affect human flourishing.	Core Policy 23: Housing Density in the adopted Part 1 plan ensures that residential dwellings are provided at an appropriate density to reflect the need to use land efficiently, whilst also taking account of local circumstances. Developers should justify their approach to density in the Design and Access Statement.
758065	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	Gallagher Estates and Gleeson Strategic Ltd	758063	Mr Andrew Raven	Savills		IDP - Monks Farm (Part 1 plan)	One comment suggests that the IDP is updated to ensure it complies with the requirements set out in the evidence base Gallagher-Gleeson has previously made comments in relation to leisure, sports pitch and play provision on the site at Monks Farm.	Noted. The Council has updated the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan in relation to leisure and open space requirements.
728491 827932	Mr Paul Gibbs Julie Maberley	Culham Parish Council Wantage and Grove Campaign Group				No No	Infrastructure	<p>Several comments, including from Culham Parish Council raise concerns in relation to infrastructure delivery. Specific comments included:</p> <p>The infrastructure necessary to support site allocations is not deliverable within the timeframe of the Local Plan 2031</p> <p>Concerns over funding for elements of the infrastructure proposed, since all funding is not yet in place, and it was suggested that this may not be delivered until 2040</p> <p>It was recommended to the Inspector that following the conclusion of negotiations regarding Brexit, the SHMA should be updated based on the new methodology as set out in the Housing White Paper and that the Local Plan be revised to reflect the new SHMA</p> <p>Part 1 plan made limited reference to health services such as NHS England and Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group or emergency services such as the Police, Fire or Ambulance Services</p> <p>Development Policy 8 refers to quality and accessibility of community services but does not mention health services or emergency services</p> <p>Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy states that delivering the necessary infrastructure to support growth from now to 2040 is estimated to cost at least £8.96 billion; national policy requires that infrastructure is delivered alongside development</p>	<p>The Council has worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and a range of other infrastructure providers and is satisfied that appropriate consideration has been given to this matter. The Development Site Templates set out the policy requirements that all additional site allocations in the Part 2 plan would need to comply with and the plan is accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Viability Assessment.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been updated and supports the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.</p> <p>More detailed comments are provided in response to other consultation responses that concern specific infrastructure requirements, such as for highways, waste water, health care etc. These are set out elsewhere within the appendix.</p>
928610	Lynette Hughes	Oxfordshire County Council				No	Infrastructure Delivery	Oxfordshire County Council were supportive that a number of matters raised through the Preferred Options consultation on the Part 2 plan have been resolved through revisions to text and allocations. OCC commented that decisions are awaited from Government on funding and future changes to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and that the way forward is joint working. OCC reference progress through the Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) and decision in principle to prepare a Joint Statutory	The Council has worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and prepared joint evidence to assess the impact of development. The Council continues to work with Oxfordshire County Council on a number of areas of work relevant to the Local Plan Part 2. This includes refinement of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI) work, including consideration of how the Oxfordshire Strategic Model validates in the Abingdon area. In addition, OCC is a key stakeholder in the development of Supplementary Planning Documents

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
								Spatial Plan for Oxfordshire. OCC also referred to the National Infrastructure Commission's report on the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford Arc.	for both Harwell Campus and Dalton Barracks. OCC were also involved in preparing the brief for the Oxford-Abingdon Sustainable Transport Study and commented on drafts of the report. Vale of White Horse District Council will continue to engage positively with OCC to support effective planning for highways and infrastructure to support Sustainable Development in accordance with the Adopted Local Plan Part 1, Local Transport Plan 4, Oxfordshire Strategic Employment Plan and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy for which the Council considers there is a high degree of consistency. This is considered further within the SOCG between VOWH and OCC.
1144066	Mr James Oliphant					No	Job security	One comment outlining their concern relating to their job security if the Plan goes ahead.	Noted. The Parts 1 and 2 plans support the delivery of around 23,000 jobs and is supported by the Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan. The Council is content the plan is positive towards supporting economic growth.
1145361		Hinton Group Ltd	1145360	Mr James Griffin	Hunter Page Planning	No	Land use	One comment states that the Part 2 focuses on housing but should look at leisure, retail and tourism. It is requested that opportunities to unlock brownfield sites should be explored. Comment also suggests that the implications of the proposed alleviation and transport measures are assessed in greater details focusing particularly on the inter-relationship between the flood alleviation and Upper Thames Reservoir safeguarded land to the West of Abingdon and the South Abingdon-on-Thames bypass safeguarded land.	The Council has published a Brownfield Register which specifies those sites being developed on brownfield sites or "previously developed land" as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework. The register focuses on the redevelopment of sites for residential use but can include other uses such as offices and retail provided they support a residential element. Core Policy 43: Natural Resources in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 encourages developers to make effective use of natural resources including re-using previously developed land. Furthermore, planning policies contained in the adopted Part 1 plan and the emerging Part 2 plan sufficiently support the provision of leisure, retail and tourism development, for example Core Policy 31: Development to Support the Visitor Economy, Core Policy 32: Retail Development and other Main Town Centre Uses and Development Policy 13: Changes of Use of Retail Units to Other Use.
1022473 1096701		Rosconn Group WebbPaton	737353 737353	Mr Nathan McLoughlin Mr Nathan McLoughlin	McLoughlin Planning McLoughlin Planning	No	Local Development Scheme	A few comments raised concerns relating to the approach of the Plan. In particular, the Plan should be prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme. At the time of the Preferred Options consultation on the Part 2 plan there was no an up-to-date version of the LDS available. Comment has suggested additional supporting text after paragraph 2.8 as follows: THIS PART 2 PLAN WILL SUPPORT THE ABOVE OBJECTIVE BY MAKING A RANGE OF HOUSING ALLOCATIONS TO MEET OXFORD'S UNMET NEED AS WELL AS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR 'SMALLER DEVELOPMENT SITES' ARISING FROM PART 1. THIS INCLUDES HOUSING AT GREEN BELT VILLAGE LOCATIONS.	The purpose of the Part 2 plan was modified through the Part 1 plan examination and the Inspector made a modification to define the purpose of the Part 2 plan as: Main Modification 1: 'Local Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Local ADDITIONAL Sites. The Local Plan 2031 Part 2 will contain detailed planning policies to guide day-to-day decisions on planning applications. The document will provide more detailed policies to those within Part 1 of the Local Plan, and identify and allocate supplementary and predominantly smaller (referred to as non-strategic) development sites SET OUT POLICIES AND LOCATIONS FOR HOUSING FOR THE VALE'S PROPORTION OF OXFORD'S HOUSING NEED UNABLE TO BE MET

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
									<p>WITHIN THE CITY BOUNDARIES. THIS DOCUMENT WILL ALSO CONTAIN POLICIES FOR THE PART OF DIDCOT GARDEN TOWN THAT LIES WITHIN THE VALE OF WHITE HORSE DISTRICT COUNCIL AND DETAILED DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES TO COMPLEMENT LOCAL PLAN 2031 PART 1. IT WILL REPLACE THE SAVED POLICIES OF THE LOCAL PLAN 2011, AND MAY ALLOCATE ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT SITES FOR HOUSING AND OTHER USES.'</p> <p>On this basis, the Council consider that the Part 2 plan is entirely consistent with the purpose of the Part 2 plan, as set out in the Adopted Part 1 plan and is soundly based. The Council have since updated their LDS to reflect the modification made by the Inspector to the Part 1 plan.</p> <p>It is clear that the purpose of the Part 2 plan is to set out policies and locations for housing for the Vale's proportion of Oxford housing need unable to be met within the City boundaries; this does not specify whether sites are strategic or non-strategic. Furthermore, the purpose of the Part 2 plan includes the provision that it 'may' allocate 'additional' development sites for housing. Again, this does not specify strategic or non-strategic scale development.</p> <p>The Council considers that the Part 2 plan is entirely consistent with the Spatial Strategy set out in the Part 1 plan. The Spatial Strategy includes the following 'identifying appropriate housing requirements for the rural areas to inform neighbourhood plans or the Local Plan 2031 Part 2'. This is fulfilled in the Part 1 plan by identifying Sub-Area housing requirements, which include residual housing requirements to be met within the Part 2 plan. There is therefore no need, or expectation, that the housing requirements for the Sub-Areas would be reviewed within the Part 2 plan. The Part 2 plan should add policies and locations to address unmet need and 'may' allocate additional sites.</p>
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS					LPP1 Site at Sutton Courtenay	<p>One comment was received in relation the site at Hobbyhorse Lane, Sutton Courtenay that sits within the allocation in the adopted Part 1 plan for 220 dwellings. This site can deliver up to 200 dwellings and the delivery of residential development is fundamental to ensure the Council is able to meet their housing need in accordance with the adopted Part 1 plan and the Part 2 plan. This site represents an achievable, suitable and deliverable site to support the supply of housing and maintaining a rolling 5 year supply of suitable housing sites throughout the plan period. Comment notes that the Part 2 plan does not seek to review the strategic site allocations in the adopted Part 1 plan.</p>	

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
844270	Mrs Angela Ziemelis						Miscellaneous	Comment made in reference to the South Oxfordshire District Council and Chalgrove Neighbourhood Plan.	This comment does not relate to LPP2 or Vale of White Horse District.
1144126 1144133	Mrs Sheila Bury Mr Mark Rogers						Objection	Several comments wished to make known their general objections to the Local Plan 2031 part 2	Noted.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Offer to work with Council	One comment offers to work with the Council to build healthy and sustainable communities	Noted.
1097353	Liam Ryder	Gladman Developments				No	Public Examination	One comment requests to make their objections known at the Examination of the Part 2 plan.	Noted. The Planning Inspectorate will be informed of all individuals/organisations that wish to participate at the Examination.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Request for response	One comment requested a response to general comments, the consultation process, and specific questions and concerns and building ways for strategic partnerships to support the successful integration of new housing developments with the existing communities	A summary of consultation responses received from the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan are set out in the Regulation 22 Statement to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan. The Council has undertaken an extensive consultation programme in accordance with national legislation, policy and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Further details on the Council's consultation programme for the preparation of the Part 2 plan is set out in the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.
1142381	Ms Lynn Mander					No	Site Allocation process - North of Shrivenham Site - Local plan 2031 part 1	One comment suggests a stop to the Highworth Road development due to its impact on rural countryside and lack of infrastructure.	The North of Shrivenham site is a strategic site allocation in the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1. The Council does not consider this a matter that affects the soundness of the Part 2 plan.
1149396	Ms B Tink						Site Promoters	One comment raises concerns that site promoters are allowed to provide information on a site without scrutiny or addressing issues raised by local residents.	All duly made representations received by the Council to the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan will be forwarded to the Planning Inspector alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan for his/her consideration at an independent Examination.
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Social housing	One comment suggests that social housing should not be alienated and there should be joined up provision for those living with deprivation.	Core Policy 24: Affordable Housing in the adopted Part 1 plan sets out the Council's approach to the provision of affordable housing as part of new residential development. The Council will seek 35% affordable housing on all sites capable of a net gain of eleven or more dwellings and a 75:25 split for rented (either social or affordable) and intermediate housing. This policy also ensures that the provision of any affordable housing is distributed evenly across the site. Core Policy 26: Accommodating Current and Future Needs of the Ageing Population in the adopted Part 1 plan sets out measures to ensure new homes are well designed and easily adapted to the changing needs of residents.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
782835	Mr Hugh Rees	Wantage Deanery (Oxford Diocese)				No	Social infrastructure	One comment raises a concern that the Plan does not develop social infrastructure or the integration of new residents.	Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services in the adopted Part 1 plan ensures new community services and facilities are delivered alongside new housing and employment, including social infrastructure such as education, health facilities and other community facilities. The Site Development Templates to support the additional site allocations in the Part 2 plan set out site specific requirements relating to issues including infrastructure provision. Developers will be required to provide public open space and recreational facilities or contribute towards health care, leisure provision and other community services and facilities in accordance with the requirements set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP has been updated to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan.
934607	Mr Robert Love	REDROW HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS					Soundness - Plan not sound	One comment raises a concern that the Local Plan in unsound and requires a number of amendments to Development Policies.	Noted.
1097637	Lioncourt Strategic Land Limited		724828	Mr Roger Smith	Savills L and P Ltd, Mr R Smith, Director	No	Strategic infrastructure	One comment was received from the site promoter in relation to the proposed allocation at East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor. Comment supported Core Policy 4a and the Council's intentions to address housing need arising from elsewhere in the Housing Market Area, expressly the quantum of housing need for Oxford City. Comment suggested that this Plan must consider influences on and the requirements of adjoining areas and how strategic infrastructure is to be delivered.	Support acknowledged and welcomed. The Council has prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan, working closely with key infrastructure providers, including Oxfordshire County Council as the lead Highway Authority. The IDP identifies the infrastructure requirements for the site. The IDP has been updated following Regulation 19 Publication and further consultation has been undertaken with OCC, other Infrastructure Providers and the site promoter. This matter is also considered through the SOCG between OCC and VOWH and the SOCG between VOWH, Savills and Lioncourt Strategic Land
785705	Mr Brian Rixon	Sunningwell Parish Council				No	Sunningwell / SPADE	A number of comments objected to the Local Plan 2031 part 2 and endorsed the representations made by SPADE and Sunningwell Parish Council and requested that the Council take SPADE's comments into account and give further consideration to the Plan and its proposals.	The Council notes the objections to the Local Plan 2031 and support from members of the public for the representation made by Sunningwell Parishners Against Damage to the Environment (SPADE).
1094284	Mr James Greenman				No				
1142989	Mrs Fiona Freeman				No				
					No				
1143089	Mrs Anne Newman				No				
1143299	Ms Marie Monaghan				No				
1143365	Mrs Sheila Greenman				No				
1144126	Mrs Sheila Bury					No			

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144133	Mr Mark Rogers								
1144169	Professor Elizabeth Browne								
1144235	Mr Anthony Thomas								
1144249	Ms Annabel Ownsworth								
1144316	Mr Terry Monaghan								
1144775	Ms J Partington					No			
1144868	Mr D.J. Knowles					No			
1144039	Mr Noel Blatchford					No			
1142989	Mrs Fiona Freeman					No	Sunningwell / SPADE support for consultation process	One comment thanked the Council for their hard work at putting information forward at the public meeting.	Noted and acknowledged.
879120	Gow Family						Sustainability policy as it relates to alternative sites	One comment raised a concern that the Local Plan Part 2 makes repeated references to sustainability yet does not explain how it interprets its understanding of sustainability in putting forward strategic plan to 2031. Concern is also raised that the Council has chosen to state "its Support for Economic prosperity" rather than "Support Sustainable Economic prosperity". The respondent considers that development in the Local Plan is driven by the need for housing and infrastructure without fully considering the wider or future impacts on the communities themselves, and that this is unsustainable. They raise a concern that development is needed where it can ensure existing services and facilities remain sustainable for the communities they serve, which is often in smaller rural settlements	The Spatial Strategy for the Local Plan 2031 supports the delivery of sustainable growth through three key strands, including promoting thriving villages and rural communities whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character. The Plan's strategy supports appropriate development in smaller villages to help meet the local needs of rural communities and to focus development within the rural areas to the Larger Villages to maintain their vitality and the sustainability of local services. Core Policy 4 in the adopted Part 1 plan supports limited infill development at Smaller Villages where they are in keeping with local character, proportionate in scale, meet local housing needs and provide local employment, services and facilities. This policy also supports appropriate development in the open countryside where supported by other relevant policies as set out in the Development Plan or national policy. There are also a number of relevant policies in the adopted Part 1 plan and the emerging Part 2 plan that support appropriate development in rural areas.
1144120	Mr Stephen Fairman						Traffic issues - North-West of Abingdon-on-Thames site (Part 1 plan)	One comment raised concerns regarding traffic levels on Marcham Road, Wootton Road and Dunmore road which they feel will be exacerbated by the North-West of Abingdon-on-Thames site allocation	The North-West of Abingdon-on-Thames site is a strategic allocation in the adopted Part 1 plan. The Council has produced an Evaluation of Transport Impacts (ETI) Study to assess the cumulative impact of growth from the adopted Part 1 plan and proposals set out in the Part 2 plan on the existing transport network.

Person ID	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Agent ID	Agent's Full Name	Agent Company / Organisation	Plan Soundness	Comment Category	Comment Summary	Officer Response
1144561	Ms Diana Martin					No	General Objection	General Objection	Noted
1144562	Ms Rupert Martin					Office use only - blank	General Objection	General Objection	Noted

Alternative formats of this publication are available on request

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

Please contact Planning on 01235 422600

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

Email: planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk