

East Challow parish responses to web-based comments (pdf also attached)

Our responses to these comments are relatively few.

Responder 1 Letcombe Brook Project

We support the response and recommendations made by the respondent if the Examiner is minded to add wording to Policy EV1 or to introduce a new policy to cover this point.

Responder 2 – no comment

Responder 3 The Vale Planning Policy

We agree with all these points except for these additional comments.

Pt 6. P37. 7.2.2. We disagree since Grove airfield has had nesting curlews, the Challow Marsh area supports biodiversity with Curlews recorded, and in all areas the hedgerows and watercourse routes provide biodiversity so we believe the construction of the sentence to be correct

Pt 8. P45. L2. We prefer to keep the wording as it is since the existing wording more closely aligns with the duties in relation to AONBs.

Pt 12. P68 E1 We agree with the suggested changes but think that it is unrealistic to expect a cycle path connecting the W&G estate on the A417 with East Challow village.

P69. Policy E2. We have previously made a response seeking to retain the employment and skills plan part of the policy. We do not support the deletion of that part of policy E2 but support the rest of the changes to the policy.

Pt 16. P84 FP2. "Footpaths should be accessible to wheelchairs" presumably this just refers to new footpaths and suggest altering the text accordingly

Pt 17. P85/86 FP4 The policies add something at a local level over and above policy DP32 in LPP2. We therefore do not accept the proposed deletion of the policies.

Pt 20. App 6. The comments are welcomed.

Pt 21. App 11. We accept this recommendation.

Responders 4-6. no comment (Scottish & Southern; Historic England; and the Coal Authority)

Responder 7. Thames Water. We accepted the proposed additional text.

Responder 8. National Highways. no comment

Responder 9. Network Rail. The public bridleway mentioned at Grove sits outside our area.

Responder 10 and 11. no comment needed (Natural England and National grid)

Responder 12. Oxfordshire County Council

L4 LGS Letcombe Hill and Hedgehill Rd we have responded to OCC previously about this. Vale Transport Planner – no comments needed.

Responder 13. Wilts and Berks Canal Trust

Some changes sought but most proposals suggested are related to the canal restoration rather than management of development with which we therefore disagree. However, the proposal that contributions should be made to improve and restore the canal if further development should further development take place is acceptable.

P73 7.16.4 web link non-functional – The gap will be eliminated restoring the web link.

Responder 14. Policy L3 is a well-tested and accepted approach to protecting important views and vistas and which have previously passed examination. LPP1 Core Policy 44 contains the requirement to enhance. We therefore strongly oppose their point of view and suggested change.