

**CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION**

<b>Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b>	<b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b>
<b>Format of the Plan</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 1.7</u></b></p> <p>A number of references to 'the Council' were removed from para 1.10 at second deposit. Inspector endorses these changes and recommends that that the process should be completed by some further minor changes in wording to this paragraph.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (at page 2 of his report):</b> Delete "District Council's" from line 2 of para 1.7.</p> <p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 1.9</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector suggests that the first two sentences of para 1.9 could readily be combined as follows; "The written statement sets out the policies and proposals, which are distinguished from the rest of the text by the use of capital letters, and explains the reasons for them.". In the current fifth sentence, "the Council" should be replaced by "that", with the second part of the final sentence after "respectively" deleted, as it refers to other non statutory documents that do not form part of the local plan and may well change during its lifetime.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (at page 2 of his report):</b> Replace first two sentences of para 1.9 with "The written statement sets out the policies and proposals, which are distinguished from the rest of the text by the use of capital letters, and explains the reasons for them.".</p> <p>Replace "the Council" with "that" in line 5 of para 1.9.</p> <p>Delete second part of last sentence of para 1.9 after "respectively".</p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in his report (para1.1.3).</b></p> <p>The Inspector's changes improve the clarity and accuracy of this part of the plan and should be accepted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendations for the reasons given in his report (para1.1.3).</b></p>

**CHAPTER 3 - LOCAL PLAN STRATEGY**

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>Policy GS1 - Development in Existing Settlements</b>	
<p><b><u>Development Boundaries to the Five Main Settlements</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector considers that Sudbury House Hotel and its surrounding curtilage, together with numbers 1 and 3 Stanford Road, Faringdon should be included within the development boundary of the town. He concludes that these properties are not so distinct or separate from the main built up area, nor so clearly forming part of the open countryside as to justify their exclusion from the development boundary. The land is previously developed, but he notes that this does not mean that all the undeveloped parts of the site are suitable for redevelopment (para 3.3.2 – 3.3.7).</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (at page 14 of his report): Amend the settlement boundary of Faringdon to include Sudbury House and its grounds, as well as nos. 1 and 3 Stanford Road and their existing curtilages. Amend Proposals Map accordingly.</b></p> <p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 3.7</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector notes that the change to policy H11 will require a consequential amendment to paragraph 3.7 of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (at page 16 of his report): Replace "only one or two dwellings" with "development of not more than four small dwellings" in fourth sentence of para 3.7.</b></p>	<p>(Note to members: policy GS1, together with the proposals map, defines and establishes development boundaries for the Vale's five main settlements).</p> <p>While it is regrettable that the Inspector has not accepted the Council's position, his reasons for doing so are clear and logical. As he says in para 3.3.5 of his report, any future proposals for development at the site would have to be judged against all the relevant policies in the plan including those related to safeguarding the character of listed buildings and conservation areas. In view of this officers consider there is little to be gained from opposing the Inspector's recommendation. The plan showing the change to the boundary is at the end of the Appendix containing the proposed modifications.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in paragraph 3.3.2 - 3.3.7 of his report.</b></p> <p>Provided the Council accepts the change to policy H11 (which is considered in the housing chapter of this schedule) this consequential change should be accepted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: If the Council accepts the change to policy H11, the Inspector's recommendation for paragraph 3.7 should be accepted as a consequential change.</b></p>
<b>Policy GS2 – Development in the Countryside</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 3.8</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector concludes that the only change required to this part of the plan is to update the reference to refer to PPS7 and not PPG7 (para 3.3.5).</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (at page 17 of his report): Replace reference to PPG7 with PPS7 in first sentence of para 3.8.</b></p>	<p>The Inspector's covering letter also refers to the Council considering whether the plan should be modified to take account of new national guidance and the need for consistency in the use of terminology.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation in relation to paragraph 3.8 of the local plan and update other references to government guidance where the titles have changed since the second deposit plan was prepared.</b></p>
<b>Policy GS3 – Development in the Oxford Green Belt</b>	
<b><u>Local Plan paragraph 3.14</u></b>	

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>The only change the Inspector recommends to this part of the plan is to accept a pre inquiry change agreed by the Council to refer to plans for the whole of Oxford Brookes University. The Inspector considers that taking into account all relevant guidance on such matters in PPG2 he has no doubt that this is appropriate.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 23 of his report):</b> Add "for the development of the whole university" after "plans" in the third sentence of para 3.14 (PIC 3/1).</p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation (previously advertised as pre inquiry change 3/1) for the reasons given in paragraph 3.7.16 of his report.</b></p>
Policy GS4 – Major Developed Sites in The Green Belt	
<p><b>Local Plan paragraph 3.14</b></p> <p>The Inspector recognises the concerns of objectors that the Council being 'sympathetic' to the possible need for the expansion of Oxford Brookes University might be seen as implying a presumption in favour of development (para 3.8.3). He considers it would not be appropriate for the Council to pre-empt or pre-judge their duties as a local planning authority in impartially considering planning applications in any way.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 25 of his report):</b> Replace "is sympathetic to" with "understands the aspirations of" in the second sentence of para 3.14.</p> <p><b>Major Developed Site Boundary at Radley College</b></p> <p>The Inspector considers it appropriate as part of a plan-led system to take into account acknowledged needs arising from a well established and continuing educational use in the Green Belt during the plan period. He accepts Radley College's need for two new boarding houses (as does the Council) but, having examined a number of options considers that such development if located within the major developed site boundary would have a serious detrimental effect on the visual appearance and overall character of the site. He considers that an area adjoining the north of the MDS boundary (area 11) exhibits a much closer relationship in both physical and visual terms to the MDS than any other areas of open land outside the built up framework of the campus. Subject to a high standard of design and limited height in relation to existing buildings he considers new development could be assimilated without materially expanding the practical extent of the developed site. As such, it would not have a significant impact on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. By way of compensation the Inspector considers that the area between the main college entrance and the original dwelling is so important to the appearance and character of the site that it should not be developed and should be excluded from the MDS boundary (area 10). See attached plan for the implications of these changes.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 29 of his report):</b> At Radley College, change the MDS boundary to delete area 10 (see urban design report April 2005) and add area</p>	<p>The Inspector's reasoning is correct. It was never the intention that the local plan should pre-judge such applications.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 3.8.3 of his report.</b></p> <p>Although the Council has accepted the need for new boarding houses it is regrettable that the Inspector has not accepted the Council's view as to their location. However, the area of land recommended to be removed from the MDS is larger than the area to be included, and area 11 is the site beyond the current MDS boundary that if developed would cause least harm to the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt. Given these factors and that PPG2 refers to account being taken of the acknowledged needs arising from well established educational uses, officers consider that the Inspector's recommendation should be accepted. A plan showing the change to the MDS boundary is at the end of the Appendix containing the proposed modifications.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 3.9.1 – 3.9.9 of his report.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic Local Planning Advisory Group
11. Amend PM accordingly.	
<b>Policy GS5 – Safeguarded Land</b>	
<p>In relation to housing land supply the Inspector considers that the strategic housing site at Grove is not likely to deliver 750 dwellings by 2011 and that additional land should be identified to compensate for the potential shortfall from this and other large sites in the district. He recommends allocating three additional housing sites for the period up to 2011. Of the three sites he recommends to be allocated, two sites, at Lime Road and Tilbury Lane in Botley, are designated as safeguarded land in the adopted and emerging local plans. The Inspector considers these sites should no longer be safeguarded. The third safeguarded site he considers should be neither allocated for housing nor included in the Green Belt. He recognises that this may lead to pressures for development but is satisfied this could be resisted by the application of other policies in the plan until such time as the site is needed for new housing.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 30 of his report): policy GS5 - delete policy and para 3.15 as no longer necessary. Amend Proposals Map accordingly.</b></p>	<p>(Note to Members: The Inspector's recommendation in relation to policy GS5 needs to be seen in the context of his recommendations concerning policy H1 "The amount of housing to 2011" in the housing chapter of this schedule.)</p> <p>In view of the time taken to bring forward development at Great Western Park Didcot, officers would find it difficult to justify not accepting the Inspector's view that there may be some delay in developing the other large local plan sites allocated for development. If officers had to recommend additional housing sites to be allocated in the plan then the two sites at Botley would be high on the list given that Botley is a sustainable location for development in transport terms and the recognition that the land has been specifically safeguarded for future development and excluded from the Green Belt for just this purpose. These sites are considered in more detail in the housing chapter schedule below. While it is regrettable that the Inspector recommends removing the safeguarded status from all the sites, including the one that is not proposed for housing, it is accepted that policy GS2 restricts development on land that is not allocated outside the built up areas of existing settlements. This will protect the site from development provided there is not a case to release the site because of a significant shortage in the supply of housing land. The site, which will effectively become 'white land', is 1.56 ha in extent. Officers are of the view that it is too small to warrant protecting as the only area of safeguarded land in the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Provided that the Council agrees to accept the Inspector's recommendation to allocate the two sites in Botley for housing, the Council should accept the Inspector's recommendations in relation to policy GS5 for the reasons set out in para 3.10.1 – 3.10.2 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy GS7 – Redevelopment of Buildings Outside Settlements</b>	
<p>With two minor exceptions, the Inspector considers the policy and text are consistent with the most recent national guidance. However, he considers it is not usually appropriate for a site or building to be granted a series of temporary permissions and that the phrase should be deleted from criterion i) of the policy. He also considers the tone of paragraph 3.20 would better reflect PPS7, paras 17-19 if it said 'if they are not in locations where new buildings for non agricultural purposes would normally be allowed' (rather than 'as')</p>	<p>The Inspector's reasoning is accepted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendations for the reasons in para 3.12.4 of his report.</b></p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>Inspector's Recommendations (on page 34 of his report):            policy GS7 - delete "OR A SERIES OF TEMPORARY PERMISSIONS" from criterion i). Para 3.20 – replace "as" with "if" in third line of penultimate sentence.</p>	
<b>GS8 – Non Vernacular Buildings Outside Settlements</b>	
<p>The only changes are to update the reference to PPS7 from PPG7.</p> <p>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 35 of his report):            Paras 3.23 and 3.24 – replace references to PPG7 with PPS7.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation in relation to paragraph 3.23 for the reasons set out in paras 13.13.1 and 3.5.5 of his report. However, a reference to PPS7 in paragraph 3.24 would not be accurate and the specific reference to government guidance in this paragraph should be deleted.</b></p>

**CHAPTER 4 - GENERAL POLICIES FOR DEVELOPMENT**

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>DC1 – Design</b>	
<p>The Inspector is satisfied that policy DC1 is generally consistent with national guidance on design. However, in the light of PPS1 para.34, he recommends that criterion i) should be amended to more accurately reflect this latest guidance.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 40 of his report):</b> Replace "IT IS DESIGNED TO A HIGH STANDARD" with "IT IS OF A HIGH QUALITY AND INCLUSIVE DESIGN" in criterion i).</p>	<p>The Inspector's recommendation is a minor change to criterion i) and can be accepted. The lower case text at para 4.10 should be amplified to explain the term inclusive design.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 4.2.2 of his report. An explanation of "inclusive design" should be given in paragraph 4.10 of the plan as follows: "Policy DC1 refers to inclusive design, which is about ensuring buildings and places can be used by everyone. It means thinking about the way design affects our ability to move, see, hear and communicate. It aims to remove barriers, enabling everyone, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity or ability, to participate in everyday activities."</b></p>
<b>DC3 – Design against Crime</b>	
<p><b><u>Policy DC3 &amp; Local Plan paragraph 4.12</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector endorses the Council's 'pre-inquiry change' PIC 4/1 to policy DC3 to clarify that the policy applies to access provisions. The Inspector also notes that Circular 5/94 has now been cancelled and that the relevant reference in plan para 4.12 should be to PPS1.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (page 42 of his report):</b> Add "AS WELL AS ACCESS PROVISIONS" after "THEM" in line 2 of the policy.</p> <p><b>Para 4.12 – Replace "Circular 5/94" with "PPS1" in second line.</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 4.4.1 of his report.</b></p>
<b>DC8 – Provision of Infrastructure &amp; Services</b>	
<p><b><u>Policy DC8 &amp; Local Plan paragraph 4.20</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector comments that the evolution of policy DC8, particularly 'pre-inquiry changes' PICs 4/2 and 4/3, reflects not only the objections to this plan but the recommendations in the joint Inspectors' Report on Didcot and the response of South Oxfordshire District Council as well as the replacement of Circular 1/97 with Circular 05/2005. Given this context the Inspector recommends minor changes to the wording of the policy. In his report, these changes appear to be more substantial than they are because his recommendation reproduces the policy wording in its entirety. He also recommends changes to local plan para 4.20. He confirms that the Council may seek commuted payments to cover maintenance costs for at least ten years but deletes the</p>	<p>Members will recall that following first deposit, changes were made to the wording of the policy partly in response to South Oxfordshire District Council's objection that the maintenance period should be 25 years to be consistent with their approach at Didcot. A change was made to local plan para 4.20 to state that major proposals at Didcot, Grove and Faringdon will require a maintenance period of 25 years. There was then an objection following the local plan's second deposit in 2004 that the time period was onerous and not consistent with Circular 1/97. The Joint Inspector's Report about Didcot was published in May 2005. This did not address the issue of the time period for commuted payments but in considering the Joint Report (SLAG 31 August 2005), it was noted that South Oxfordshire District</p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>reference to major developments and a maintenance period of 25 years. He also adds that on large sites commuted payments can be phased to link with the phases of the development.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (page 48 of his report):</b>  <b>Reword policy as follows: "DEVELOPMENT WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED WHERE THE NECESSARY SOCIAL AND PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICE REQUIREMENTS OF FUTURE OCCUPIERS AND/OR USERS OF THE DEVELOPMENT ARE: i) AVAILABLE AT A SUITABLE STANDARD; OR ii) WILL BE PROVIDED IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE DEVELOPMENT; OR iii) CAN BE SECURED OR IMPROVED TO A SUITABLE STANDARD THROUGH AN APPROPRIATE FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION FROM THE DEVELOPERS OR LANDOWNERS. SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE MUST BE PROVIDED IN TIME TO ENSURE CO-ORDINATION BETWEEN THEIR PROVISION AND NEEDS ARISING FROM THE DEVELOPMENT. WHERE APPROPRIATE COMMUTED SUMS TO COVER MAINTENANCE WILL ALSO BE SOUGHT FROM DEVELOPERS OR LANDOWNERS."</b></p> <p><b>Para 4.20 – The sixth sentence should read as follows:</b>  <b>"The Council may also seek commuted payments to cover the costs of maintaining the new facilities and services provided for a period of at least 10 years." Delete remainder of sentence. Add new sentence "The Council will normally ask for these payments to be made before development starts, but on large sites phased payments may be appropriate, tied to the commencement of each phase." Replace "1/97" with "05/2005" in eighth sentence.</b></p>	<p>Council were understood to be proposing to modify the lower case text of its local plan that outdoor playing space maintenance may be required in perpetuity. In the light of this, draft proposed modification 5 (DPM5) was agreed to the Vale local plan para 8.50 to delete the reference to 25 years and to insert "in accordance with policy DC8 and paragraph 4.20. In the case of outdoor playing space this may be required in perpetuity." After the Vale's public inquiry was formally closed, South Oxfordshire District Council formally amended its local plan at para 5.79 to remove the reference to a commuted sum and 25 years but to confirm that the maintenance of outdoor playing space may be required in perpetuity. To address these latter points the Inspector incorporates in his recommendations changes to local plan para 4.20. He retains the reference in the first deposit local plan para 4.20 to commuted payments and "a period of at least 10 years", he deletes the reference to major developments and a maintenance period of 25 years, and he updates the reference to government guidance replacing Circular 1/97 with Circular 05/2005. Circular 05/2005 <i>Planning Obligations</i> states at para B18 that it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the development and that 'such provision may be required in perpetuity'. It is considered that for clarity and completeness reference to this should be made in para 4.20 of the local plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p>a) <b>Accept the Inspector's recommendation to change local plan para 4.20 and policy DC8 for the reasons given in paras 4.9.1, 4.9.2 &amp; 4.9.3 of his report.</b></p> <p>b) <b>In local plan para 4.20 after "...Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations." add a new sentence "This circular advises that the provision for subsequent maintenance of facilities may be required in perpetuity."</b></p>
<b>DC11 – Agricultural Land</b>	
<p><b>Local Plan Para 4.32</b></p> <p>The Inspector notes that policy DC11 is consistent with the most up to date guidance in PPS7. However, to update the local plan he concludes that reference should be made to PPS7 in local plan para 4.32 and all but the first sentence of plan para 4.33 should be deleted as it refers to PPG7.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (page 51 of his report):</b>  <b>Paras 4.32 and 4.33 – Replace reference to PPG7 with PPS7 in para 4.32. Delete para 4.33, with the exception of the first sentence to be added to the end of para 4.32.</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation: As PPG7 has now been superseded by PPS7, accept the Inspector's recommendation to change local plan paras 4.32 and 4.33 for the reasons given in para 4.12.1. of his report.</b></p>
<b>DC13 – Flood Design</b>	
<p>The Inspector comments that policy DC13 as amended should ensure that new development will not be at risk from flooding and that, in conjunction with policy DC14, it should not increase</p>	<p>The draft local plan states where a risk of flooding is identified, mitigation measures must be implemented before development commences. At the inquiry, officers accepted that on larger</p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>flooding elsewhere and that in his view this is in accord with government advice in PPG25. He also notes that mitigation is mentioned in the policy but that in response to objectors' concerns in relation to larger schemes the policy would be better worded if it referred to the nature and timing of mitigation measures being agreed before planning permission is granted.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 54 of his report): policy DC13 reword last sentence as follows: "WHERE DEVELOPMENT IS PERMITTED UNDER THIS POLICY, THE NATURE AND TIMING OF ANY ASSOCIATED MITIGATION MEASURES MUST BE AGREED BEFORE PLANNING PERMISSION IS GRANTED."</b></p>	<p>schemes the mitigation measures may not be required at the outset and that the policy would be better worded if it referred to the nature and timing of mitigation measures being agreed before planning permission is granted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation to change policy DC13 for the reasons given in para 4.14.3. of his report.</b></p>
<p><b>DC18 – Advertisements in Conservation Areas and the North Wessex AONB</b></p>	
<p>The Inspector accepts the Council's proposed 'pre-inquiry change' PIC 4/4 that policy DC19 should refer to the 'special' character of conservation areas.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 57 of his report): Add "SPECIAL" before "CHARACTER" in penultimate line of policy.</b></p>	<p>The Council proposed PIC 4/4 to insert the word 'SPECIAL' before 'CHARACTER' to more accurately reflect Government guidance.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation to change policy DC18 as set out in para 4.20.1 of his report.</b></p>



**CHAPTER 5 - TRANSPORT**

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>Policy TR1 - Integrated Transport Strategy (Abingdon)</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 5.20</u></b></p> <p>The only change the Inspector recommends to this part of the plan is to accept a pre-inquiry change suggested by the Council to delete the fifth sentence of the paragraph which addresses the need to update the text in relation to the A34 study.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (on page 61 of his report):</b> Delete fifth sentence of para 5.20 (PIC 5/1)</p>	<p>This change to para 5.20 of the local plan was put forward by the Council to update the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation (previously advertised as pre inquiry change 5/1) for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.2.1 - 5.2.3 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy TR1– Integrated Transport Strategy (Wantage/Grove)</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paragraphs 5.21 to 5.24</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector endorses the pre-inquiry changes proposed by the Council as recognising the need for the integrated transport and land use study for Wantage and Grove to fully address all the transport issues raised, particularly through the reasoned assessment of alternative road improvement proposals and to provide more up to date information for readers of the plan. As far as it is able, he has no doubt that the study will consider the position of Wantage and Grove within the wider highway network and the implications, if any, of national transport policies and proposals for the area.</p> <p>However the inspector agrees with objectors that the new housing planned for Didcot should also now be mentioned at the end of para 5.22 and he has altered the text accordingly in his recommendation. All other matters relating to potential road improvements in the area arising from the proposed new housing development west of Grove are dealt with under policy H5. The inspector is satisfied that the reference in para 5.23 to the hoped for relief road for Wantage is appropriate as a long term objective, providing that it remains a general reference to a scheme, rather than to any specific route or proposal. In his view, it is reasonable in the circumstances to have a policy seeking contributions towards such provision, even if construction does not commence within the plan period, so that all new development in the locality may be assessed for pro-rata contributions, in accordance with the levels of additional traffic to be generated.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (on pages 62 &amp; 70 of his report):</b> Delete second sentence of para 5.21 (PIC 5/2). Reword paras 5.22 to 5.24 inclusive as follows: "5.22 - The County Council has agreed to establish a Wantage and Grove Area Strategic Transport study which will consider the transport issues arising from the planned growth in the Wantage and Grove area and the connections from Grove and Wantage in their wider context, including the expected</p>	<p>The pre-inquiry changes to paragraphs 5.21 to 5.24 were put forward by the Council to update the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 of his report.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>job growth at Didcot, Milton Park, the Harwell/Chilton campus and the planned housing expansion at Didcot. The major transport issues raised by these developments are also under consideration in phase two of the Didcot Integrated Transport Study (PIC 5/2 amended).</p> <p>5.23 - Grove and Wantage will not be able to absorb the additional traffic generated by the strategic housing site west of Grove without significant improvements in the highway network. It has been a long held objective of the District Council and Wantage Town Council that Wantage should have a relief road for the traffic which exacerbates problems throughout the town, particularly in the historic town centre. These problems are likely to worsen in the future as a result of increasing levels of car ownership, the new development at Grove and the redevelopment of sites in Wantage. Relieving the town of through traffic would provide the opportunity to improve and enhance the town centre and improve its vitality and viability, help retain higher order retail and service facilities and enhance the tourism potential. For these reasons, the Council will pursue its vision of a Wantage relief road scheme and seek contributions towards its provision (PIC 5/2 amended).</p> <p>5.24 The phasing and timing of a relief road scheme will be determined through the Wantage and Grove Area Strategic Transport Study. In accordance with policies DC8 and TR1A, the Council will seek appropriate contributions towards a relief road scheme from new developments within the Wantage and Grove area. The Council will also require development to fund the construction of a new road from the strategic housing site west of Grove to join the A338 north of Grove before the third phase of the strategic housing site can begin." (PIC 5/2 amended)</p> <p>Add new policy TR1A as follows: "CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE SOUGHT FROM DEVELOPMENTS IN THE GROVE AND WANTAGE AREA TOWARDS A WANTAGE RELIEF ROAD SCHEME" (PIC 5/2 amended).</p>	<p>In amending pre inquiry change 5/2 the Inspector, in addition to a number of minor textual changes, also recommends that housing development at Didcot should be mentioned at the end of para 5.22. These changes improve the clarity and accuracy of the plan.</p> <p>The Inspector concludes that it is reasonable that there should be a policy seeking contributions to a relief road scheme so that all new development in the locality may be assessed for pro-rata contributions in accordance with the levels of additional traffic to be generated. It is accepted that it would, in the absence of any specific road line, be appropriate for the policy to refer to a scheme. See also paras 8.16.12 to 8.16.13 of the Inspector's report and policy H5.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3.1 to 5.3.2 of his report.</b></p>

**Policy TR1- Integrated Transport Strategy (Didcot)**

Local Plan Paragraphs 5.25 to 5.28

The Inspector notes that all the issues relating to the Didcot ITS were considered in the joint Inspector's Report of May 2005. In the light of the recommendations and events since then he notes that the Council now proposes a complete revision of paras 5.22 to 5.28 inclusive as discussed at the inquiry. He endorses all of the amendments as providing a more accurate picture of the current situation that should be included in the plan. Also, as a result of more recent information regarding the A34 multi modal study, similar conclusions apply in respect of the Council's proposed changes to para 5.70 (PIC 5/10).

**Inspector's Recommendations (on page 64 of his report):**

**Reword paras 5.25 to 5.28 inclusive as follows: "5.25 - The proposed western development at Didcot (part of which is**

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>located within the Vale) will have significant transport implications for the surrounding area. In 2001 Colin Buchanan and Partners were commissioned jointly by the County Council, this Council and the South Oxfordshire District Council to assess all the transport issues at, or in the vicinity of, Didcot. The assessment was necessary in order to provide a sound basis for advice on transport matters of relevance to the preparation of the local plans in the two districts, including advice on the transport requirements relating to major development sites in the Didcot area. Prior to the Buchanan study, it had already been made clear by the Highways Agency and the County Council that off-site road and other improvements to the transport network would be necessary at the Milton Heights A34 interchange to serve proposed new developments in the vicinity, including the Milton Heights Service Facilities, Milton Park, the Harwell/Chiltern Campus and the housing development west of Didcot. The Buchanan report was produced in February 2002 and provided the technical context for later work on the integrated transport strategy for Didcot.</p> <p>5.26 - The decision to undertake the integrated transport strategy for Didcot was taken in 2002 and the County Council, in association with this Council, South Oxfordshire District Council, Didcot Town and Parish Councils in the area, commissioned the Halcrow Group to progress the study. Work on the development of a strategy started in September 2002. The study area included the major employment sites at Milton Park, Culham Science Park and Harwell International Business Centre, together with the surrounding 21 parishes. In addition to drawing on the findings of the Buchanan study, it had regard to the influences outside the study area, including the various studies on the A34 trunk road and the Oxfordshire Transport Network Review. Phase 1 of the transport strategy was approved by the County Council in April 2004. It identified a large number of relatively small schemes in both Didcot and the surrounding villages which focused on improving road safety, protecting various routes from an increase in traffic, encouraging walking and cycling and promoting the use of public transport. Implementation started on the initial phase of projects in 2004/2005.</p> <p>5.27 - Phase 2 of the transport strategy has the objective of developing a package of more major schemes for the Didcot Area in the context of the planned levels of growth for the area. This includes the housing development at Great Western Park, the employment growth expected at Milton Park and the Harwell International Business Centre and the major new housing development at Grove insofar as it will impact on roads in the Didcot area. The provisional Phase 2 strategy was approved by the County Council in October 2004 and is based on a package of measures which would improve traffic flows at key junctions throughout the area and provide an alternative for some of the east/west movements at the Milton Interchange (A34/A4130). The resulting reduction of congestion at this Interchange would benefit both traffic accessing and leaving the A34. In respect of traffic travelling south and</p>	

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>exiting the A34 during peak hours, queues frequently back up the slip road, onto the main carriageway, which is a major safety issue. The measures proposed in the provisional phase 2 strategy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement to a number of key junctions</li> <li>• A new road between the A4130 and B4493 through or around the new Great Western Park development</li> <li>• Alternative routes for a Harwell bypass between the B4493 and A417</li> <li>• A route from the A417 providing either a Harwell southern bypass or a link to the A4185 which will improve access to the Harwell Business Centre</li> <li>• Initiatives to reduce the reliance on car borne travel.</li> </ul> <p>5.28 - Detailed technical work is currently progressing on developing the provisional strategy. The strategy will also need to be appraised against the output from the stage 1 Wantage and Grove Strategic Transport Study which has recently been completed. The scale and nature of the improvements to the transport network at the Milton Heights A34 Interchange to serve proposed new development in the vicinity will need to be discussed with the highway authority. Account will need to be taken of the recommendations of the Didcot Phase 2 Strategy Study. Access to the service area and land south of Milton Park will be required to be taken from the A4130."</p>	<p>The Inspector has endorsed the further change (proposed by officers at the Inquiry) to paras 5.25 to 5.28 of the local plan as providing a more accurate picture of the current situation of the Didcot ITS. The Inspector did however in his recommendation remove the cross reference to developer funding and policy TR2 which he considered unnecessary.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation (proposed by officers at the Inquiry) for the reasons given in paragraph 5.4.1 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy TR1 – Integrated Transport Strategies (General)</b>	
<p><b>Local Plan paragraph 5.29</b></p> <p>The Inspector at paragraph 5.6.3 of his report considers that the reference in paragraph 5.29 of the local plan, to Circular 1/97 covers the points made about measures being directly and reasonably related to development, but should now be changed to the new Circular 05/2005.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 69 of his report):</b> Replace "1/97" with "05/2005" in para 5.29.</p> <p>The Inspector agrees with the Council's proposed pre-inquiry change that the wording in policy TR1 could be improved by the use of "and/or".</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 69 of his report):</b> Replace "OR" with "AND/OR" in second sentence of policy (PIC 5/3).</p>	<p>The Inspector's recommendation updates this part of the local plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for reasons given in paragraph 5.6.3 of his report.</b></p> <p>This change to the policy was put forward by the Council to allow more flexibility in the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraph 5.6.3 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy TR3 – Cycling and Walking</b>	
<p><b>Local Plan paragraph 5.34</b></p> <p>The inspector sees no reason to disagree with the Council's proposed pre-inquiry change that a new sentence be inserted in</p>	<p>This change to para 5.34 of the local plan was put forward by the Council to encourage the provision of more pedestrian and cycling</p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>para 5.34, referring to the provision of new routes as part of development schemes, with a cross reference to policy DC5.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 76 of his report):</b> Add new third sentence to para 5.34 as follows: "The Council will encourage the provision of pedestrian and cycle routes in new development in the context of policy DC5." (PIC 5/4).</p> <p><b>Local Plan policy TR3</b></p> <p>The joint Inspector's report for the Didcot Inquiry Didcot (May 2005) recommended that this policy should be reinstated to the plan, in a reworded form, to help provide a clear focus on the need to promote and encourage walking and cycling. However, the Inspector considers that there is no need to over complicate the wording, delegate the assessment of schemes to be in accordance with the County Council's Cycling Strategy or duplicate the specific provisions of that strategy in the plan.</p> <p>Individual decisions on new routes and improvements to existing ones are normally a matter for determination at the development control stage in relation to new proposals. Otherwise, they are for the County Council as highway authority to determine via the various integrated transport strategies and/or the overall countywide walking and cycling strategies, rather than this general policy.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (on page 76 of his report):</b> Reinstate policy TR3 as follows "THE NEEDS OF PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS WILL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND IN THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGHWAY AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SCHEMES BY SEEKING THE PROVISION OF SAFE AND CONVENIENT FACILITIES AND SECURE AND COVERED CYCLE PARKING."</p>	<p>facilities .</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation (previously advertised as pre inquiry change 5/4) for the reasons given in paragraph 5.9.2 of his report.</b></p> <p>The re-introduction of the policy will provide consistency with the Didcot Local Plan and help provide a clear focus on the need to promote and encourage walking and cycling.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 5.9.1 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy TR6 – Grove and Kennington Stations</b>	
<p><b>Local Plan Paragraph 5.54</b></p> <p>The addition of the Council's proposed pre inquiry change 5/6 draws attention to the recent Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) document (New Stations: A Guide for Promoters) and acknowledges the obvious need for a detailed evaluation of the project. The Inspector considers that given the present uncertainty surrounding the project, as confirmed by the SRA, this is not only appropriate but as far as the plan is able to go under current circumstances.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (on page 81 of his report):</b> Replace "Grove and Kennington Stations" with "Grove Station" in subtitle. (PIC 5/5).</p> <p><b>Add at end of para 5.54:</b> "The Strategic Rail Authority has recently published guidance entitled 'New stations: A Guide for Promoters' which will be of assistance to all parties involved in the promotion of the new station at</p>	<p>The changes to para 5.54 and deletion of para 5.56 of the local plan were put forward by the Council to accord with the draft deposit of the Structure Plan to 2016 and reflect the fact that Oxfordshire County Council has deleted Kennington Station from its list of proposed rail projects.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation (previously advertised as pre inquiry changes 5/5 and 5/6) for the reasons set out in para 5.12.1 of his report.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>Grove.” (PIC 5/6)</p> <p><b>Local Plan Paragraph 5.56</b></p> <p>The Inspector notes that the reference to reopening Kennington Station has now been omitted from the policy and para 5.56 deleted. This he considers acknowledges the fact that such a scheme cannot be started in the plan period.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 81 of his report):</b> Delete para 5.56 (PIC 5/7)</p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation (previously advertised as pre inquiry change 5/7) for the reasons set out in para 5.12.7 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy TR6A – Public Transport Interchange Facilities</b>	
<p><b>Local Plan paragraph 5.56d</b></p> <p>The Inspector endorsed the Council's proposed pre-inquiry change PIC5/8</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 82 of his report):</b> Add new para 5.56d as follows: “Proposals for Transport Interchanges will be considered in the light of other policies in the local plan including policies in chapter 3 relating to development in the Green Belt and Chapter 4 General Polices for Development.” (PIC 5/8)</p> <p><b>Local Plan paragraph 5.56e</b></p> <p>The Inspector endorses the suggestion, which the Council put forward at the inquiry, that the first sentence of para 5.56e should be amended to more clearly accord with the advice in PPG2 on transport interchanges. “As set out in PPG 2, proposals for park and ride facilities may be acceptable in the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances.”</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (on page 83 of his report):</b></p> <p>Add new para 5.56e as follows; “As set out in PPG 2, proposals for park and ride facilities may be acceptable in the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. All alternative options will have to have been evaluated and any proposals should not conflict with the principles set out in Policy GS3”. (PIC 5/9 amended)</p>	<p>This new para 5.56c was put forward by the Council for completeness and to add clarity to the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraph 5.13.2 of his report.</b></p> <p>This new para 5.56e was put forward by the Council to clarify the plan regarding park and ride facilities in the Green Belt.</p> <p>At the inquiry officers put forward minor amendments to the previously advertised pre inquiry change 5/9 so that it more clearly accorded with the advice in PPG2 on transport interchanges</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraph 5.13.2 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy TR8 – Improving the Highway Network</b>	
<p>As a result of more recent information regarding the A34 multi modal study the Inspector endorses all of the proposed changes to para 5.70 put forward in the Council's pre inquiry changes (PIC 5/10).</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (on page 66 of his report):</b></p> <p><b>Reword para 5.70 as follows: “There are growing problems of congestion on the A34, particularly around Oxford and at many of the interchanges along its length. In 2003 GOSE</b></p>	<p>PIC 5/10 to the plan was put forward by the Council to update the plan. The Inspector has endorsed further changes proposed by officers at the inquiry providing a more accurate picture regarding the A34.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 5.4.1. of his report.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>and SEERA jointly commissioned a 'scoping study' to review the key issues affecting the A34 Corridor and examine the case for a further study and the appropriate scale of that study. The scoping study took a long term strategic view and recommended the need for focused localised studies around South Hampshire and Oxford. The Highways Agency also commissioned an A34 route management study. The resulting draft strategy sets out a 10 year plan for the management and operation of the A34 and provides some short term solutions for making better use of existing capacity and increasing safety. The Department of Transport have made it clear that rather than pressing ahead with further study work in the A34 Corridor now, they consider it would be better for regional partners to consider how the Corridor's potential needs rate against other projects that people are hoping will find a place in the programme over the next few years. This is disappointing, but the County and District Councils will continue to press that local transport needs are taken into account when any decisions are made given that the A34 clearly serves a local as well as national function providing the main access link between major settlements and employment centres.”.</p>	
<b>Policy TR9 – Lorries and Roadside Services</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 5.73</u></b></p> <p>With regard to the range of uses referred to in the text supporting this policy, the Inspector notes that the Council properly points out that the list at the end of para 5.73 is not intended to be exhaustive. He goes on to state that at the inquiry, it became common ground that limited additions to that sentence referring to “breakdown and recovery operations” and “facilities appropriate to a major trunk road service area” would be consistent with both the Council's expectations and the objector's aspirations.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 88 of his report):</b>  <b>Reword last sentence of para 5.73 as follows: “The range of facilities likely to be required in the future includes car, lorry, coach and abnormal load parking, an expanded fuel operation, a breakdown and recovery service, toilet facilities, additional picnic and children's play areas, as well as those appropriate to a major trunk road service area.”</b></p> <p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 5.74</u></b></p> <p>With regard to landscaping of the proposed Milton Service Area, the Inspector notes that the previous local plan Inspector made no reference to the need for extensive landscaping of the northern and/or eastern boundaries of the site allocated for additional service facilities, nor to a significant proportion of the land along the A4130 as remaining undeveloped. Instead, the loss of a relatively small area of open land was deemed acceptable in the light of the overall benefits arising. The Inspector shares that opinion and considers that the latter requirement in particular is now even less justified in view of the committed B1 development on the opposite side of the A4130,</p>	<p>The rewording of the last sentence of para 5.73 proposed by the Inspector would be consistent with the Council's expectations and suggestions put forward by officers at the inquiry.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 5.17.4 and 5.17.6 of his report.</b></p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

<p><b>Summary of the Inspector’s Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b></p>	<p><b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b></p>
<p>which will include the creation of a new signalized access. In his view, once completed, this will materially reduce any public perception of the site as having a rural or semi-rural location.</p> <p>For the same reasons, the insistence on “extensive” landscaping of the northern and eastern boundaries is unnecessarily prescriptive in a situation where the Council seeks to encourage a comprehensive scheme for the whole site. In particular, it could inhibit the scope for the overall design and layout to potentially enhance the character and appearance of the area, including in relation to all of the boundaries. Accordingly, the Inspector considers that the landscaping proposals should form part of the comprehensive scheme, to be considered alongside all other details, rather than being “pre-judged” to an extent, via the supporting text of the policy. To this end, he concurs with the suggestion that the fifth sentence and the words “including extensive landscaping of the northern and eastern boundaries” in the last sentence should be deleted from para 5.74. In his judgement, retention of the second sentence and the remainder of the last one would be sufficient to ensure that any scheme would be likely to achieve the general objectives sought, including in relation to any long distance views from the east of the site.</p> <p><b>Inspector’s Recommendations (on page 88 of this report):</b>  <b>Delete fifth sentence of para 5.74.</b></p> <p><b>Delete “including extensive landscaping of the northern and eastern boundaries” from the end of the last sentence of para 5.74.</b></p>	<p>It is agreed that the wording retained would be sufficient to ensure that any scheme would be likely to achieve the general objectives sought including in relation to any long distances views from the east of the site.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector’s recommendations for reasons set out in paragraphs 5.17.4-5.17.5.</b></p>



**CHAPTER 6 - HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**

<b>Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b>	<b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b>
<b>Policy HE2 – Demolition of Unlisted Buildings in Conservation Areas</b>	
<p>This change recommended by the Inspector was suggested by the Council, as a pre-inquiry change to overcome an objection made by GOSE that policies should not refer to 'the Council as sole decision makers.'</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 90 of his report: Delete 'THE COUNCIL IS SATISFIED THAT' from fourth line (PIC 6/1).</b></p> <p>The Inspector considers that criterion iii of policy HE2, which expects redevelopment proposals involving the demolition of unlisted buildings in conservation areas to always provide substantial community benefit, is unduly onerous and restrictive. In his view the requirement goes beyond improving the outward physical appearance and the requirement of national guidance especially where existing buildings are beyond economic repair.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 90 of his report: Delete 'SUBSTANTIAL COMMUNITY' from the second line of criterion iii).</b></p>	<p>This recommendation was proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change, to delete a reference to the Council as sole decision maker.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 6.2.1 of his report.</b></p> <p>In view of the Inspector's concern that criterion iii) goes beyond Government guidance it is proposed to accept his recommendation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 6.2.2 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy HE13 – Archaeology</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan Paragraph 6.41</u></b></p> <p>This change recommended by the Inspector is similar to that suggested by the Council as a pre-inquiry change. Having deleted the reference to procedures from policy HE13 it was felt helpful and informative for plan users to add a reference to implementation via planning permissions or legal agreements at the end of para. 6.41.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 97 of his report: Add to end of para 6.41</b></p> <p><b>"These requirements may be the subject of planning conditions or legal agreements." (PIC 6/2 amended)</b></p>	<p>The minor changes proposed by the Inspector to refer to 'may' be the subject of a 'legal agreement' (rather than 'will' be the subject to a 'Section 106 agreement') are a more accurate reflection of Government guidance.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 6.13.2 of his report.</b></p>

**CHAPTER 7 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**

<b>Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b>	<b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b>
<b>Introduction and Planning Context</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paragraphs 7.18 &amp; 7.19</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector recommends that for the sake of accuracy this section should be amended to refer to PPS7 and PPS9.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (Page 99 of his report): Paras 7.18 and 7.19 – Replace references to PPG7 and PPG9 with PPS7 and PPS9.</b></p> <p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 7.27</u></b></p> <p>In the light of PPS9 and Circular 06/2005 the Inspector considers that in local plan para 7.27 the statement that applicants "are urged to" consider nature conservation issues may not be strong enough and is not accurate in terms of what is now expected of prospective developers. In plan para 7.27 it should be substituted by 'must'.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (Page 99 of this report): Para 7.27 – Replace "are urged to" with "must" in the fourth sentence.</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 7.1.1 of his report.</b></p> <p>The Inspector's recommendation strengthens the protection that the Council can give to nature conservation interests.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 7.1.2 of his report.</b></p>
<b>NE3 – Geologically Important Sites</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 7.34</u></b></p> <p>Following the comments received on the second deposit plan, the Inspector notes the Council's 'pre-inquiry change' PIC 7/1 to update the information at local plan para 7.34, which lists the names of the nine Regionally Important Geological sites and advises that four are also Sites of Special Scientific Interest.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (Page 102 of his report): Para 7.34 – Reword the last two sentences as follows: "Regionally Important Geological Sites are proposed at Coxwell Pit; Faringdon (Rogers Concrete); The Manger, Whitehorse Hill; Hatford Sand Pit; Gimbro Copse Quarry, Pusey; Dry Sandford Quarries; Tubney Woods; Shellingford Quarry; and Wicklesham Quarry, Faringdon. Four of these sites are also identified as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, see policy NE2 above and list of sites in Appendix 4."</b></p>	<p>Since pre-inquiry change PIC 7/1 was published it has been noted that the number of Regionally Important Geological sites that are Sites of Special Scientific Interest is four not five.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation in para 7.5.2 of his report.</b></p>
<b>NE4 – Other Sites of Nature Conservation Value</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paragraph 7.36</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector accepts the Council's proposed 'pre-inquiry change' PIC 7/2 to local plan para 7.36 to insert a cross reference to Appendix 4 which was added for completeness.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (Page 103 of his report): Para 7.36 – Add "see Appendix 4" after "Vale," at end of fifth sentence.</b></p>	<p>This recommendation confirms the minor pre-inquiry change proposed by the Council.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation in para 7.6.1 of his report to add to local plan para 7.36 a cross reference to Appendix 4.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>NE7 – Area of High Landscape Value</b>	
<p><b>Policy NE7 &amp; local plan paras 7.61 to 7.64</b></p> <p>The Inspector considers that as PPS7 now endorses an approach based on landscape character assessment, the AHLV designation is inconsistent with national guidance, and in these circumstances adopts the Council's suggestion that the AHLV designation should be changed to refer to North Vale Corallian Ridge with the wording of the policy unaltered. In accepting this change the Inspector notes that given the plan policies that apply to the other landscape character areas, it would be equally inconsistent to have no policy at all relating to the North Vale Corallian Ridge. The Inspector also makes consequential changes to the plan text at plan paras 7.61 to 7.64.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (Page 107 of his report):</b> Replace "Area of High Landscape Value" in both policy and title with "Corallian Ridge" after "North Vale".</p> <p>Delete paras 7.61 to 7.64 inclusive. Replace with the first sentence of para 7.61 followed by "The Council has identified the Corallian limestone and sandstone ridge and the adjoining Thames Valley between Buscot and Wytham as an area requiring special care in assessing the visual impact of proposals for development" and the last sentence of para 7.63.</p>	<p>The Government guidance in PPS7 explains (para 24) that criteria based policies should provide sufficient protection for areas of landscape outside nationally designated areas without the need for local designations. In formulating his recommendations, the Inspector has noted the recent advice in PPS7 and that the plan's criteria based policies such as DC6, DC9 and DC11 obviate the need for rigid local designations. The changes to the text he recommends retain the Council's identification of this area as requiring special care in assessing the visual impact of development proposals and its commitment to protecting the North Vale Corallian Ridge from development which would harm its special character. The last sentence of local plan paragraph 7.63 which is retained by the Inspector's recommendation carries a reference to AHLV. The Inspector has indicated that AHLV should be replaced with 'North Vale Corallian Ridge' and for completeness additional change is recommended to the last sentence of local plan paragraphs 7.63, 7.50 and 7.52. Policy NE7, as recommended, seeks to prevent development which would harm the character and appearance of the North Vale Corallian Ridge. In this context it is additionally suggested that the plan text should explain in more detail what is the special character of this area and why special care is required. It is therefore proposed that a new local plan paragraph is inserted after local plan paragraph 7.61. The consequential changes that will be required are detailed in the recommendations below.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept the Inspector's recommendations for the reasons given in paras 7.10.5 &amp; 7.10.6 of his report;</li> <li>In the last sentence of local plan paragraph 7.63 change the reference AHLV to North Vale Corallian Ridge.</li> <li>Insert after para 7.61; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"The North Vale Corallian Ridge has a striking landform with a steep north facing scarp slope separating the clay vale from the Thames valley. In the west the ridge has been dissected by streams, which have eroded steep slopes to hills such as Badbury Hill and Faringdon Folly. The ridge is characterised by woodland, including a significant proportion of ancient woodland, country houses designed to look out over the scarp, villages built of the local coral ragstone, and expansive views."</li> </ul> </li> <li>On the proposals map, policy designation NE7 will need to be renamed 'North Vale Corallian Ridge'.</li> <li>Rename AHLV as 'North Vale Corallian Ridge' as required in the text of the local plan; ie in paras 7.50, 7.52, 7.61.</li> </ol>
<b>NE9 – Lowland Vale</b>	
<p>The Inspector considers that for consistency, the area to which policy NE9 applies should be shown on the proposals map.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (Page 108 of his report):</b> Add definition of area to which policy NE9 applies to the Proposals Map.</p>	<p>This addition is logical and adds to the local plan's clarity.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 7.11.1 of his report.</p>

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>NE12 – Great Western Community Forest</b>	
<p>The Inspector accepts the Council's proposed 'pre-inquiry change' PIC 7/3 to policy NE12 to clarify that development should contribute to woodland creation that must be appropriate to the landscape character of the area.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (Page 112 of his report): Add "APPROPRIATE TO THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER OF THE AREA" after "ENVIRONMENT" in the first sentence.</b></p>	<p>This recommendation confirms the Council's proposed pre-inquiry change.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 7.14.1 of his report.</b></p>

**CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING**

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>Policy H1 – The Managed Release of Sites</b>	
<p><b><u>The Amount of Housing to 2011</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector notes that the Local Plan provides for some 700 more dwellings than are required to meet the Structure Plan requirement to 2011, which he considers to be a small over-provision of around 12%. However, in his experience there is always a long lead in time for major new housing developments, even when outline permission has been granted. He thinks that a more realistic estimate of delivery on the Grove site would be 500 dwellings by 2011, not 750 as anticipated. Bearing in mind the uncertainty surrounding a reliance on just three major sites (Grove, Didcot and Faringdon) to provide a large percentage of the housing required, he is not satisfied that any lesser degree of over provision from that originally intended is justified. Although it carries little weight, he notes that the Barker Review suggests that an over-provision of 20%-40% may be required to ensure the delivery of sufficient completions. He concludes that some limited new allocations are required.</p> <p>The Inspector considers that two of the three safeguarded sites at Botley are available for development and should be allocated for housing in the plan. He also considers the site at the Red House/Winslow in Faringdon should be allocated for housing and an increased number of houses should be allowed on the former Dow site at Letcombe Regis. These are considered in more detail under policies H3, H8 and H9 below.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 121 of his report): Table 8.1 – Update and amend Table 8.1 and para 8.11 to a new April 2005 database and to reflect the recommendations in this report, including 500 (rather than 750) new dwellings at Grove by 2011 (policy H5) and an additional 280 dwellings at Botley (policy H3).</b></p>	<p>It is regrettable that the Inspector has reached the conclusion that more land needs to be identified for housing. However, given the long time delay in bringing forward completions at Great Western Park (Didcot), which is required to provide 500 dwellings in the Vale by 2011, the Inspector's caution is understandable. Adding in the additional 383 dwellings recommended by the Inspector would give a potential over-supply of just over 900 dwellings to 2011 which is a 16% over provision in relation to the fifteen year requirement to 2011. PPG3 (para 6.8) indicates that local plans should be for a period of 10 years from the date of adoption.</p> <p>Since the inquiry closed the Oxfordshire Structure Plan to 2016 has been adopted. This requires 7150 dwellings be provided in the Vale over 15 years, which is a higher rate of provision than the Structure Plan to 2011 (5750 dwellings over 15 years). This increases the average build rate from 383 to 477 dwellings a year. Any over provision in this plan to 2011 will count towards the new Structure Plan to 2016. Indeed on the basis of land already identified, plus the Inspector's recommendations, phase 2 of Grove and a modest allowance for small unidentified sites, the land supply in the Vale will be some 500 dwellings short of the Structure Plan requirement to 2016.</p> <p>A robust land supply will mean that the Council has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more time to negotiate on the planning application for the major site at Grove to ensure a well designed, comprehensive and sustainable scheme</li> <li>• a better chance of defending appeals on sites which do not comply with the local plan strategy for the location of development</li> <li>• more time to prepare a site allocations development plan document under the new system.</li> </ul> <p>Even though Great Western Park at Didcot could deliver a further 200 dwellings in the Vale in addition to the figures above, the Advisory Group is minded to accept the Inspector's view that some limited new allocations are required for the reasons set out above and section 8.2 of the Inspector's Report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: The Inspector's recommendation to update table 8.1 and para 8.11 to an April 2005 base be accepted. The table also be amended to reflect the Council's decision in relation to the additional allocations and increased densities recommended by the Inspector.</b></p> <p><b>Please note: The Inspector's recommendations for the sites at Botley, Faringdon, Grove and Letcombe Regis are considered in relation to his recommendations for policies H3, H4, H5 and H8 below.</b></p> <p><b>For consistency consequential changes should also be made to Table 8.2 and other relevant paragraphs in the plan.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p><b><u>The Managed Release of Sites</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector considers that the unanticipated delays in the commencement of large housing sites and the plan's short timescale means that the phasing approach is already "passed its sell-by date" and is no longer required. Bearing in mind the need to avoid a repeat of the low building rate achieved in recent years, the Inspector considers the phasing proposals are not consistent with the objective of helping avoid a repeat of the low building rates achieved in recent years. He recommends deleting references to the phasing proposals in policies H1-H6 and para 8.15.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 124 of his report): Policy H1 - delete "AND THEIR RELEASE WILL BE PHASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TIMESCALES SET OUT" from the end of the policy and para 8.15. Similar deletions should also be made to policies H2 to H6 inclusive. Para 8.15 – Delete.</b></p> <p>The Inspector also considers that the Council must take responsibility for helping to ensure that the relevant number of dwellings are built in the plan period, and there must be a commitment to positive action if monitoring reveals a shortfall. In his opinion the reference to monitoring in para 1.15 of the Introduction to the plan lacks detail and could be supplemented by SPG setting out how the Council will monitor completions, what information will be publicised and the actions the Council will take in the event of a material shortfall being identified. As it was not a matter specifically before the Inquiry the Inspector puts this forward as a suggestion only.</p>	<p>When the plan was published in 2002 the phasing proposals for pre and post 2006 were logical and consistent with Government advice about the managed release of sites. However, it is accepted that by the time the plan is adopted the phasing proposals relating to 2006 are no longer needed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in 8.4.1-8.4.3 of his report.</b></p> <p>Under the new arrangements for preparing development plans the Council has to publish an Annual Monitoring Report. This has to contain a housing trajectory which projects the net additional dwellings up to the end of the period covered by the development plan document. The Annual Monitoring Report also has to set out the reasons why policies are not being met and whether policies need adjusting or changing. The actions that may need to be taken to help remedy any shortfall are likely to be different for different sites and therefore cannot be included in the plan at this stage. However, there would be no harm in including a reference to the publication of an Annual Monitoring Report in paragraph 1.15 as it is a matter of fact.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Refer to the production of the Annual Monitoring Report in paragraph 1.15 of the Local Plan to reflect a matter of fact.</b></p>
<b>Policy H3 – Botley</b>	
<p><b><u>Land South of Lime Road</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector considers that no material harm would arise in visual or landscape terms for the locality or the setting of Oxford if land south of Lime Road were developed with two storey dwellings (see attached plan). He notes that as safeguarded land it is suitable in principle for development, and its development would accord with the overall strategy of the plan and the PPG3 search sequence. It is in a highly sustainable location close to a wide range of services and facilities. He notes the County Council's view that 130 dwellings could be built without material effect on the local road network. He concludes that it is not logical that the most sustainable site in the district (according to the Council's assessments) should not be allocated when additional land is required and he</p>	<p>The site at Lime Road, Botley has been identified in the Council's comparative assessment of sites on the edges of the five main settlements (May 2002) as the most sustainable site in the district. As it is not in the Green Belt but has been safeguarded for future development, and as it is partly a brownfield site, officers consider that if the Council accepts that additional land should be identified for housing development in this local plan this site should be allocated. The site covers approximately 3.6 hectares and 130 dwellings represents an average density of 36 dwellings a hectare. Given the mature trees on the site which should be retained and the access through existing residential roads the guideline figures of 130 dwellings is reasonable. A plan showing the site is at the end of the Appendix containing the</p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>recommends its allocation. (See the recommendation below.)</p> <p><b><u>Land South of the A420 either side of Tilbury Lane</u></b></p> <p>Again the Inspector notes that Botley is well served with jobs, services and facilities, has good public transport to Oxford, and that the site either side of Tilbury Lane scored very highly in the Council's sustainability analysis. This is despite it being principally grade 2 farmland. Access could be made available from Fogwell Road to the west.</p> <p>In landscape and visual terms the Inspector considers that the site is seen largely in the context of the A420 and the overhead pylon line, and that as new building need project no further north than the existing housing to the west and east this would limit any harmful impact on the landscape surrounding the settlement. He considers that the hedges along both sides of Tilbury Lane should be retained and enhanced with the allotments to the south. He does not agree with the previous Inspector that the site adds much to the rural setting of the north side of the settlement.</p> <p>Taking into account the evidence in PPS7 and his conclusion that more land must be identified to meet the Structure Plan requirements, the Inspector concludes that the agricultural land quality (grade 2) of this relatively small area is not such a critical constraint as to override all other material considerations in this instance. As the site could provide new dwellings in the early part of the plan period he recommends the site be allocated for housing.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 135 of his report):</b>  <b>Policy H3 - add: "iv) LAND SOUTH OF THE A420 (BOTH SIDES OF TILBURY LANE) – 150" and "v) LAND SOUTH OF LIME ROAD – 130". Amend Proposals Map (Botley Inset) to add: "H3 iv) LAND SOUTH OF THE A420 (BOTH SIDES OF TILBURY LANE)" and "H3 v) – LAND SOUTH OF LIME ROAD" as allocations for new residential development.</b></p>	<p>proposed modifications.</p> <p>In the Council's assessment of alternative sites (May 2002) this was the third highest scoring site in the district after Lime Road and Grove airfield (assuming improved facilities). It was noted that high quality farmland was a 'critical' (but not absolute) constraint. PPS7, paragraph 28, states that 'the presence of best and most versatile agricultural land .... should be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations..... when determining planning applications'. This is a lesser degree of protection than afforded in the old PPG7.</p> <p>As the allotments are a valued and well used facility the inspector's conclusion to omit the allotments from the area he recommends for housing is welcomed. 150 dwellings on 3.8 hectares represents a density of 40 dwellings a hectare which given the need for landscaping, is an acceptable guideline figure. As it is in a highly sustainable location that has been safeguarded for future use, officers consider that if the Council decides to identify additional land for housing, this site should be allocated. A plan showing the site is at the end of the Appendix containing the proposed modifications.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation to allocate two additional housing sites at Lime Road and Tilbury Lane, Botley for the reasons set out in section 8.2 and paragraphs 8.7.2-8.7.19 of his report.</b></p>

## Policy H4 - Faringdon

### The Former Nursery Site

Despite objectors' views to the contrary, the Inspector concludes there are no alternative locations around Faringdon for the siting of new development that would be preferable in landscape/visual terms. In his view the site is the most sustainable location for new development in Faringdon at present, particularly in view of the anticipated benefits of new employment land in a commercially attractive location, well related to the local road network, and the major expansion of Folly Park in a prominent and environmentally sensitive location. He agrees that vehicular access should be from Park Road only. He endorses the allocation of the land for some 400 new

The confirmation of this allocation is welcomed. While the phasing proposals were useful when the plan was first published, as the plan will be adopted after April 2006 it is accepted that they are no longer necessary. Since the inquiry closed the Structure Plan 2011 has been replaced by that to 2016. In this context it is accepted that the reference to the Structure Plan provisions not being exceeded is no longer relevant.

**Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 8.9.11 of his report. Consequential changes will also be required to paragraph**

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>houses, but in view of his conclusions on housing land supply sees no need for the policy to refer to the phasing proposals before and after 2006 or to refer to the Structure Plan requirement not being significantly exceeded.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 142 of his report):</b>  <b>Policy H4 - delete second sentence and second sentence preceding part v) regarding phasing and the fourth sentence of para 8.22.</b></p> <p><b><u>Land at Winslow and the Red House</u></b></p> <p>This site of 1.3 hectares on the eastern side of Coxwell Road includes two houses known as Winslow and the Red House as well as a conifer plantation and open land. The Inspector considers that the site is seen largely in the context of the existing built up area of the town rather than as part of the open countryside. He also considers that the somewhat alien conifers are in poor condition, reaching the end of their useful life, and he does not accept they preclude consideration of the site for residential development. The Inspector concludes that taking into account the visual impact of the tennis courts and associated buildings permitted on the opposite side of Coxwell Road, the development of this partly brownfield site would not be unduly intrusive in landscape terms. It would also provide a useful addition to the number of new dwellings to be built to 2011, in a sustainable location, without extending the built up area into open countryside. He considers that development on this site would facilitate the creation of a new, firm, consistent and defensible boundary to this part of the settlement.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 150 of his report):</b>  <b>Allocate land at Winslow and The Red House, Coxwell Road, Faringdon for new housing under policy H4 iv) (37 dwellings estimated).</b></p>	<p><b>8.22 of the local plan.</b></p> <p>This site has an extensive planning history. It was suggested by the Council as being a suitable housing site in the currently adopted local plan (November 1999). At that inquiry the local plan Inspector concluded that the development should not extend as far south as the southern extremity of the Red House site and that the plantation should remain free of development. He considered any new building should be confined to the site of the existing dwellings, outbuildings and greenhouses, but he questioned whether this would be an effective use of development land or justify the environmental harm that would be caused. In the event he recommended the site should not be allocated for housing development in the plan. Since then the Council has won an appeal against the refusal of 4 dwellings on the Winslow site. A plan showing the site is at the end of the Appendix containing the proposed modifications.</p> <p>Given the changes in circumstances since the previous Inspector's report: namely the deterioration of the conifer plantation, the construction of houses and the permission for the tennis courts on the opposite side of Coxwell Road, officers accept that the landscape context for this site has changed in recent years. As development in Faringdon is consistent with the general strategy for the location of development in the plan, officers are inclined to accept his recommendation.</p> <p>The estimated number of dwellings reflects a density of 30 dwellings a hectare which is lower than that normally sought on sites within the five main settlements. However, as the development of this site will require landscaping particularly on its southern boundary an estimated net gain of 37 dwellings is a reasonable figure to include on the plan. It is noted that the Red House is now called Coxwell House and the name should be changed accordingly.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in paragraphs 8.10.9-8.10.13 of his report.</b>  <b>The reference to the Red House should be changed to Coxwell House to reflect the current name of the property.</b></p>
<b>Policy H5 – Strategic Housing Site West of Grove</b>	
<p><u>Strategic considerations and mix and type of dwellings</u></p>	
<p>The Inspector endorses the strategic choice of the former</p>	<p>Noted. If the Council accepts a change to policy H16 on</p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006



Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>airfield west of Grove as a major new allocation in the plan. He considers it is a sustainable location in PPG3 terms and is consistent with the Oxfordshire Structure Plan to 2016 which was in draft form at the time of the inquiry. Although it would result in a large addition at Grove, the Inspector considers it provides the opportunity to create a better serviced, integrated and more sustainable community which should help reduce the need to travel. He considers that providing that public transport is also improved before or at the same time as the local road network, it is appropriate for identification as a housing site beyond 2011. He acknowledges that none of the other main settlements in the Vale offers the same opportunity for a major sustainable urban extension. However, as the Inspector recommends that the amount of affordable housing sought should be 40% (rather than 50%) in policy H16; he recommends that consequential changes be made to policy H5 to also refer to 40% (sections 8.1, 8.13 and 8.14 of the Inspector's report).</p> <p><u>General Considerations</u></p> <p>The Inspector considers that it should be possible to ensure that the development is well integrated with the existing settlement in physical, visual and social terms. He notes the site is not subject to any designations to protect wildlife interest, and that although there is some grade 3A farmland the majority of the site is not classed as best and most versatile. He is satisfied that the site is not within an indicative floodplain and that an application will require a flood risk assessment. He sees no reason to preclude the allocation in relation to on-site flooding or surface water drainage concerns (section 8.12 of the Inspector's report).</p> <p><u>The Provision of Services</u></p> <p>In relation to the provision of services on the site the Inspector is content that the policy is both comprehensive and entirely appropriate for the overall scale of development envisaged (para 8.5.3 of the Inspector's report). However, because of the importance of assessing all potential requirements at the outset he agrees that reference should be made to cemetery space and allotment land in para 8.28 of the local plan. The specific detail of community provision he considers may safely be left to the SPG and the development control process. For consistency with policy DC8 and paragraph 4.20 he considers the penultimate sentence of paragraph 8.33 should be deleted (this refers to commuted sums for maintenance covering 25 years). He also considers that for clarity the words 'among others' and 'among other things' should be omitted from the policy (para 8.15.4 of the Inspector's report).</p> <p>On the basis that there are employment opportunities available locally (including at Grove Technology Park) and that existing employment sites are retained, the Inspector considers there is sufficient employment land available to 2011. He emphasises the issue should be thoroughly reconsidered for the period after 2011 in the review of this plan (paras 8.15.6 – 8.15.7).</p> <p>The Inspector acknowledges that the term 'facilities for teenagers' is rather imprecise, but considers the specific details can be resolved via SPG and is one of the matters that could</p>	<p>affordable housing then a consequential change should be made to policy H5 for consistency.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>It is reasonable to include a reference to cemeteries and allotments in the lower case text to ensure all requirements are considered at the outset.</p> <p>These minor wording changes are accepted for clarity.</p> <p>Noted</p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>reasonably be considered via the proposed Development Forum (para 8.15.9).</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>Subject to detailed wording changes the Inspector is satisfied that policy H5 and paras 8.29 and 8.29a provide a robust and practical framework within which the detailed implementation of necessary highway improvements and traffic management measures may be resolved on a phased basis (para 8.16.20 of the Inspector's report). For the new road north of Grove the Inspector considers that sufficient land exists for a road to be designed so that the listed buildings at Monks Farm and Grove Wick Farm need not be materially harmed (para 8.16.2). However, he does not think it necessary to refer to the road joining the A338 south of Bellinger's Garage as it would restrict the highway design options to be considered in the light of the outcome of WAGASTS phase two (para 8.16.4).</p> <p>In the interests of clarity and certainty to all concerned he considers that the policy should state that no more than 1500 dwellings should be built before the new road is completed (para 8.16.21)</p> <p>The Inspector has no objections to the Council's proposed change to add Harcourt Way to the list of roads referred to in part xv a) of the policy (to minimise traffic from the development using these roads) to assist clarity (para 8.16.7).</p> <p>The Inspector fully endorses the need to increase the attractiveness of the southern link to the A338 via Mably Way which in his view should be the principal link in the first phase of the development. He considers the realignment of Denchworth Road south of Grove, or a suitable alternative road as suggested by the Council in the further proposed changes made before the inquiry to be an essential component of the first phase of the development (8.16.8 – 8.16.9).</p> <p>The Inspector is content that the policy's general reference to seeking contributions to a Wantage relief road is necessary and appropriate. He notes that the policy for the Wantage relief road should not normally be included in the plan because it does not relate to an agreed scheme with a defined route. However, he recognises the omission of the policy might result in an inability to seek appropriate contributions to necessary highway improvements arising from this major development. However, he considers that only the final outcome of WAGASTS and the new local transport plan can determine whether or not extensions to Mably Way are the best solution. Accordingly he recommends that contributions are sought to a generalised Wantage relief road scheme, rather than a specific proposal (8.16.12 – 8.16.15).</p> <p>The Inspector recognises that while the re-opening of Grove rail station is highly desirable, it is not an essential prerequisite of the allocation. However, he considers it is difficult to overstate the importance of providing improvements to public transport services, particularly to the local employment areas (8.16.16 – 8.16.17).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>It is accepted that it is appropriate that the detailed alignment of the new road north of Grove and its junction with the A338 be considered in the light of the WAGASTS phase 2. The local plan should be changed accordingly in the light of the Inspector's recommendations.</p> <p>This addition is welcomed for the reasons given by the Inspector.</p> <p>The Inspector's acceptance of the Council's proposed change is welcomed.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The Inspector's support for a Wantage relief road is welcomed and the recommended reference to a relief road scheme, in the absence of a firm route, is sensible and logical.</p> <p>Noted</p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p><b>Inspector's recommendations (on pages 178 – 179 of his report):</b></p> <p><b>Para 8.23 - Replace '750' with firstly '500' and secondly '1,000' in last sentence.</b></p> <p><b>Policy H5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delete 'START AFTER 1 APRIL 2006 AND' from policy wording.</li> <li>- Replace '750' with '500' and delete '1 APRIL' from part i) of policy.</li> <li>- Replace '50%' with '40%' in part iii) of policy and at start of third sentence of para 8.25.</li> <li>- Add 'OR AN ALTERNATIVE ROAD' before 'SOUTH' in line 1 of part xiv) Add 'or the provision of an alternative road' after 'Denchworth Road' to fifth sentence of para 8.29.</li> <li>- Reword part xiv a) of policy H5 as follows 'A NEW ROAD FROM THE SITE TO THE A338 NORTH OF GROVE TO BE STARTED EARLY IN THE SECOND PHASE OF DEVELOPMENT AND COMPLETED BEFORE ANY MORE THAN 1,500 DWELLINGS IN TOTAL HAVE BEEN BUILT ON THE SITE' (PIC 8/2 amended).</li> <li>- Delete 'AMONG OTHERS' from part xv a) of policy H5 and 'AMONG OTHER THINGS,' from part xv c) of policy H5.</li> <li>- Add 'HARCOURT WAY' after 'ROAD' in point 1 of part xv a) of policy H5.</li> <li>- Replace 'A NEW ROAD FROM MABLY WAY TO THE A417 EAST OF' with 'A RELIEF ROAD SCHEME FOR' in point 5 of part xv a) of policy H5 (PIC 8/4 amended).</li> </ul> <p><b>Add 'and cemetery space' after 'land' in last sentence of para 8.28.</b></p> <p><b>Para 8.29a – Reword as follows after first and second sentences: 'Excellent footpath and cycle and public transport links to the rest of Grove will need to be created</b></p>	<p>In the Inspector's consideration of the amount of housing to be provided to 2011 he concludes that there is always a significant time delay in achieving completion on large sites. Given the experience of Great Western Park, it would be difficult to mount a convincing argument to disagree with his recommendation to reduce the first phase of the development from 750 dwellings to 2011 to 500. A figure of 500 dwellings to be completed in the first phase to 2011 will also reduce pressure to ensure the development commences early, potentially allowing more time to plan and secure infrastructure provision, which has been a significant stumbling block at Great Western Park.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: accept the Inspector's recommendation to amend the phasing of the Grove site for the reasons given above and paragraphs 8.2.4 and 8.4.2 – 8.4.3 of his report.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: If the Council accepts the change to policy H16 seeking 40% rather than 50% affordable housing then the consequential changes recommended by the Inspector to policy H5 should be accepted for consistency.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 8.16.9 of his report.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in paras 8.16.4 and 8.16.21 of his report/</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 8.15.4 of his report.</b></p> <p>This was the change proposed by the Council for completeness and clarity.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 8.16.7 of his report.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in paras 8.16.13 – 8.16.15 in his report.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>and improvements to the Mably Way/A338 junction provided to increase the attractiveness of the southern link to the A338 in the first phase of the development to 2011 (500 dwellings). The second phase from 2011 to 2016 (1,000 dwellings) will include traffic management measures to seriously deter vehicles from using the existing roads within Grove. A new road from the site to the A338 north of Grove will be required to be started early in the second phase of development and completed before any more than 1,500 dwellings in total have been built on the site. In the third phase of the development from 2016 to 2021 (1,000 dwellings) it will also be necessary for contributions to be made towards the construction of a new relief road scheme for Wantage, the routing, phasing and timing of which will be determined through the Wantage and Grove Area Strategic Transport Strategy (see policy TR1A in chapter 5).' (PIC 8/1 amended).</p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 8.15.4 of his report.</b></p> <p>This paragraph amends pre-inquiry change 8/1 together with the changes recommended by the Inspector to the phasing of development on the site, the greater clarity introduced to the phasing of the road north of Grove and the Wantage relief road scheme. If the changes to policy H5 and its supporting text are accepted, consequential changes will be needed to this paragraph.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in section 8.16 of his report.</b></p>

### Policy H7 – Major Development West of Didcot

<p>Listed below are the recommendations from the Joint Inspectors' Report relating to major development at Didcot that apply to the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011. Not listed are those recommendations that apply only to South Oxfordshire's Local Plan. Please note that in this section relating to H7 references to paragraphs and pages are from the joint report.</p> <p><b>Local plan Appendix 5</b></p> <p>The Inspectors note the importance which the Councils and the County Council attach to the Didcot Area Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) and consider that any transport strategy or proposals for the development area need to be consistent with this ITS and an appropriate reference in the supporting text would be helpful.</p> <p><b>Inspectors' recommendation no. 3 (see pages 49 and 105 of joint report); Appendix 5(v) – Add to the first sentence after "Strategy": "consistent with the objectives of the Didcot Area ITS,"</b></p> <p><b>Local plan para 8.36 &amp; Fig 8.1</b></p> <p>The Inspectors noted in para 11.2.16 that the revised Fig 8.1 included some 12 ha in the north west to allow for playing fields. They reported that a development masterplan indicated that playing fields can be accommodated at other locations but noted, in para 11.2.17, that these locations have not yet been shown to be adequate and it would be sensible to retain some</p>	<p>Members will recall that the joint Inspectors' Report relating to major housing development west of Didcot and the recommendations detailed below were considered at the Executive of 7 October 2005.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspectors' recommendation no. 3 to amend Appendix 5(v) for the reasons given in para 11.1.9 of the joint report.</b></p> <p>The revision to the MDA boundary in Fig. 8.1 agreed at second deposit includes this area of playing fields. The suggested wording clarifies the position. For completeness it should be noted that the Fig. 8.1 boundary as revised is accepted by the Inspectors in para 11.2.22 of the joint report, see their</p>
---	---

#### The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>flexibility in terms of layout which would be offered by retaining this north western area.</p> <p><b>Inspectors' recommendation no. 5 (see pages 61 and 105 of joint report);</b>  <b>Add a new 7<sup>th</sup> sentence to paragraph 8.36 (VWHLP), after the sentence referring to Fig 8.1 to read –</b>  <b>"It includes a 12ha field in the north-western corner which is to be considered as a reserve allocation, solely for the purpose of accommodating playing fields, if such a facility cannot be located elsewhere within the area."</b>  <b>Revise fig 8.1 by annotating the field in the north-west part of the major development area as 'Possible Location for Playing Fields'.</b></p> <p><b>Inspectors' recommendation no. 6 relating to policy H7 i), (see pages 65 and 105 of joint report). See text in right hand column.</b></p> <p><b><u>Local Plan para 8.42</u></b></p> <p>The Inspectors consider that the mix of house types in local plan paragraph 8.42 is appropriate but that the last type should additionally refer to properties with 4 bedrooms or more.</p> <p><b>Inspectors' recommendation no. 7 (see pages 68 and 105 of joint report); Add "and larger" at the end of the second sentence of paragraph 8.42.</b></p> <p><b><u>Policy H7 (vii)</u></b></p> <p>The Inspectors explain in joint report para 11.2.121 that they accepted that no more than 62 ha are required for greenspace and that H7 (vii) should be amended accordingly from 74 to 62 ha. The Inspectors note in joint report para 11.2.119 that the area had been increased from 62 to 74 ha in order to allow for the provision of playing fields in the north west. The Inspectors explain that an overall density of 40 dwellings per hectare should be achieved. They comment in joint report para 11.2.121 that this is likely to lead to a revised layout for the development but that it seems sensible to retain the flexibility offered by the north western area.</p> <p><b>Inspectors' recommendation no. 8 (see pages 83 and 105 of joint report); Replace "74" with "62" in the first line of policy H7 (vii).</b></p> <p><b>Inspectors' recommendation no. 9 (see pages 83 and 105 of joint report); Add to the end of paragraph 8.50 a new sentence;</b></p>	<p>recommendation no. 4. on pages 61 and 105.  Note: At the time of this report, the planning application for this development has been appealed but the date of the appeal inquiry has been deferred until November 2006 to allow for negotiations on the planning application to continue.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspectors' recommendation no.5 to amend local plan para 8.36 Appendix 5(v) and fig 8.1 for the reasons given in para 11.1.9 of the joint report.</b></p> <p>For completeness, policy H7 i) is considered by the Inspectors' joint report at paragraph 11.2.52 and in their recommendation no. 6 ( see pages 65 and 105). In summary, this confirms the area for housing as 80 hectares and an average net density of 40 dwellings per hectare. The local plan, as revised, already contains these figures.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Noted</b></p> <p>The Inspectors explain in joint report para 11.2.63 that this change to local plan para 8.42 will offer a certain amount of flexibility which is accepted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspectors' recommendation no.7 to amend local plan para 8.42 for the reasons given in para 11.2.63 of the joint report.</b></p> <p>This change to 62 hectares of public greenspace returns the figure to that shown originally in the first deposit draft. The figure had been increased to 74 ha by 12 ha to allow for the location of the playing fields on the flat land in the north west of the MDA. (See response to recommendation no. 5, paras.8.36 – 8.40 above). The Inspectors were shown the consortium's masterplan which indicates there is no need to include this additional area of land. This is not accepted by both Councils but both Councils &amp; the Inspectors accepted that at a density of 40 dph (See response to recommendation no. 6 to policy H7 criterion (i) &amp; paragraph 8.41, re. average net density above) no more than 62 ha are required for public openspace. The Inspectors also accepted that if the 12 ha were not required for playing fields they should remain in agricultural use. Agreed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspectors' recommendations nos.8 and 9 to amend policy H7 (vii) and local plan para 8.50 for the reasons given in para 11.2.119 – 11.2.121 of the joint report.</b></p>

## The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p><b>"The boundary of the MDA shown on Figure 8.1 includes a field in the north-western corner which may be necessary to accommodate playing fields if suitable land cannot be found elsewhere on the site. If it is not required for this purpose the land should not be developed and should remain in agricultural use".</b></p> <p><b><u>Local Plan para 8.50</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector comments that the evolution of policy DC8, particularly 'pre-inquiry changes' PICs 4/2 and 4/3, reflects not only the objections to this plan but the recommendations in the Joint Inspector's Report on Didcot and the response of South Oxfordshire District Council as well as the replacement of Circular 1/97 with Circular 05/2005. Given this context the Inspector recommends minor changes to the wording of policy DC8. The Inspector also recommends changes to local plan para 4.20. He confirms that the Council may seek commuted payments to cover maintenance costs for at least ten years but deletes the reference to major developments and a maintenance period of 25 years.</p> <p><b><u>Policy H7 ix)</u></b></p> <p>The Inspectors noted that the term 'inter alia' presupposes that contributions will be justified for all the listed items. As this may not prove to be the case in practice the Inspectors recommend a modest rewording to make the policy less prescriptive.</p> <p><b>Inspectors' recommendation no. 10 (see pages 86 and 105 of joint report); Replace "inter alia" with "where appropriate" in policy H7.</b></p> <p><b><u>Policy H7 xi)</u></b></p> <p>The Inspectors noted that although H7 was the primary policy to guide the development of Didcot West, other relevant policies also apply and that it would be appropriate to cross refer.</p> <p><b>Inspectors' recommendation no. 11 (see pages 94 and 105 of joint report); Add to the first line of criterion (xi) after "infrastructure": "IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY TR1 AIMED AT ENCOURAGING SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRAVEL AND</b></p>	<p>Members will recall that the Joint Inspector's Report about Didcot (May 2005) did not address the issue of the time period for commuted payments but in considering the Joint Report (SLAG 31 August 2005), it was noted that South Oxfordshire District Council were understood to be proposing to modify the lower case text of its local plan that outdoor playing space maintenance may be required in perpetuity.</p> <p>In the light of this, draft proposed modification 5 (DPM5) was agreed to the Vale local plan para 8.50 to delete the reference to 25 years and to insert "in accordance with policy DC8 and paragraph 4.20. In the case of outdoor playing space this may be required in perpetuity". These comments cross refers to the section that deals with policy DC8 and local plan para 4.20.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: local plan para 8.50, delete "for a period of 25 years" and insert "in accordance with policy DC8 and paragraph 4.20. In the case of outdoor playing space this may be required in perpetuity".</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspectors' recommendation no.10 to amend policy H7 ix) for the reasons given in para 11.2.132 – 11.2.133 of the joint report.</b></p> <p>Local plan Paragraph 1.10 explains that the local plan needs to be read as a whole but this recommendation to amend policy H7 xi) clarifies the matter further.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspectors' recommendation no.11 to amend policy H7 xi) for the reasons given in para 11.2.149 of the joint report.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p><b>REDUCING THE NEED TO TRAVEL BY CAR"</b></p> <p><b>Local Plan Paragraph 8.51</b></p> <p>The Inspectors explain in para 11.2.166 that they are disappointed not to be able to recommend specific highway schemes relevant to the MDA and commented that they could do no more than recommend the addition of detailed guidelines to criterion xi).</p> <p><b>Inspectors' recommendation no. 12 and 13 (see pages 95 and 105 of joint report); Reword the second and third sentences of para. 8.51 to read:</b></p> <p><b>"Criterion (xi) will secure this objective by providing appropriate on and off-site transport infrastructure. The highway authority and the Highways Agency will advise on the transport measures required. These measures will be identified through the development of an integrated transport strategy for the Didcot area, having regard to the following objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reduce reliance on the use of the private car by improving choices available to meet transport needs within Didcot and between Didcot and the surrounding settlements;</li> <li>• To increase accessibility to facilities for those without cars and/or with mobility impairment;</li> <li>• To identify and provide a safe, continuous and high quality network of pedestrian and cycle routes</li> <li>• To promote road safety and reduce the number and severity of road casualties;</li> <li>• To promote efficient highway management including the identification of transport infrastructure as appropriate, and parking demand and supply;</li> <li>• To improve provision for interchange between all modes of transport; and</li> <li>• To relieve traffic congestion where it is causing significant amenity or environmental problems."</li> </ul> <p>The District Councils and Oxfordshire County Council should urgently consider the detailed options for an A4130 to A417 link, to include a Harwell by-pass. For the section between the A4130 and the B4493, this link should not require additional land outside the boundary of the MDA."</p> <p>Rec no. 14 refers to TR3 – check with GAM</p>	<p>In the context of the above and in view of the importance the Council attaches to the consideration of the detailed options for a Harwell bypass to carry traffic from all developments in the Didcot area, the addition of these guidelines to local plan para 8.51 is proposed to be accepted and a new paragraph added to clarify the Council's position.</p> <p><b>Recommendations;</b></p> <p>a) <b>Accept the Inspector's recommendations nos. 12 and 13 to reword local plan para 8.51 for the reasons given in para 11.2.166 of the joint report.</b></p> <p>b) <b>After local plan para 8.51 insert a new paragraph ;</b>  <b>"The Council, together with South Oxfordshire District Council and the County Council, will be seeking the progression of measures identified in phase 2 of the provisional strategy as a matter of urgency. The provisional strategy proposes a range of transport measures which include a Harwell bypass in order to alleviate the impact of traffic arising from developments in the Didcot area. The Council considers that the provision of a Harwell bypass is a priority."</b></p>
<b>Policy H8 – Housing Sites in the Villages</b>	
<p>The Inspector notes there was considerable debate at the inquiry in relation to the detailed estimates of numbers of dwellings expected on each site listed in policy H8. Also</p>	<p>The Inspector's recommendation to delete policy H8, apart from the two sites without planning permission, is acceptable. It will help avoid misunderstandings that these sites have been</p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>debated was whether the policy was needed at all given that all but two of the sites (Dow at Letcombe Regis and Chilton Field) had planning permission, especially as it had increased expectations from developers about the number of dwellings that should be built on some of the sites. The Inspector considers that a policy largely reflecting existing permissions in villages and rural areas is of limited relevance to the implementation of the plan's overall strategy and of no real practical assistance in assessing any future alternative schemes. He concludes that as it constitutes little more than a listing of previously unidentified sites outside the five main settlements, and providing the future of the Dow and Chilton Field sites is addressed, the policy may safely be deleted. Given his endorsement of the overall strategy of concentrating development in the main towns, the Inspector considers there is simply no need for additional sites outside those main settlements to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement to 2011 (paragraphs 8.20.1-8.20.3 of the Inspector's report).</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation (on page 211 of his report): delete policy H8 and para 8.52. Amend Proposals Map accordingly.</b></p> <p>For <u>Chilton Field</u>, the Inspector recommends a new policy H8A which makes it clear, following the demolition of the pre-fabricated houses, that the housing development should result in a net increase of no more than 75 dwellings. He also supports the revised site area proposed by the Council and considers that provided the eastern area with its important TPO trees is retained, development will be no more harmful to the landscape of the AONB or the amenities of the residents of Chilton village than the original scheme especially as it is seen against the backdrop of the extensive buildings on the campus (paragraph 8.20.102 of the Inspector's report).</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation (on page 211 of his report): Delete policy and para 8.52. Add new policy as follows:</b></p> <p><b>"H8A – LAND AT CHILTON FIELD FORMING PART OF THE HARWELL/CHILTON CAMPUS IS IDENTIFIED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT RESULTING IN A NET INCREASE OF NO MORE THAN 75 DWELLINGS FOLLOWING THE DEMOLITION OF THE PRE-FABRICATED HOUSING."</b></p> <p><b>Amend proposals map accordingly.</b></p> <p>For the former <u>Dow site at Letcombe Regis</u> (which is allocated for housing in the draft plan for an estimated 44 dwellings) the Inspector notes the application, which the Council had resolved to permit, was 'called in' for determination by the ODPM because the proposed density of 15 dwellings per hectare was about half that of the recommended minimum in PPG3. The Inspector concludes there is no justification for imposing a maximum density below that expected in PPG3 and policy H14. Although the Inspector supports the strategy of concentrating development in the main towns he acknowledges this does not mean that all new development must take place there with none at all elsewhere. Even though the site is not an early choice of</p>	<p>allocated to help meet the structure plan requirement and as an integral part of the strategy should therefore be developed at densities so as to make the most efficient use of land. The Inspector is correct in saying that the policy will be of no practical help in determining applications for alternative schemes on the sites already with permission which must be considered on their merits. The Inspector's rejection of the 40 or so omission sites in the villages and rural areas, which he considers in his report under policy H8, is welcome.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraphs 8.20.1 – 8.20.3 of his report. Amend proposals map accordingly.</b></p> <p>As this proposed development on its revised site area does not have planning permission the inclusion of a separate policy for the site is sensible. The explicit reference to a maximum net increase of 75 dwellings strengthens and clarifies the policy in the context of potential proposals which might seek to increase the number of dwellings on the site. However, his wording of the policy could give the impression that the pre fabricated houses on the site have not yet been demolished, and a minor wording change is suggested to the Inspector's wording to clarify the position.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraph 8.20.102 of his report, with a minor wording change to clarify that the prefabricated dwellings have already been demolished.</b></p> <p><b>TO FOLLOW</b></p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006



Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>location in the PPG3 search sequence it is previously developed land. He is aware that the site could be reused for employment purposes, possibly at an increase scale, without the need for planning permission, which might have a materially harmful effect on the village by virtue of noise and disturbance. A failure to find a new use would lead to further dereliction significantly harming the character and appearance of the village as a whole.</p> <p>Given the well established landscape setting and the relationship of the site to the built up area of the village, the Inspector considers that "the removal of the existing structures and their replacement with a well designed new housing scheme at PPG3 minimum density would enhance rather than detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area and that of the village as a whole", and need not be materially harmful to the landscape of the AONB, the settings of listed buildings, the amenities of neighbours or the interests of highway safety. He acknowledges that the addition of around 100 new dwellings would be a very substantial addition to a small village, nevertheless he considers that the larger scheme is to be preferred not least because it would make best use of available previously developed land. He also notes that the lodge may be retained for community use and that some improvements to local bus services and walking and cycling links to Wantage, funded by the development, may be practical and realistic. He also notes that the provision of new public open space, the retention and enhancement of the Letcombe Brook corridor, existing trees and peripheral vegetation weigh strongly in favour of the scheme.</p> <p>The Inspector also considers there is no justification for seeking to restrict the developable area of previously developed land particularly as nearly all that shown on the proposals map is presently covered by buildings and hardstandings. 100 new dwellings would still mean an overall reduction in the footprint of building on the site by about one third (paragraphs 8.20.33-8.20.50 of the Inspector's report).</p> <p><b>"H8B – LAND AT THE FORMER DOW SITE AT LETCOMBE REGIS IS IDENTIFIED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT RESULTING IN A NET INCREASE OF NO MORE THAN 100 DWELLINGS FOLLOWING THE DEMOLITION OF THE FORMER EMPLOYMENT STRUCTURES. PROPOSALS WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED WHERE THEY ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE SCHEME FOR THE WHOLE SITE, INCLUDING LAND SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP TO BE RETAINED AS OPEN SPACE AND WHERE ALL NECESSARY ON SITE AND OFF SITE INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICE REQUIREMENTS ARE MET."</b></p> <p><b>Amend proposals map accordingly.</b></p> <p><b>Remove former village school from designation 'open space associated with development' at Letcombe Regis (PIC/PM/2).</b></p>	

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>Policy H9 – Development on Unidentified Sites in the Five Main Settlements</b>	
<p>The Inspector considers that criterion i) of policy H9 (which seeks to protect sites which contribute positively to the form, structure and character of a settlement) should be deleted as it is imprecise, lacks objectivity and relies too heavily on subjective judgement. He considers that the loss of any site that makes a positive contribution to the settlement would harm the character of the area and is thus, therefore, precluded under criteria ii) and iii) of the policy. Criterion i) is superfluous, therefore, and should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 214 of his report):</b> Policy H9 – delete criterion i).</p> <p><b><u>Land at Winslow and the Red House, Faringdon.</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector concludes that the site, comprising Winslow and the Red House, have an obvious visual and physical affinity with the built form of the town, rather than any strong relationship with the large track of open rural land to the south. As such he considers the land should not be included in the 'Important Open Land' (NE10) designation (as at second deposit), and should be included within the town development boundary and the proposals map should be amended accordingly.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 214 of his report):</b> Delete land at Winslow and the Red House, Coxwell Road, Faringdon from policies NE7 and NE10 and include within the town development boundary in this policy. Amend Proposals Map accordingly.</p>	<p>It is accepted that criterion iii) of the policy, which precludes development which would harm the character of the area, will be sufficient, especially as paragraph 8.55 refers to specifically protecting open space which is important to the character of the neighbourhood.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraph 8.21.3 of his report.</b></p> <p>If the Council allocates this site for housing, as recommended by the Inspector, then changes should be made to the proposals map to remove the NE7 and NE10 designations from the site and include it within the development boundary of the town.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 8.21.7 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy H10 – Development in the Larger Villages</b>	
<p>The Inspector is concerned that the limit of nine dwellings may preclude sites which might be acceptable for redevelopment in all other respects. He considers that an area indicator in the policy is a more practical guide and accepts that a numerical upper housing limit may be retained to assist clarity and certainty.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 220 of his report):</b> reword the first part of the policy as follows: <b>“WITHIN THE BUILT UP AREAS OF THE VILLAGES LISTED BELOW, NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON SITES OF UP TO ABOUT 0.5 HA IN TOTAL SIZE AND NOT MORE THAN 15 DWELLINGS WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED”.</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 8.57 – replace “nine dwellings” with “fifteen dwellings on sites of up to 0.5 ha in size.” in third sentence.</b></p> <p>The Inspector considers that criterion i) of policy H10, as worded, is too strict and inflexible and that it is inconsistent with a general strategy of encouraging development in the more</p>	<p>Although it is disappointing that the Inspector has recommended an increase in the number of dwellings normally allowed in the larger villages, it is understandable in the context of seeking efficient use of land and re-using brownfield sites within the built-up areas of villages. In the context of a strategy that does not make provision for greenfield allocations in the rural areas, the additional flexibility to provide housing within the built up area of villages may help to maintain lively village communities and existing services without harming the countryside or undermining the locational strategy to concentrate development in the five main settlements. Given the objections to this policy, the Inspector's recommendation to limit development to within the built-up area of settlements and to have an upper limit on the amount of development acceptable is to be welcomed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out above and in paragraph 8.22.8 of his report.</b></p> <p>It is accepted that the reworded criteria ii) and iii) effectively replace criterion i) especially when read in the context of the first sentence of paragraph 8.57 of the local plan which states that housing will be limited to sites which can be developed in a way which safeguards village character.</p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>sustainable locations, including on previously developed land in the larger villages. He also sees no justification for making special mention of gardens of properties standing in large grounds. In his view such gardens that are not associated with a listed building or in a conservation area should only be protected if they make a positive contribution to the settlement and would be harmed by the proposed development. Accordingly he recommends that criterion i) should be deleted and replaced by a reworded criteria ii) and iii).</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 341 of his report): Delete criterion i) and replace by a reworded former criterion iii) as follows: "THE SCALE, LAYOUT, MASS AND DESIGN OF THE NEW DWELLINGS WOULD NOT MATERIALLY HARM THE FORM, STRUCTURE OR CHARACTER OF THE SETTLEMENT;"</b></p> <p><b>Reword criterion ii) as follows: "IT WOULD NOT RESULT IN THE LOSS OF FACILITIES IMPORTANT TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY, INCLUDING AREAS OF FORMAL OR INFORMAL OPEN SPACE."</b></p> <p>Taking into account the EiP panel's conclusions on the Oxfordshire Structure Plan that some limited development should be permitted in the rural areas to support the social and economic well being of local communities, the Inspector considers that any village with a public sector primary school should be included within policy H10. As rural schools tend to act as an important social focus he considers that Ashbury should be listed under policy H10 and not H11.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 221 of his report): List Ashbury under policy H10 and not H11.</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation to change criterion i) for the reasons given in paragraphs 8.22.9-8.22.11 of his report.</b></p> <p>In terms of the sustainability scores, Ashbury was at the margin between policies H10 and H11. The Inspector's view that villages with state primary schools should be included in policy H10 is clear and logical.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraph 8.22.15 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy H11 – Development in the Smaller Villages</b>	
<p>In line with his conclusions and recommendations regarding policy H10, the Inspector accepts that the housing limits of policy H11 (1 or 2 dwellings) are too low. In particular he notes that they risk too great a restriction on new small housing schemes, such that they would conflict with PPS7. Moreover a limit to only 1 or 2 houses would tend to encourage the provision of larger detached dwellings, even when the site is capable of taking more. In response to any suggestion that there is no definition of 'small' in the plan, he has no doubt that the Council is capable of adopting a robustly common sense approach taking into account relevant site specific factors, including comparability with nearby properties.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 223 of his report): Replace "1 OR 2" with "FOUR SMALL" in second line of policy.</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 8.58 - replace "one or two" with "four small" in fourth line.</b></p>	<p>The Inspector's logic is accepted and the change is consistent with his recommendations to policy H10 and with the Council's desire to secure and retain more small dwellings across the Vale.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraph 8.23.2 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy H12 – Development Elsewhere</b>	

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>The Inspector concludes that the wording of policy H12 is too restrictive. Nowhere in the national, regional or strategic policy framework for rural areas is there any justification for precluding all new housing development entirely outside the towns and larger villages as to do so would not allow the smaller settlements to satisfy their social and economic needs over time, albeit on a very limited scale. Accordingly, the policy is reworded to refer to all land outside the H9-H10 towns and villages but only to the infilling of no more than one or two small houses within the built up area of the settlement. The policy continues to limit new housing in the countryside to the exceptions set out in the policy.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on page 224 of his report):</b>  <b>Reword as follows: "OUTSIDE THE BUILT UP AREAS OF THE TOWNS AND VILLAGES DEFINED IN POLICIES H9-H11 ABOVE, NEW HOUSES WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED; a) AS INFILLING WITH NO MORE THAN ONE OR TWO SMALL NEW DWELLINGS WITHIN THE EXISTING BUILT UP AREA OF A SETTLEMENT OR; b) IF PROVED TO BE ESSENTIAL TO MEET THE NEEDS OF AN AGRICULTURAL, ESQUESTRIAN OR OTHER RURAL ENTERPRISE GENUINELY REQUIRING A COUNTRYSIDE LOCATION.</b></p> <p><b>TO BE PERMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH b) ABOVE ANY NEW DWELLING MUST; i) BE LOCATED WITHIN OR ADJACENT TO AN EXISTING GROUP OF DWELLINGS, OR FARM OR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS, OR IN A WELL SCREENED LANDSCAPE SETTING; ii) BE RELATED IN SIZE TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE ENTERPRISE; AND iii) BE SUBJECT TO CONTROLS OVER OCCUPANCY TO ENSURE IT IS RETAINED FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH IT WAS ORIGINALLY JUSTIFIED. APPLICATIONS TO REMOVE SUCH CONTROLS WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS IT CAN BE DEMONSTRATED THAT THEY HAVE OUTLIVED THEIR USEFULNESS IN THE AREA AS A WHOLE."</b></p>	<p>The effect of the Inspector's recommendation is to return to a similar approach to that in the adopted local plan where development of single dwellings is allowed.</p> <p>As the Inspector considers the draft policy is not consistent with PPS7, which was published after the plan was prepared, it is considered that his recommendations should be accepted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in paragraph 8.24.2 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy H15 – Widening Housing Opportunity</b>	
<p>The Inspector recognises the increasing need for small dwellings and supports, in principle, the inclusion of a policy seeking that around 50% of the new dwellings are of two bedrooms or less. However, as the policy will apply to schemes as small as 4 dwellings, it seems to him that the insistence on at least 50% in all cases is unreasonably restrictive and does not take into account local and site specific circumstances. He recommends the first criterion of the policy be reworded more flexibly and to relate to sites of 10 dwellings in settlements of 3000 people or more and 5 elsewhere. He sees no justification for a higher percentage of small dwellings in the 4 town centres in the context of the higher densities sought there.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (pages 231 and 232 of his report):</b> Replace "FOUR" with "TEN" in first line of part i).</p> <p><b>Delete "AT LEAST" from second line of part i).</b></p>	<p>The Inspector's proposed wording of criterion i) in paragraph 8.27.3 of his report has a threshold of 10 dwellings in settlements of 3000 people or more, <u>and 5 elsewhere</u>. However, this latter wording is not carried through to his formal recommendation. If the policy only applies to sites of 10 or more dwellings, it will be difficult to secure small dwellings in rural areas as there will be relatively few sites above that threshold. In the circumstances and given the Inspector's clear view in paragraph 8.27.3 it is considered that the Inspector's recommendation not be accepted in this case and a change be made to reflect the wording he gives in his reasoning.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject the Inspector's recommendation on pages 231 and 232 of his report as it is not consistent with the conclusions and reasoning in paragraph 8.27.3 of his report. For the reasons set out above the proposed</b></p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>Delete second sentence of part i).</p> <p>He considers the withdrawal of permitted development rights on all small dwellings to be entirely unnecessary in the case of flats and to unquestioningly impose a blanket restriction irrespective of circumstances is clearly contrary to government advice in Circular 11/95 and cannot be supported. The local need for small dwellings is not so great as to justify this draconian attempt to remove rights granted by parliament. Furthermore it would not justify the time, effort and resources necessary to ensure its consistent application without which it would be fundamentally flawed. He recommends the deletion of the last part of policy H15 and that the Council relies instead on the application of normal development control practices to ensure that new small dwellings are not over extended.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 232 of his report): Delete final two sentences of policy.</b></p> <p>The Inspector considers that the word 'expectation' would be preferable to 'requirement' and the words 'at least' should be removed from the policy to provide an essential element of flexibility.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Report (pages 231 and 232 of his report): Replace "REQUIREMENT" with "EXPECTATION". Delete "AT LEAST" from the first line of part ii).</b></p>	<p>wording contained in that paragraph be used to replace criterion i) of the policy as follows: 'On sites reasonably capable of accommodating 10 or more dwellings in settlements of more than 3,000 people, or 5 or more dwellings in settlements of 3000 people or less, about 50% of new dwellings should have two bedrooms or less.'</p> <p>Although the proposal to withdraw permitted development rights was introduced to retain the stock of small dwellings, which is a laudable objective, given the Inspector's comprehensive and decisive dismissal of the proposition it would not be wise for the Council to continue with this approach.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in paragraphs 8.27.4-8.27.6 of his report.</b></p> <p>These minor wording changes are acceptable and the use of the word 'expectation' is consistent with the Council's approach to affordable housing in policy H16.</p> <p><b>Recommendations: Accept the Inspector's recommendations for the reasons set out in paragraphs 8.27.7 and 8.27.8 of his report.</b></p>
<p><b>Policy H16 – Affordable Housing</b></p>	
<p>The Inspector has no doubt about the importance of the issue of affordable housing in the district. He accepts the Housing Needs Survey is a clear indicator of the overall scale and type of local needs which shows a net shortfall of affordable housing significantly exceeding the proposed building rate (paras 8.28.1 – 8.28.3 of his report).</p> <p><u>Site Size Thresholds</u></p> <p>The Inspector considers that little weight can be attached to emerging national and regional guidance and he bases his judgements on Circular 6/98. Although the circular indicates a threshold of 25 dwellings will normally be applied, he accepts there are exceptional local circumstances to justify a lower threshold. However, in his view the circular is clear that even if exceptional local constraints can be demonstrated, the threshold should not be lower than 15 dwellings. He considers the justification for a threshold of 10 dwellings to be aspirational and unconvincing and may unduly affect site viability. He accepts that in the rural areas the circular allows for a lower threshold but considers 5 dwellings to be a more practical and realistic approach,</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Inspector's acceptance that housing needs in the district are exceptional and justify a threshold below the 25 normally expected in Circular 6/98 is welcomed. Although it is disappointing that he has not supported a threshold of 10 dwellings in settlements over 3000 people it is accepted that such an approach is not consistent with government guidance. If the Council were to reject the Inspector's recommendation and retain a threshold of 10 dwellings, the Secretary of State could direct the Council not to adopt the plan and objectors could mount a legal challenge if the Secretary of State did not intervene. Given the clear government guidance on this matter and the Inspector's careful consideration of the evidence presented at the inquiry (including the affordable housing round table) his conclusions and recommendation should be accepted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

## Appendix 2

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p><b>Inspector's recommendations (page 241 of his report):</b>  <b>Replace "10" with "15" and "0.3" with "0.5" in point i) of the policy.</b>  <b>Replace "FOUR" with "FIVE" in point ii) of the policy.</b>  <b>Delete the final three sentences of para 8.67.</b></p> <p><u>The Percentage Target Figure</u></p> <p>The Inspector considers that setting out a percentage target figure is not contrary to government guidance and provides an appropriate element of certainty. Although he appreciates that emerging regional and strategic guidance may indicate that an aspirational figure of 50% is possible, he notes the recommendations of the Council's own consultants was for 40% provision. He is not persuaded by the Council's reasons for raising the percentage figure and concludes that the 40% target is more rational.</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation (page 241 of his report)</b>  <b>replace "50%" with "40%".</b>  <b>Delete fifth, sixth and seventh sentences of para 8.68.</b></p> <p><u>Minor changes</u></p> <p>The Inspector agrees with a suggested change made by officers at the inquiry to replace "in terms of" with "including" for flexibility and clarity.</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation (page 241 of his report):</b>  <b>Replace "in terms of" with "including" in the penultimate sentence of para 8.68.</b></p>	<p>recommendations for the reasons set out in paras 8.28.5 – 8.25.10 of his report.</p> <p>Extensive evidence was put to the inquiry about the worsening housing problems in the Vale since the Fordham study was completed in 2001, but the Inspector was not convinced that this justified an increased target. The figure of a 50% target was removed from the policy in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan following the recommendation of the EIP panel and retained as an aspirational target in the lower case text. Despite the aspirational target the Structure Plan policy (H4) also makes it clear that provision shall be made at a level commensurate with the identified need in the district concerned. This has weakened the Council's position. Although the draft South East Plan contains a policy for 50% affordable housing in central Oxfordshire, this is in an early draft document and cannot be used as a sound foundation for justifying a departure from the Inspector's recommendation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in paras 8.28.12 – 8.28.13 of his report.</b></p> <p>This minor change would give flexibility and clarity.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 8.28.14 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy H17 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites</b>	
<p>The Inspector considers that as parish councils are not planning authorities it is simply not appropriate to include a requirement in the policy that their consent be obtained for affordable housing schemes on rural exception sites. Criterion iv) is also unnecessary and should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation (page 242 of his report):</b>  <b>delete criterion iv) from the policy.</b></p>	<p>The Inspector is correct in his judgement that the lack of support from a parish council would not be a sound reason for refusing planning permission that was acceptable in all other respects. Reference to the support of parish councils is contained in the last sentence of para 8.72, but the word "must" should be changed to "should" to be consistent with the Inspector's recommendation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 8.30.1 of his report. In the last sentence of paragraph 8.72 change "must" to "should" for consistency.</b></p>
<b>H23 – Open space in new housing development</b>	
<p>The Inspector considers that the phrase "at least" is not only somewhat onerous in implying that more than 15% might be</p>	<p>The Inspector's reasoning is accepted and his wording gives greater clarity to the policy.</p>

### The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p>sought in some situations, but also does not actually reflect how the policy is likely to be implemented in practice. The deletion of "at least", which is recommended, should render the policy wording more consistent with the text in para 8.87 in the sense that 15% is not to be taken as an absolute requirement in all cases, irrespective of all other circumstances.</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation (page 245 of his report):</b> Delete "AT LEAST" from criterion i) of the policy.</p>	<p><b>Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 8.34.2 and 8.34.3 of his report.</b></p>
<p><b>H24 – Extensions to dwellings and the erection of ancillary buildings and structures</b></p>	
<p>In accordance with the Inspector's conclusions in respect of policy H15, the first criterion of this policy must also be deleted for the sake of consistency.</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation (page 246 of his report):</b> Delete part i) of the policy.</p>	<p><b>Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 8.35.1 of his report.</b></p>

**CHAPTER 9 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES**

<b>Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b>	<b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b>
<b>CF5 – Public Houses</b>	
<p><b><u>Policy CF5 &amp; Local Plan para 9.29a</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector endorses the inclusion of a policy to address the loss of services, particularly in rural areas, but concludes that the policy has no place in urban areas and recommends the wording of the policy is changed to reflect this. He also comments that he is not satisfied that the wording of what constitutes an 'important' facility in criterion i) is sufficiently clear and concludes that criterion i) should be deleted. With regard to criterion ii) the Inspector considers that, in principle, this part of the policy is justified and should remain but that the words "to support the view" should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 251 of his report):</b></p> <p><b>CF5 – Add at beginning of policy "OUTSIDE THE FIVE MAIN TOWNS,".</b></p> <p><b>Delete part i) of policy.</b></p> <p><b>Reword part ii) as follows: "THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT THE PUBLIC HOUSE IS AN IMPORTANT LOCAL COMMUNITY FACILITY, WHEN IT MUST BE DEMONSTRATED THAT IT WOULD NOT BE ECONOMICALLY VIABLE TO CONTINUE WITH THAT USE".</b></p> <p><b>Para 9.29a – Add "Outside the five main towns" after "house" in line 2.</b></p>	<p>Members will recall that the adopted Vale local plan contains policy S27 which covers changes of use of rural public houses. In 2000 a proposal to redevelop a public house in Botley called the 'Fair Rosamund' was lost on appeal. One of the comments the appeal inspector made was that the Botley situation was very different to rural areas where policy S27 would apply. The appeal Inspector concluded that given the restricted facilities the public house offered and the available alternatives, local residents would undergo no material change in the level of facilities (para 10). The wording of policy CF5 was specifically intended to seek to prevent the loss of any public house which is an important local community facility, irrespective of its location.</p> <p>In the evidence given to the local plan Inquiry reference was made by both an objector and the Council to the 'Fair Rosamund Public House' appeal decision. In its evidence the Council explained that policy CF5 and the supporting text, as modified, were intended to enable matters such as the level of facilities and the role the public house played in the local community to be given more weight in the decision making process.</p> <p>From paragraph 9.5.2 of the Inspector's report, it will be seen that while he supports the inclusion of this policy, he sees it addressing the wider loss of services in rural areas only. He explains that he accepts that "local community" is likely to prove difficult to define in towns and that reasonably convenient alternatives will nearly always exist, and concludes that the policy has no place in urban areas, given the operation of a free market economy and the new licensing laws. These comments by the Inspector, especially on the definition of community and the availability of alternatives are matters for which there is no sound evidence to justify departing from the Inspector's recommendations.</p> <p>However, the policy will apply outside the five main towns in the rural areas where it is particularly relevant.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation to change the wording of plan para 9.29a and policy CF5 for the reasons given in paras 9.5.2 – 9.5.4 of his report;</b></p>
<b>CF6 – Masts and Antennae</b>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paras 9.36 &amp; 9.37</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector notes that policy CF6 is consistent with national guidance. In relation to local plan paras 9.36 &amp; 9.37 he notes that as the 'Vale Objective' relates to Council ownership, it has no place in a statutory plan and should be deleted. However, he accepts that criterion iii) should remain so that the health issue is not omitted. He also endorses "pre-inquiry change" PIC 9/1 and is satisfied that, subject to these changes, the revised policy, its criteria and the supporting text would be consistent with PPG8. He rewords local plan para 9.39a to make it more consistent with PPG8 and policy GS3.</p>	<p>The Inspector recommends deletion of local plan paras 9.36 and 9.37 which relate to the 'Vale Objective'. Members will recall that the Vale Objective applies only to its own land. The Inspector notes that a Council's actions as a landowner should clearly remain separate from its duties as a local planning authority, that Government advice is clear that Council's should not seek to impose their own policies which are more stringent than current national guidelines and that health issues are adequately addressed in local plan para 9.35 and criteria iii) of the policy.</p> <p>The Vale Objective derives from the Council's desire, in good faith, to ensure that health considerations are taken into account on its own land. As land ownership will enable the Council to apply the Vale Objective to its</p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006



Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 253 of his report):</b></p> <p><b>Paras 9.36 and 9.37 – Delete.</b></p> <p><b>Para 9.39a – Reword as follows; “Development for telecommunications in the Green Belt will be expected to maintain openness in line with policy GS3. However, it is recognised that, due to the technical and operational characteristics of telecommunications development proposals may be made which do not maintain openness. Such development is inappropriate and will only be permitted if very special circumstances are demonstrated which outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. In these circumstances the operator must demonstrate that there are no suitable alternative sites outside the Green Belt which would meet the needs of network coverage or capacity.”</b></p>	<p>own land, it would seem helpful to local plan users to make what is essentially a statement of fact clear from the outset. Consequently, it is proposed to accept the Inspector's recommendation to delete local plan para 9.36 except for the first sentence which should be retained in order to make clear the attitude the Council will take to its own land.</p> <p>The Inspector recommends deletion of local plan para 9.37 as the health issues are covered in local plan para 9.35 which the Inspector retains. However, the last sentence of local plan para 9.37 usefully explains to local plan users that the Council will scrutinise carefully proposals that might be sited near children. This complements the information set out in retained local plan para 9.35 ii). Consequently, it is proposed to accept the Inspector's recommendation to delete local plan para 9.37 except for the last sentence which should be retained for the above reason. For editorial reasons it is proposed that this last sentence of local plan para 9.37 is added as the first sentence of local plan para 9.38.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>a) local plan para 9.36. Delete this paragraph except for the first sentence which should be retained in order to make clear the attitude the Council will take to its own land.</b></p> <p><b>b) local plan para 9.37. Delete this paragraph except for the last sentence which should be retained and added as the first sentence of local plan para 9.38.</b></p>
<p><b>CF10 – Production of Renewable Energy</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Local Plan paras 9.54 &amp; 9.55</u></b></p> <p>The Inspector notes the changes to policy CF10 and the supporting text and together with the textual amendments in the Council's proposed “pre-inquiry change” PIC 9/2 to plan paras 9.54 and 9.55, including with reference to energy from waste. He confirms that the policy and supporting text are now consistent with national guidance in PPS22.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 257 of his report):</b></p> <p><b>Paras 9.54 and 9.55 – Replace “PPG22” with “PPS22”.</b></p> <p><b>Para 9.54 – Delete “although PPG7: The Countryside touches on energy crops”.</b></p> <p><b>Para 9.54 – Add at end “(but not energy from mass incineration of domestic waste).”</b></p> <p><b>Para 9.55 – Replace “annexes to the PPGs give” with “PPS gives”.</b></p>	<p>Policy CF10, as modified, is accepted by the Inspector. The pre-inquiry changes, which the Inspector accepts, seek only to update the local plan following the replacement of PPG22 by PPS22 in August 2004.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation to change the wording of plan paras 9.54 &amp; 9.55 for the reasons given in paras 9.10.1 of his report.</b></p>

**CHAPTER 10 - LEISURE**

<b>Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b>	<b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b>
<b>Policy L1 – Protecting open space within settlements</b>	
<p>The change to policy L1 recommended by the Inspector was suggested by Officers during the local plan inquiry. The purpose of the change was to simplify the policy and remove the reference to 'the Council' as required by GOSE and clarify that the loss of outdoor play space to development would only be permitted if a deficiency would not be created or exacerbated.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 262 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Policy L1, 3<sup>rd</sup> Line– replace 'NOT' with 'ONLY' and 'UNLESS THE COUNCIL IS SATISFIED THAT' with 'IF'.</b></p> <p>To be helpful and provide clarity to the public the District Council proposed amending the Faringdon Inset to the proposals map at Second Deposit to identify land at Coxwell Road, Faringdon as land with planning permission for tennis.</p> <p>Because of the special circumstances surrounding the provision of tennis at Faringdon the Inspector has agreed with the Council that the site should not be included within the settlement boundary or allocated generally for leisure use. However, the Inspector also sees no reason to specifically identify the site for tennis as the relocation from the present site can take place without the recognition on the Proposals Map, particularly as it may create some sort of 'hope value' that other forms of development might also be permitted, either as an addition or as an alternative to the tennis club.</p> <p>In his view if the planning permission is not taken up any alternative should be considered afresh against all relevant policies in the plan.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 262 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Proposals Map, Faringdon Inset</b>  <b>Delete change PM/40 in respect of land with planning permission for tennis at Coxwell Road, Faringdon.</b></p>	<p>This change was suggested by Officers during the local plan inquiry to simplify the policy and remove the reference to 'the Council'.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 10.3.2 of his report.</b></p> <p>This change to the proposals map had been suggested by the Council to be helpful to plan users. However, as it appears to have created hope value that uses other than tennis may be appropriate on the site, officers agree that the notation of land with planning permission for tennis at Coxwell Road, be deleted from the Faringdon Inset to the proposals map. (Change No PM/40)</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 10.3.8 and 10.3.10 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy L3 – Green Corridors</b>	
<p>The Inspector has agreed with the Council's proposed pre-inquiry change (PIC/PM3) that the Letcombe Brook Green Corridor should be extended at Mill House, Locks Land, Wantage.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 265 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Proposals Map Wantage Town Centre Inset</b>  <b>Extend green corridor at Mill House, Locks lane, Wantage</b></p>	<p>This change to the proposals map had been proposed by the Council as the land to which the extension relates is similar in character to land already included in the Letcombe Brook green corridor.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept Inspector's recommendation</b></p>

**The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011**Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
(PIC/PM3).	
<b>Policy L7A – Small Scale Leisure Facilities</b>	
<p><u>Local Plan paragraph 10.34</u></p> <p>In response to an objection that policy L7A should have additional criteria requiring developments to be accessible by cycling, walking or public transport, the Council proposed that policy L7A should be cross referenced to policy DC5 (PIC 10/1).</p> <p>The Inspector agrees with this proposed change to the plan.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 267 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Para 10.34</b>  <b>Add 'in particular policy DC5 which dealt with access' after 'Plan' (PIC 10/1),</b></p>	<p>This change to para 10.34 of the local plan was suggested by the Council as a pre-inquiry change, to clarify that new small scale leisure developments should be accessible by modes other than the private car.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept Inspector's recommendation</b></p>
<b>Policy L9 – Public Rights of Way</b>	
<p><u>Local Plan paragraph 10.41</u></p> <p>In response to an objection that policy L9 should indicate how rights of way will be protected and, improvements to the network secured, the Council proposed that a new sentence should be added to the end of para 10.41 (PIC 10/2), to refer to planning conditions and section 106 agreements.</p> <p>The Inspector has accepted this change subject to an amendment deleting 'section 106' in front of agreements and inserting 'legal'</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 269 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Add new sentence at the end of para 10.41 as follows 'To this end, the Council will seek to use planning conditions or legal agreements with developers to ensure rights of way are protected and opportunities to improve the network are secured.'</b> (PIC 10/2) amended)</p>	<p>This addition to para 10.41 of the local plan was proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change to improve the clarity of the plan. The Inspector has accepted the change subject to the deletion of the words section 106 agreement and their replacement with legal agreement.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept Inspector's recommendation as set out in para 10.11.2 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy L13 – Wilts &amp; Berks Canal</b>	
<p><u>Local Plan paragraph 10.71</u></p> <p>The addition to para 10.71 of the local plan recommended by the Inspector was proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change so that the potential of the canal to help alleviate drainage problems can be investigated.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 274 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Para 10.71 after first sentence add 'Opportunities should also be taken to investigate whether the canal could be used to alleviate drainage problems in the area.'</b> (PIC 10/5)</p>	<p>This recommendation was proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change so that the potential of the canal to help alleviate drainage problems can be realised.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept Inspector's recommendation as set out in para 10.15.5 of his report.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<p><u>Local Plan Para 10.72a</u></p> <p>The proposed amendment to the first sentence of para 10.72a, recommended by the Inspector, was suggested by the Council as a pre-inquiry change. The purpose of the change is to clarify that an EIA needs to be satisfactory. (PIC 10/3)</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 274 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Add 'satisfactorily' between 'be' and 'addressed' in first sentence of para 10.72a (PIC 10/3)</b></p> <p><u>Local Plan Para 10.72a</u></p> <p>The Inspector has agreed with the Council's proposed pre-inquiry change that any new route for the Wilts &amp; Berks canal should pay regard to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan prepared by Oxfordshire County Council (PIC 10/7)</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 274 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Add new sentence at end of para 10.72a as follows 'Regard will also need to be paid to minerals and waste issues as identified in Oxfordshire County Council's Minerals &amp; Waste Local Plan (PIC 10/7).'</b></p> <p><u>Local Plan Para 10.72b</u></p> <p>The Inspector has agreed with the Council's pre-inquiry change that for clarity a reference should be made to development on or near the route of the Wilts &amp; Berks canal contributing to its restoration. (PIC 10/4)</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 274 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Add new para 10.72b as follows 'Development on or near the route of the canal will be expected to contribute towards its restoration in order to enhance its role as a major recreational and leisure facility in the district (PIC 10/4).'</b></p> <p>The Inspector has agreed with the Council's pre-inquiry change to policy L13 that a reference should be made to ensure any development on or close to the canal will facilitate development of its heritage value.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 274 of his report:</b></p> <p><b>Policy L13 - Add 'AND HERITAGE' to end of second para of policy L13 after 'CONSERVATION' (PIC 10/6).</b></p>	<p>This recommendation was proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change to clarify that an EIA needs to be satisfactory.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept the Inspector's recommendation as set out in para 10.15.3 of his report.</b></p> <p>This change to the plan was proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change to clarify that regard will be paid to Oxfordshire County Council's Mineral and Waste Local Plan in any proposal for a new route for the Wilts and Berks Canal.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept the Inspector's recommendation as set out in para 10.15.3 of his report.</b></p> <p>This change to the plan was again proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change to clarify that development on or close to the route of the canal will be expected to contribute towards its restoration.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept Inspector's recommendation as set out in para 10.15.4 of his report.</b></p> <p>This change to the plan was proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change to ensure any development on or close to the canal will facilitate development of its heritage value.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>Accept Inspector's recommendation as set out in para 10.15.3 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy L19 – The Keeping and Rearing of Horses</b>	
<p>The Inspector has agreed with the Council's proposed pre-inquiry change that a reference should be made in policy L19 to a path's fabric.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 278 of his report:</b></p>	<p>This change to the plan was proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change to include a reference in the policy to a path's fabric.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

## Appendix 2

<b>Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b>	<b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b>
Policy L19 – Replace the last point with 'GIVE RISE TO EXCESSIVE USE OF PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY IN TERMS OF TRAFFIC GENERATION OR DAMAGE TO A PATH'S FABRIC OR NOISE, SMELL OR OTHER DISTURBANCES WHICH WOULD BE HARMFUL TO THE AMENITY OF NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES OR OTHER PATH USERS (PIC 10/8).	Accept Inspector's recommendation as set out in para 10.20.1 of his report.

### The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

**CHAPTER 11 – THE ECONOMY OF THE VALE**

<b>Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b>	<b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b>
<b>Policy E4 – New Development at Grove Technology Park</b>	
<p>Policy E4 aims to allow further B1, B2 and a limited amount of B8 development on the Grove Technology Park whilst preventing any single user occupying more than 2.4ha of the Park. The Inspector considers that it is not essential to protect the Grove technology park from a single user occupying more than 2.4ha of the site as he considers that the limitation would not assist in the achievement of the objectives for the site as set out in para 11.42 of the Plan. The Inspector does not recommend any other modifications other than the removal of the single user occupancy provision.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 288 of the Inspector's report): Policy E4 - delete the last sentence of the policy and para 11.41.</b></p>	<p>While it is regrettable that the Inspector has not accepted the Council's position, his reasons for doing so are clear and logical. As he says in para 11.5.5 of his report, any relocation of an existing large local firm like Crown Cork and Seal to the site might be considered acceptable by the Council and in para 11.5.5 he observes that in his opinion the risk of a single user wishing to occupy the site is small. In view of these observations officers consider the Inspector's recommendation is acceptable.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in paragraphs 11.5.1 – 11.5.6 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy E7 – Harwell/Chilton Campus</b>	
<p>Criteria (i) of the policy aims to restrict development at the Harwell International Business Centre to the 1986 level of 240,000 sq m. However the Inspector concludes that the restriction is no longer necessary and the historical floorspace calculations are in his words "passed their sell by date" and do not demonstrate "joined up thinking" in relation to the need to secure jobs for the occupants of proposed new housing. The Inspector also recommends changes to criteria (iv) for clarification and to local plan para 11.62 as set out in a pre inquiry change proposed by the Council.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (at page 295 of his report):</b>  <b>Policy E7 - delete criterion i) from the policy and para 11.59 from the supporting text.</b>  <b>Delete "OF THE CAMPUS" after "EAST" and all words after "NORTH" in criterion iv).</b>  <b>Delete "there is one wildlife site of county importance on the campus, which together with any other" from second sentence of para 11.62 (PIC 11/1).</b></p>	<p>The Inspector has considered the Council's argument that the restriction was justified in order to ensure that the impact of development at Harwell will not have greater impact than that of the established site. The Inspector concludes that this restriction, which dates from 20 years ago, is no longer warranted in the light of the content of the emerging (now adopted) Structure Plan and the need for employment to support strategic housing developments at Didcot and Grove. It is considered by officers that this is a logical and considered approach to the current circumstances. The other minor changes help to make the policy and supporting text clearer.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendations in relation to criteria (i) and (iv) and to paras 11.59 and 11.62 for the reasons set out in paras 11.8.1 to 11.8.14 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy E10 – Protecting Strategic Employment Sites</b>	
<p>The only changes the Inspector recommends to this policy are to include the three sites which were previously included under policy E12 which he has deleted and to change the reference in the text from PPG7 to PPS7.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (at page 303 of his report):</b>  <b>Policy E10 - add "GROVE ROAD, WANTAGE; DOWNSVIEW ROAD, GROVE AND STATION ROAD, GROVE to policy after "GROVE TECHNOLOGY PARK".</b>  <b>Replace reference to PPG 7 with PPS 7 in para 11.76.</b></p>	<p>The inclusion of the three sites formerly under policy E12 is logical if policy E12 is deleted in order to maintain their protection and the change to the PPG/PPS reference is warranted. A consequential amendment to the title of this section will be needed to refer to single user sites and to the lower case text which refers to policies E10 – E13.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendations for the inclusion of three sites and the change to the PPG/PPS reference in accord with the reasons set out in paras 11.11.1 to 11.11.7 of his report.</b>  <b>Consequential changes be made to the supporting text.</b></p>

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>Policy E11 – Protecting Rural Multi-User Sites</b>	
<p>The only changes the Inspector recommends to this policy are to the title and its first line. He considers that it will be clearer if the word 'Local' is removed as it serves no purpose.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 304 of his report):</b> Policy E11 - delete "LOCAL" before "RURAL" in first line of policy and title.</p>	<p>The Inspector's reasoning is logical. The inclusion of the word 'Local' in the title and first line of the policy makes no material difference to the purpose of the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 11.12.1 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy E12 – Main Single User Employment Sites at Grove and Wantage</b>	
<p>This policy was intended to protect employment sites at Wantage and Grove from other forms of development due to their importance to the local economy. He has however concluded that although the sites should be protected the wording of policy E10 is so similar to E12 that it is pointless to have two policies.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (at page 305 of his report):</b> Policy E12 - delete policy and add "GROVE ROAD, WANTAGE; DOWNSVIEW ROAD, GROVE AND STATION ROAD, GROVE" to policy E10 after "GROVE TECHNOLOGY PARK" with consequent amendments to the Proposals Map.</p>	<p>The Inspector's reasoning is logical. Inclusion of the three sites under policy E10 retains the spirit and intention of policy E12 and simplifies the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: The Council should accept the Inspector's recommendations in relation to policy E12 for the reasons set out in para 11.13.3 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy E14 – Ancillary Uses on Key Employment Sites</b>	
<p>The Inspector considers that although this policy is worthwhile in its intentions, its implementation is difficult. He considers in paras 11.15.1 to 11.15.3 of his report that it will not be practical to exclude users from nearby villages using the facility and that impact can be controlled by limiting the size of facilities</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (at page 308 of his report):</b> Policy E14 - delete "AND NOT TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF A WIDER AREA" from the end of criterion i).</p>	<p>The Inspector's reasoning is accepted. The implementation of the policy by specifically excluding users of ancillary facilities who are not employees would be difficult to achieve and impact on facilities elsewhere can be limited by restricting the size of a facility.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendations for the reasons in para 11.15.3 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy E15 – Small Commercial Premises</b>	
<p>The Inspector considers that the policy is acceptable apart from the modification suggested by the Council as a pre inquiry change.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (at page 309 of his report):</b> Policy E15 - add "INAPPROPRIATE" before "LEVELS" in criterion iii) (PIC 11/2).</p>	<p>The Inspector's recommendation is in accord with the Council's wishes to clarify the meaning and effect of the policy as demonstrated in the pre inquiry changes to the text of policy E15.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para 11.16.1 of his report.</b></p>
<b>Policy E16 – Steventon Storage Facility</b>	
<p>The Inspector accepts the Council's position that a policy is needed to control future use of the isolated Steventon Storage Facility. However, he considers that the last part of the policy which refers to an alternative site "is not</p>	<p>The Inspector's reasoning is correct. The effect of the existing policy would be to commit the Council to major development on an unspecified site which could have potentially damaging consequences for people living near to this unidentified site. Any</p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

## Appendix 2

<b>Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b>	<b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b>
<p>appropriate" as it refers to "an unidentified location or locations for such a potentially major development" and therefore recommends its deletion. The text preceding the policy in para 11.93 remains unaltered.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 310 of his report):</b> <b>Policy E16 - delete all words after "RESTORATION OF THE SITE" in the policy wording.</b></p>	<p>proposed relocation can be dealt with through other policies in the local plan or via an allocation in any replacement plan which will allow full consideration of the effects of development. Retaining para11.93 allows the Council's intentions for the future of the site to be clear.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons set out in para's 11.17.1 to 11.17.5 of his report.</b></p>

### The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006



**CHAPTER 12 SHOPPING AND TOWN CENTRES**

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>POLICY S2 – Primary Shopping Frontage</b>	
<p>The extension of the primary shopping frontage on the south side of Mill Street, Wantage, between Alfred Street and the Market Place on the revised Proposals Map Inset erroneously included The Bell public house. This was proposed for deletion by the Council's Pre Inquiry change PM/4, which the Inspector endorses.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 318 of his report: Delete The Bell public house, Mill Street, Wantage from the primary shopping frontage (policy S2) on the Proposals Map Inset (PIC PM/4).</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reason given in paragraph 12.3.7 of his report.</b></p>
<b>POLICY S14 – Retention of Village and Small Local Shops</b>	
<p><u>Local Plan Paragraph 12.71</u></p> <p>The Inspector concludes that, as the Council suggests, overall economic viability is the criterion that matters most in considering applications involving the potential loss of a village or other important local shops. Accordingly, he endorses not only the changes made in the revised deposit plan to address earlier objections on this matter, but also the Council's proposed Pre Inquiry change 12/1 which adds para 12.71a to explain how the phrase "all reasonable efforts" would be interpreted in practice. Subject to this, the Inspector considers that the policy is generally appropriate and consistent with national guidance in both PPS 6 and PPS 7 regarding rural retail outlets.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation on page 323 of his report: Add new para 12.71a "In assessing whether all reasonable efforts have been made to sell or let a village shop this will involve consideration of the marketing, either as a going concern or where it has ceased trading. It will need to take account of how the shop was operated over time and what efforts were made to advertise and market it on the open market, whether or not the sale value was realistic and whether the potential of the business was made clear. It will not be sufficient for an applicant to state that a village shop is not viable if this cannot be proved to be correct." (PIC 12/1).</b></p>	<p>This change to the plan was proposed by the Council as a pre-inquiry change to clarify the lower case text.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reason given in paragraph 12.13.1 of his report.</b></p>
<b>POLICY S15 – Garages and Garage Shops</b>	

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

<p><b>Summary of the Inspector’s Reasoning and Recommended Changes</b></p>	<p><b>Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group</b></p>
<p><u>Local Plan Paragraph 12.74</u> The Inspector concludes that reference should now be to para 2.58 of PPS 6, which has superseded PPG 6.</p> <p><b>Inspector’s Recommendation on page 323 of his report: Replace “PPG 6” with “PPS 6” in para 12.74.</b></p>	<p>This proposed change updates this part of the local plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector’s recommendation for the reasons set out in paragraph 12.14.1 of his report</b></p>

**CHAPTER 14 – PROPOSALS MAP**

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
<b>Eastern Vale Proposals Map</b>	
<p>The Inspector recommends in Chapter 8 of his report that policy H8, as currently constituted, should be deleted and individual allocations applied to those few sites not already the subject of planning permissions, or the Council's resolutions to grant it subject to the completion of legal agreements. The special circumstances applying to the Chilton Field site, including its status as previously developed land and close relationship to the Harwell/Chilton campus, essentially mean that it constitutes development in a relatively sustainable location for a rural area. Moreover, it is of a size and scale appropriate to that location, taking into account its former use for housing and the surrounding buildings. Subject to detailed design, the Inspector considers that it is capable of redevelopment at a density that need not be unduly prominent in the landscape of the AONB, including when seen from the Ridgeway, notwithstanding compliance with the minimum requirements of PPG 3.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 329 of his report): Delete all H8 allocations and replace with H8A (Chilton Fields) and H8B (Letcombe Regis).</b></p> <p><b>Remove former village school from designation "open space associated with development" at Letcombe Regis (PIC/PM/2).</b></p>	<p>The change to the village school designation was proposed by the Council as a pre inquiry change as the area has a separate permission for 5 dwellings. The change to delete policy H8 was put forward by officers during the inquiry as there was a danger of PPG3 minimum density requirements being applied to all sites that have been permitted or allocated contrary to the local plan strategy because of special circumstances of each site.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendations (one previously advertised as pre inquiry change PM/2) for the reasons given in para 14.2.2 of his report</b></p>
<b>Botley, North Hinksey and Chawley Inset</b>	
<p>The Inspector has dealt with all issues concerning housing allocations and omission sites in relation to Botley, in chapter 8 of his report.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (on pages 135, 330 and 334 of his report): Amend Proposals Map to allocate land at Lime Road, Botley and Tilbury Lane, Botley for housing.</b></p>	<p>Provided the Council agrees to include these sites in policy H3, consequential changes should be made to the proposals map.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 14.6.1 provided the Council accepts the changes to policy H3.</b></p>
<b>Faringdon Inset</b>	
<p>The Inspector is satisfied that the development boundary of Faringdon has been properly and logically defined in the London Road area and should not be amended to permit further residential development that would visually project into the open countryside between the built up area of the town and the A420 to the south. The Inspector has however recommended changes at Sudbury House and at Coxwell Road for reasons explained in Chapter 3 and Chapter 8 (Policy H4).</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendation (page 332 of his report): Amend development boundary for Faringdon at Sudbury</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendation for the reasons given in para 14.7.1 of his report.</b></p>

The Inspector's Report on the draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

Development Control Committee and Executive 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and Council 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006

Summary of the Inspector's Reasoning and Recommended Changes	Observations of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group
House and Coxwell Road. Delete PM/40.	
<b>Wantage Town Centre Inset</b>	
<p>Both the boundaries of the Wantage Conservation Area and that of the Letcombe Brook Corridor have been amended in the revised deposit plan. However, the Council now agrees that further changes are required in relation to the Letcombe Brook corridor under PIC/PM/3 and The Bell PH on Mill Street, regarding the primary shopping frontage, under PIC/PM/4. The Inspector has no reason to disagree.</p> <p><b>Inspector's Recommendations (page 333 of his report):</b>  Delete The Bell PH frontage on Mill Street, Wantage from primary frontage (PIC/PM/4).</p> <p><b>Extend area of Letcombe Regis green corridor adjacent to Mill House, Lock Lane, Wantage (PIC/PM/3).</b></p>	<p>These changes to the proposal map were suggested by the Council as pre inquiry changes. The Bell Public House is not a A1 retail outlet and therefore should not be included as primary frontage and the land to which the extension of the Letcombe Brook corridor relates to is similar in character to land already included in the green corridor.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept the Inspector's recommendations (previously advertised as pre inquiry changes PM/3 and PM/4) for the reasons given in para 14.8.1 of his report.</b></p>