

Agenda



Contact: Candida Basilio
Telephone number: 07895 213820
Email: candida.basilio@southandvale.gov.uk
Date: 30 August 2024
Website: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

A meeting of the **Scrutiny Committee**

**will be held on Monday, 9 September 2024 at 7.00 pm
At Abbey House, Abbey Close, Abingdon OX14 3JE**

Members of the Committee:

Councillors:

Katherine Foxhall (chair)
Judy Roberts (vice chair)
Ron Batstone
Debby Hallett
Eric De La Harpe
Oliver Forder
James Cox
Hayleigh Gascoigne
Robert Maddison

Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email and easy read. For this or any other special requirements (such as access facilities) please contact the officer named on this agenda. Please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.

Vivien Williams,
Head of Legal and Democratic (Interim)

Agenda

Open to the Public including the Press

1. Chair's announcements

To receive opening announcements from the chair.

2. Apologies for absence

To record apologies for absence and the attendance of substitute members.

3. Minutes of the last meeting

(Pages 4 - 5)

To consider the Scrutiny Committee minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2024. If agreed to be a correct record, the chair will sign them as such.

4. Declaration of interests

To receive declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests, other registrable interests and non-registrable interests or any conflicts of interest in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting.

5. Urgent business

To receive notification of any matters which the chair determines should be considered as urgent business and the special circumstances which have made the matters urgent.

6. Public participation

To receive any questions or statements from members of the public that have registered to speak.

7. Work schedule and dates for all Vale and Joint scrutiny meetings

To review the attached scrutiny work schedule. Please note, although the dates are confirmed, the items under consideration are subject to being withdrawn, added to or rearranged without further notice. (schedule to follow)

REPORTS AND ISSUES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

8. Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan Part 2 review

(Pages 6 - 88)

Scrutiny Committee will consider a Cabinet report with recommendations to Cabinet and Council on the Local Plan Part 2 review.

9. Exclusion of the public

To consider whether to exclude members of the press and public from the meeting for the following items of business under Section 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended on the grounds that:

- (i) It is likely that there will be disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A, and
- (ii) the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

10. Exempt minutes

(Pages 89 - 92)

Committee may discuss exempt minutes if required, after exclusion of the public.

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Scrutiny Committee



held on Tuesday, 11 June 2024 at 7.00 pm
at Meeting Room 1, Abbey House, Abbey Close, Abingdon, OX14 3JE

Open to the public, including the press

Present in the meeting room:

Councillors: Katherine Foxhall (Chair), Judy Roberts (Vice-Chair), Ron Batstone, James Cox, Oliver Forder, Hayleigh Gascoigne, Debby Hallett, Robert Maddison and Eric de la Harpe

Officers: Tim Oruye (Head of Policy and Programmes), Candida Basilio (Democratic Services Officer)

Cabinet members: Councillor Andrew Crawford (Finance and Property Assets)

Also present remotely:

Councillors: Cabinet Member Mark Coleman (Waste and Environmental Services)

Officers: Andrew Busby (Head of Development and Corporate Landlord), Suzanne Malcolm (Deputy Chief Executive – Place), Mark Minion (Head of Corporate Services), Aileen Sparling (Principal Place Officer)

1. Chair's announcements

Chair ran through housekeeping matters.

2. Apologies for absence

None.

3. Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the meeting on 5 February 2024 were agreed to be a correct record, and the chair will sign them as such.

4. Declaration of interests

Councillor Judy Roberts declared that she was a member of Oxfordshire County Council, as Cabinet Member for Infrastructure & Development Strategy.

5. Urgent business

None.

6. Public participation

None.

7. Work schedule and dates for all Vale scrutiny meetings

There will be additional meetings around September to ensure time to scrutinise the reports coming up.

Other work programme ideas:

Decarbonisation lesson learned report – a member asked what other items we can add as lesson learned.

How do we deliver housing?

Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 requests – how do we decide what we are asking for in S106 agreements. This could come under lessons learned, also infrastructure and services that come with housing.

Section 106 concern over funds needing to be paid back – can we have reporting on this? It was confirmed that this would be covered in a later meeting.

Chair asked members to consider what they wanted to add or remove from the work programme.

8. Update on recommendations from previous Vale Scrutiny Committee meetings

Members noted the updates.

9. Exclusion of the public

Resolved:

Members voted in favour of excluding the public to consider a confidential report.

10. New waste vehicle depot

Members discussed the report of the Head of Development and Corporate Landlord and gave recommendations to Cabinet.

The meeting closed at 8.46 pm

Chair:

Date:

Cabinet Report



Report of Head of Policy and Programmes

Author: Robyn Tobutt

Telephone: 01235 422600

E-mail: Robyn.Tobutt@southandvale.gov.uk

Wards affected: All Wards

Vale Cabinet member responsible: Councillor Andy Foulsham

Tel: 07977 416133

E-mail: Andy.Foulsham@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

To: CABINET

Date: 27 September 2024

Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2 Review

Recommendation(s)

(a) That Cabinet approve for publication of the Regulation 10A review of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2.

(b) That the Council will not revise any Local Plan Part 2 policies as the preparation of the Joint Local Plan will enable the council to adopt replacement policies quicker than a formal review of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.

(c) To authorise the publishing of a formal statement confirming that Vale of White Horse District Council has completed the Regulation 10A review of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.

Implications (further detail within the report)	Financial	Legal	Climate and Ecological	Equality and diversity
	No	Yes	No	No
Signing off officer	Nicole Tyreman	Pat Connell	Jessie Fieth	Ruth Lewin-Leigh

Purpose of report

1. To seek approval of the review undertaken on the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2, in accordance with Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2021 (as amended).

Corporate objectives

2. This report helps to meet the Vale of White Horse Corporate Plan 2020-2024 Objectives by reviewing the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, which contains a suite of policies, many of which are related directly to these Objectives.
3. The key Corporate Objectives met through this analysis are:
 - Providing the homes people need
 - Tackling the Climate Emergency
 - Building healthy communities
 - Working in partnership

Background

4. Legislation introduced in 2018 requires that Local Plan reviews must be completed five years from the date of adoption – this ensures plans remain effective. Regulation 10A of the Town and Country (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) states that:

“10A. (1) A local planning authority must review a local development document within the following time periods — (a) in respect of a local plan, the review must be completed every five years, starting from the date of adoption of the local plan, in accordance with section 23 of the Act (adoption of local development documents).”

5. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 33 also draws attention to the regulatory requirement for five yearly reviews:

“33. Policies in local plans and spatial development strategies should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years and should then be updated as necessary¹⁸. Reviews should be completed no later than five years from the adoption date of a plan and should take into account changing circumstances affecting the area, or any relevant changes in national policy. Relevant strategic policies will need updating at least once every five years if their applicable local housing need figure has changed significantly; and they are likely to require earlier review if local housing need is expected to change significantly in the near future.

¹⁸Reviews at least every five years are a legal requirement for all local plans (Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012).”

6. The Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (LPP2): Detailed Policies and Additional Sites was adopted on 9 October 2019. In summary, LPP2 sets out:

- Policies and locations for new housing to meet the Vale’s proportion of Oxford City’s unmet housing need, which cannot be met within the City boundaries;
 - Policies for the part of Didcot Garden Town that lies within the Vale of White Horse District;
 - Detailed development management policies that complement the strategic policies as set out in Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (LPP1): Strategic Sites and Policies, and where appropriate, replace the remaining saved policies of the Local Plan 2011; and
 - Additional site allocations for housing.
7. LPP2 complements Local Plan 2031 Part 1: Strategic Sites and Policies (LPP1). A [review of LPP1](#) was carried out for the purposes of Regulation 10A, and the Vale Cabinet approved the review on 3 December 2021.
8. As LPP2 was adopted on 9 October 2019, it should be reviewed by October 2024 to comply with Regulation 10A.
9. The decision to progress a Joint Local Plan (JLP) was taken by full Council for the Vale of White Horse on 24 March 2021 and South Oxfordshire on 25 March 2021. Both Councils agreed the principles of governance to prepare and produce a JLP under Section 28 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The [Joint Local Development Scheme](#) (LDS) approved in August 2024 sets out the timetable for producing the JLP. Some stages such as the issues and preferred options consultation have already been completed. The remaining key stages as set out in the LDS can be summarised as:
- Publication of Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) for Representations to be made – October / November 2024
 - Submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 22) – December 2024
 - Expected Hearing of Examination in Public (Regulation 24)* – April 2025
 - Inspector’s report (Regulation 25)* – October 2025
 - Adoption (Regulation 26)* – December 2025
- *Timings and requirements post submission to the Secretary of State will be determined by the appointed Inspector. Subject to progression of the examination process, there may be subsequent changes to the published dates through to adoption.
10. The purpose of the JLP is to produce a suite of up-to-date development plan policies which will replace the existing local plans. The JLP enables the councils’ to pursue more ambitious objectives. The timescale of the emerging JLP is material to the decision on the need to review LPP2.
11. To help understand the scope of any future review of LPP2 the Council has undertaken a high-level assessment of the policies, taking account of how many are due to be replaced by emerging policies in the JLP (see Appendix 1). Emerging policies from the

JLP, using the Regulation 18 Part 2 document (January 2024), have been used to complete this assessment.

12. The assessment identifies if a policy is proposed to be carried forward, replaced, or deleted; then if it is proposed to be replaced, it assesses it against the relevant proposed replacement policy or policies in the JLP to establish if the replacement policy is in substance materially the same. If it is not materially the same, it considers if the LPP2 policy is effective and / or consistent with national policy. In this assessment the current NPPF, dated December 2023, has been used as the national policy position. Whilst the Government has recently consulted on revisions to the NPPF, these have not been considered in this assessment as they are currently only proposed. The LPP2 Review process cannot wait for revisions to the NPPF, which the Government have said will be published by the end of the year, as the timeframe set out in para 8 above means LPP2 should be reviewed by October 2024 to comply with Regulation 10A. Appendix 1 contains the results of this assessment.
13. Whether or not a policy is consistent with national policy is an exercise of planning judgement, paragraph 225 of the NPPF advises that:

“existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).”

Thus, a policy that is not wholly consistent with the NPPF should not necessarily be regarded as “out-of-date”. Government planning practice guidance (PPG) further expands (at paragraph ID61-064-20190315):

“Policies age at different rates according to local circumstances and a plan does not become out-of-date automatically after 5 years. The review process is a method to ensure that a plan and the policies within remains effective.”

The term ‘effective’ is not explained in either the NPPF or PPG, thus it is reasonable to regard it as concerned with the question of whether the policies provide an adequate basis to guide the Council in making decisions on planning applications, noting that any determination should be in accordance with the plan (taken as a whole) unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

14. The results from this assessment exercise are as follows:

- 2 policies in LPP2 are being carried forward in the JLP; 5 policies are being deleted; 50 policies are being replaced.
- Most of the policies being replaced in the JLP differ significantly in substance from those in LPP2. This is often because the original policies are no longer effective or consistent with national policy; 25 policies are being replaced for these reasons. The assessment has found that 27 of the policies do not need updating. However, most will still be replaced by the new JLP policies, which are more effective or better aligned with the Council’s ambitions. In some cases, this replacement is due to a shift in policy style: the JLP aims to integrate the best aspects of the South and Vale local plans, presenting

policies in a clearer and simpler language, in line with the Council's Corporate Plan commitment to working in an open and inclusive way.

15. Through this assessment the Council is able to form a judgement on the likely timescale for the preparation of revisions to LPP2. This is based on the likely time needed to complete the tasks associated with revising the policies that are no longer effective and / or consistent with national policy. Of the 57 policies in LPP2, our assessment concludes that 25 need updating. Any revision to LPP2 would have to go through the formal procedures for the preparation of development plan documents in Part 2 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the associated Local Planning (England) Regulations 2012. Based on the fact that 25 policies need updating, we can assume an approximate timeline of:
- Preparation of revised policies - Autumn 2024
 - Publication of Regulation 18 for Representations to be made – Winter 2024
 - Publication of Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) for Representations to be made– Summer 2025
 - Submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 22) – Summer/Autumn 2025
 - Expected Hearings of Examination in Public (Regulation 24) – Winter 2025
 - Inspector's report (Regulation 25) – Spring 2026
 - Adoption (Regulation 26) – Summer 2026
16. This timeline refers to the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulation 2012, and is making reasoned assumptions based on the typical time taken to complete each stage.
17. This allows the Council to have an informed basis for making a comparison. It is relevant to compare the timescale because it can be reasonably assumed that were it not for the JLP replacing policies that are no longer consistent with national policy and / or effective, the Council would likely need to revise these policies.
18. We note the Regulation 19 version of the JLP is currently being finalised for publication. The policies in the Regulation 19 version will build on policies from the Regulation 18 Part 2 document (January 2024), therefore it is not considered necessary that a specific appraisal of LPP2 against emerging Regulation 19 policies take place to understand that the JLP will be in place before any revised LPP2 can be adopted.
19. This comparison reveals that there would likely be a material difference between the time taken to put the proposed policies of the JLP in place (December 2025) and the time it would take to put a revised LPP2 in place (Summer 2026). On this basis, revising LPP2 would not produce a suite of up-to-date development plan policies materially sooner than via the JLP process that is already underway and advanced. In fact, the reasonable estimate in this report establishes that revising LPP2 would do so later. Preparing revisions to LPP2 would therefore serve no practical purpose in terms of having effective policies in place but would involve a duplication of effort and resources.

Options

20. There are three options to consider regarding this review:

Option 1: Approve the Regulation 10A review of LPP2 for publication in October 2024 and decide not to revise LPP2 policies.

This action would comply with Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). The review within this report fulfils the Council's duty to consider whether to revise the document. Whilst this review concludes that there are LPP2 policies that require updating, the preparation of the JLP, makes the revision of LPP2 policies not necessary as it would not produce a suite of up-to-date development plan policies materially sooner than via the JLP process that is already underway and advanced. This is the recommended option.

Option 2: Approve the Regulation 10A review of LPP2 and instruct officers to prepare a LPP2 review.

This option is not recommended because whilst it would comply with the regulations, this report has considered that reviewing the policies of LPP2 could not be done materially sooner than the preparation of the JLP, which will replace LPP2 policies once adopted. This option would result in a duplication of effort and resources and would have financial implications.

Option 3: Not to approve the Regulation 10A review of LPP2 for publication.

This option is not recommended, as undertaking a five-yearly review is a statutory requirement. Should the review not be published, Vale of White Horse District Council would not be meeting a legislative requirement, and this could additionally result in an increase of planning appeals or the potential for a Judicial Review.

Financial Implications

21. There are no direct financial implications to the review itself. The review has been conducted in-house and within existing budgets. Approving the review and instructing officers to prepare a revised LPP2 (option 2) could have financial implications due to the existing budget not accounting for the work and the resources needed to complete the task. Failure to publish a review (option 3) in 2024 could result in an increase in the number of planning appeals being upheld and the associated costs being awarded to the appellants.

Legal Implications

22. The recommended Option meets the five yearly review statutory requirement and enables officers to focus on progressing the JLP.

Climate and ecological impact implications

23. The LPP2 Review has no direct climate or ecological impacts. However, through the review process all LPP2 policies that have a direct or indirect link to climate and ecological impacts has been assessed to determine their effectiveness and consistency with national policy. The policies in LPP2 that relate to protecting the environment and responding to climate change are: Development Policy 20: Public Art;

Development Policy 21: External Lighting; Development Policy 22: Advertisements; Development Policy 23: Impact of Development on Amenity; Development Policy 24: Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments; Development Policy 25: Noise Pollution; Development Policy 26: Air Quality; Development Policy 27: Land Affected by Contamination; Development Policy 28: Waste Collection and Recycling; Development Policy 29: Settlement Character and Gaps; Development Policy 30: Watercourses; Development Policy 31: Protection of Public Rights of Way, national Trails and Open Access Areas; Development Policy 32: The Wilts and Berks Canal; Development Policy 33: Open Space; Development Policy 34: Leisure and Sports Facilities; Development Policy 35: New Countryside Recreation Facilities; Development Policy 36: Heritage Assets; Development Policy 37: Conservation Areas; Development Policy 38: Listed Buildings; Development Policy 39: Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments. Going with option 1 will save a modest amount of paper and emissions like travel to meetings/ events/ an examination, by avoiding duplicating plan-making processes already well advanced for the JLP.

Equalities implications

24. In making decisions the council is required to have regard to its equalities duties and in particular to those set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and eliminate any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act, to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic namely age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation, and persons who do not share it and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
25. The proposal to carry out the review of the plan does not have direct equalities implications however by carrying out a review and not revising the policies but instead to focus on devising and implementing a joint local plan will have a positive impact for local residents as it will:
- Ensure that future plans to build homes meet the latest requirements for best practice and will provide better quality, affordable homes suitable for those with additional needs.
 - Provide local services e.g shops, transport close to where people live and make those services more accessible by reducing the need to travel. In addition, reducing travel, providing better public transport options will potentially have a positive impact on the environment and lowering carbon emissions, which improves the health and wellbeing of residents. Local services will improve the lifestyle of local residents with mobility issues.
 - Ensure there are a range of homes available to meet the varying needs of local residents at different points in their life will support the most vulnerable in the community who may have protected characteristics.
 - Improve travel routes will benefit residents particularly those with visual or physical impairments to safely travel around the district.
 - Ensure adequate parking including disabled parking for residents to easily access amenities e.g healthcare, retail, transport.

- Improve the environment residents live in and reduce the impact of climate change will support those with health and wellbeing issues.

Risks

26. The risks associated with the different options are presented in this report, particularly the risk of not meeting legislative requirements, which could result in an increase of planning appeals or the potential for a Judicial Review. These risks are minimised by the decision in this report.

Other Implications

27. NA

Conclusion

28. This review in accordance with Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2021 (as amended) has concluded that in light of the ongoing preparation of the JLP, no revisions to LPP2 are necessary. This is a matter of planning judgement, and for the reasons set out in this report preparation of such revisions would not be sensible. This fulfils the Council's duty to consider whether to revise the documents following each review.

29. The Council should not revise LPP2 because it is going to be replaced by the JLP, which is at a more advanced stage. The JLP is not a revision to LPP1 and LPP2 but is to be a replacement for them, covering a more extensive geographical area, as well as a different plan period. The preparation of the JLP is proceeding as a joint plan under Section 28 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The plan-preparation process should see the JLP in place as a replacement local plan by the end of 2025 (in accordance with the LDS).

Background Papers

- Appendix 1 – Review of policies in LPP2

Appendices

APPENDIX 1: VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031 PART 2 REVIEW POLICY ASSESSMENT

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
CP4a: Meeting our Housing Needs	Carried forward	<p>HOU2 – Sources of housing supply carry forward the following allocations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North-East of East Hanney • South-East of Marcham • North of East Hanney <p>Other aspects of this policy have been replaced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HOU2 – Sources of housing supply • HOU1 - Housing 	Partially, the proposed replacement policies carry forward the site allocation elements of policy CP4a which have yet to be delivered. However, the emerging JLP identifies a new (separate) housing requirement during the plan period for Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire. The emerging JLP plans to deliver growth beyond the period planned by LPP2, to	Following changes in national planning policy and guidance on how housing need is calculated, and the datedness of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA's) underpinning forecast, we no longer consider these a sound basis for housing need. Planning practice guidance states that through the plan making process there may be exceptional circumstances to uplift housing need above	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
		requirement	<p>2041.</p> <p>Housing targets in LPP2 are derived from the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)(2014). In the emerging JLP the preferred policy option is using the standard method for assessing the Vale of White Horse's own housing need. However, the JLP preferred options consultation makes a continued allowance for existing agreed unmet need from Oxford City identified by / exported from their Oxford City</p>	the "standard method", where there is a commitment to accommodate unmet need from a neighbouring council. However, this will need to be determined through the upcoming examination into the JLP. Until such a time that this has been tested, national policy and guidance is clear that the council should rely solely on the standard method for assessing its housing need for monitoring purposes (as Core Policy 4a is now more than 5 years old and requires updating).		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			Local Plan 2036. This essentially represents a continuation of the approach for addressing the unmet need agreed in Core Policy 4a, albeit over a shorter period from 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2031 - as opposed to 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2031. Nevertheless, the uplift in housing need for the district remains 183 homes per annum in both the Local Plan 2031, and the emerging JLP 2041.	Despite the policy no longer being consistent with national policy, it still remains partially effective as it contains site allocations which have yet to be delivered and which are being carried over into the JLP. The policy is also effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO1 and SO3.		
CP8a: Additional Site Allocations for	Carried forward	HOU2 – Sources of housing supply carry forward the following	Partially, the replacement policies carry forward the site	The overall housing requirement figure is updated in response to	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area		<p>allocations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North-East of East Hanney • South-East of Marcham • North of East Hanney <p>Other aspects of this policy have been replaced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HOU2 – Sources of housing supply • HOU1 - Housing requirement • SP1 – Spatial strategy 	<p>allocation elements of policy CP8a which have yet to be delivered. However, the emerging JLP proposes a new spatial strategy and whilst this includes familiar elements of the previous spatial strategy, it looks to deliver growth beyond the period planned by LPP2, to 2041.</p> <p>The policy also identifies a housing requirement for the sub area that is linked to Core Policies 4, 4a and 8 - both of which require updating (as a result of the review of</p>	<p>changes to national planning policy and guidance on how housing need is calculated.</p> <p>However, the policy remains partially effective as it contains site allocations that still need to be delivered and which are being carried over into the JLP. The policy is also effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO1 and SO3.</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			this LPP2, and the December 2021 review of the LPP1). Therefore, this element of the policy will also require updating.			
CP8b: Dalton Barracks Strategic Allocation	Replaced	AS10 - Land at Dalton Barracks Garden Village, Shippon	Partially, the proposed replacement policy seeks to extend and allocate the site for 2,750 homes, up from the 1,200 dwellings allocated through LPP2. The replacement policy sets out an extensive series of requirements for the proposal to demonstrate. Policy CP8b comments on	Policy CP8b is generally consistent with national policy. However, the emerging JLP is replacing the allocation policy to optimise the delivery of an exemplar mixed-used development on the site and ensure consistency with the Supplementary Planning Document for Dalton Barracks adopted in 2022. The policy is, however, still	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			the masterplanning of the site, setting out the need for a Supplementary Planning Document, which has since been published and therefore is no longer a policy requirement.	effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO1 and SO3.		
CP12a: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area	Replaced	IN3 - Transport infrastructure and safeguarding	Partially, the replacement policy identifies the approach to safeguarding sites for transport and seeks to safeguard a range of transport schemes. The proposed replacement policy is retaining all of the schemes identified in CP12a, with updates to the 'Lodge Hill Mobility Hub and	The policy remains consistent with national policy, as it safeguards transport schemes which are still deemed to be necessary. The policy is effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO3, SO8 and SO9. However, a replacement policy is needed to update	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			upgraded A34 slips' (formerly: Lodge Hill for Park & Ride and upgraded slips) and 'Upgraded active travel route between Shippon and Abingdon-on-Thames' (formerly: Land safeguarded for upgraded footpath between Shippon and Abingdon-on-Thames).	schemes and ensure it remains effective.		
CP13a: Oxford Green Belt	Replaced	SP1 - Spatial strategy	No, the proposed replacement policy is not materially the same. Policy SP1 sets out where new development will be promoted and where it will be limited to meet the objectives of the plan. The Oxford	Policy 13a amended the Green Belt boundary to reflect the allocation at Dalton Barracks. It had a specific purpose and requires that applicants read it in conjunction with Core Policy 13 (LPP1). Core	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>Green Belt forms one element of this spatial strategy, with it set out that development in the Green Belt will be considered in accordance with the NPPF. Adopted policy CP13a directs readers to Core Policy 13 (Local Plan 2031: part 1) for the Council's approach to development within the Oxford Green Belt. The addition in CP13a is the amendment to the Green Belt boundary to remove land at Dalton Barracks to be allocated as an additional housing allocation.</p>	<p>Policy 13 is no longer consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 154 and 155 of the NPPF.</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
CP14a: Upper Thames Strategic Storage Reservoir	Replaced	IN7 - South East Strategic Reservoir Option (SESRO) Safeguarding	<p>Partially, the area safeguarded in CP14a remains unchanged in the replacement policy.</p> <p>The proposed replacement policy IN7 sets out requirements for the applicants, whereas CP14a sought to update the safeguarded area to reflect plans prepared by Thames Water and required the reader to consider it alongside Core Policy 14 (LPP1). The replacement policy includes a much greater level of detail than the policies in</p>	<p>The policy relates to the delivery of a potential Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), updating the safeguarded area. However, for the full context it needs to be read it in conjunction with Core Policy 14 (LPP1).</p> <p>The policies in LPP1 and LPP2 remain consistent with national policy, but the council consider it necessary to improve its effectiveness, through a more detailed policy, that will also reflect the latest position on the NSIP.</p>	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			LPP1 and LPP2.	The policy is, however, effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO12.		
CP15a: Additional Site Allocations for South-East Vale Sub-Area	Replaced	SP1 - Spatial strategy HOU1 - Housing requirement HOU2 – Sources of Housing Supply AS8 – North West of Grove, Grove - Added	Partially, the only allocation in the South-East Vale Sub-Area is at North-West Grove, the principle of an allocation here remains the same. The site North West of Grove, Grove is proposed to be allocated for approximately 600 new homes in policy AS8 of the emerging JLP. The site was originally allocated by CP15a for 400 new homes, with the acknowledgement that the site has the	Policy CP15a is generally consistent with national policy. However, the emerging JLP is replacing the allocation policy to include site specific requirements, where previously these were in appendix A of LPP2, to make the policy more effective. The policy is, however, effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO1 and SO3.	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>capacity to deliver more housing. As the emerging JLP covers an extended plan period, the preferred policy option is to allocate the site for 600 homes, to cover up until 2041. Other sites allocated by this policy will have their site allocations carried forward (where they have not fully built out) as an appendix to the emerging JLP under policy HOU2: Sources of housing supply.</p> <p>The Policy also identifies a housing requirement for the</p>			

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			sub area that is linked to Core Policies 4, 4a and 15- all of which require updating (as a result of the review of this LPP2, and the December 2021 review of the LPP1). Therefore, this element of the policy will also require updating.			
CP15c: Grove Comprehensive Development Framework	Deleted	A Supplementary Planning Document is no longer required as a framework for Grove has been progressed through the development management process for planning applications in the settlement.	N/A	The policy is no longer necessary as the framework for Grove has been progressed through the development management process for planning applications in the settlement.	Yes	NA

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
CP15b: Harwell Campus Comprehensive Development Framework	Replaced	AS12 - Harwell Campus	Partially, policy CP15b sets out some criteria for how future development should come forward through a Supplementary Planning Document. In the emerging JLP the delivery of a Supplementary Planning Document is no longer required, but the criteria have been carried forward to preferred policy AS12. The proposed replacement policy is requiring a masterplan, and for proposals to deliver all the elements listed in CP15b, plus adequately assessing and mitigating impact	Policy CP15b remains generally consistent with national policy. The emerging JLP is proposing to replace the allocation policy to require the delivery of a masterplan, rather than a Supplementary Planning Document. The existing policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO6; however, the proposed policy in the JLP will be more effective.	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			upon areas of archaeological interest.			
CP16b: Didcot Garden Town	Replaced	SP3 - Strategy for Didcot Garden Town	No, the proposed replacement policy offers an opportunity to plan holistically across Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire. It is not materially the same as it is a more detailed policy, which goes beyond the Didcot Garden Town Masterplan Principles as set out in CP16b. The emerging JLP updates the proposed policy and principles that will apply to development within the Didcot masterplan area, providing	Policy CP16b remains generally consistent with national policy. Whilst the policy also remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO1, SO2, SO3, SO5, SO8, and SO11, the proposed replacement policy has greater effectiveness due to the ability to have a joint policy, covering the whole of the Didcot Area of Influence. Since the adoption of LPP2 the council has decided to provide more detailed guidance. Providing	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			greater clarity within the Didcot policy about the importance of the surrounding Area of Influence.	more detail gives an opportunity to provide the most up to date infrastructure and funding opportunities, projects and council-led opportunities.		
CP18a: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Highway Improvements within the South-East Vale Sub-Area	Replaced	IN3 - Transport infrastructure and safeguarding	Partially, the proposed replacement policy identifies the approach to safeguarding sites for transport and seeks to safeguard a range of transport schemes. The proposed replacement policy is retaining the schemes identified in CP18a, with an updated safeguarding plan for the 'Didcot to	The policy remains consistent with national policy, as it safeguards transport schemes which are still deemed to be necessary. However, a replacement policy is needed to update schemes and ensure it remains effective. The policy is, however, effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			Culham river crossing' (formerly 'Thames River Corssing between Culham and Dodcot'), 'Milton Heights pedestrian and cycle bridge' (formerly 'provision for a new pedestrian and cycle bridge across the A34 at Milton Heights'), and 'Cinder Track active travel improvements' (formerly 'Cinder Track Improvements').	objective SO8.		
CP19a: Re-opening of Grove Railway Station	Replaced	IN3 - Transport infrastructure and safeguarding	Partially, the proposed replacement policy identifies the approach to safeguarding sites for	A replacement policy is needed to ensure the policy remains effective and up to date, reflecting the suitability or otherwise	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>transport and seeks to safeguard a range of transport schemes. The replacement policy is retaining the safeguarded scheme 'Wantage and Grove Railway Station (formerly 'Land for Grove Statement').</p> <p>CP19a shows three potential options for the new railway station, two of these have now been identified as being less suitable by Oxfordshire County Council. Therefore, the replacement policy only identifies one safeguarded location.</p>	<p>of land safeguarded for particular schemes. The policy is, however, effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO8.</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
CP20a: Housing Supply for Western Vale Sub-Area	Replaced	SP1 - Spatial strategy HOU1 - Housing requirement HOU2 – Sources of Housing Supply	Partially, the proposed replacement policies carry forward the site allocation elements. Policy CP20a updates the housing supply for the Western Vale Sub-Area to ensure consistency with the other Sub-Areas, but does not contain any contribution towards the agreed quantum of unmet housing need. Other sites allocated by this policy will have their site allocations carried forward (where they have not fully built out) as an appendix to the JLP	The overall housing requirement figure is updated in response to changes to national planning policy and guidance on how housing need is calculated.	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>under policy HOU2: Sources of housing supply.</p> <p>The emerging JLP proposes a new spatial strategy, and whilst this includes familiar elements of the previous spatial strategy, it looks to deliver growth beyond the period planned by LPP1 and LPP2.</p> <p>The policy also identifies a housing requirement for the sub area that is linked to Core Policies 4, 4a and 20- all of which require updating (as a result of the review of</p>			

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			this LPP1, and the December 2021 review of the LPP1). Therefore, this element of the policy will also require updating.			
CP47a: Delivery and Contingency	Deleted	Sufficiently covered by the National Planning Policy Framework.	N/A	The policy is no longer necessary as the matter is sufficiently covered by the National Planning Policy Framework.	Yes	NA
DP1: Self and Custom-Build	Replaced	HOU6 - Self and Custom Build Housing HOU7 - Affordable Self and Custom Build Housing	No, both policies support the provision of self and custom build housing, but the proposed JLP policy adds further detail specifying where such development would be supported. The JLP seeks to	Policy DP1 is generally consistent with national policy which seeks opportunities, through policies and decisions, to support small sites to come forward for community-led development for housing and self-build and custom-build	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			<p>elevate the affordable housing requirement to 50%.</p> <p>The JLP extends the marketing period by 12 months requiring it to be marked as a shell home following 12 months of marketing as self-build or custom housebuilding plot.</p>	<p>housing.</p> <p>Changes have been made to the equivalent proposed policies HOU6 and HOU7 in the emerging JLP to make it more effective in dealing with self and custom build housing; however, the existing policy remains effective including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO1 and SO2.</p>		
DP2: Space Standards	Replaced	HOU4 - Housing Mix and Size	No, both policies require all affordable homes, and all 1- and 2-bedroom market homes to be designed to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards.	Policy DP2 is generally consistent with national policy which encourage planning policies for housing to make use of the Government's optional technical standards for	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>However, the emerging JLP is investigating whether evidence justifies extending these standards to cover more new homes (for example 3-bedroom market homes).</p> <p>The proposed JLP policy aligns with emerging Building Regulations requirements for all new homes to be built to at least M4(2) (Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings) (or any equivalent replacement standards).</p>	<p>accessible and adaptable housing, where this would address an identified need for such properties. National policy also encourages the use of the nationally described space standard, where the need for an internal space standard can be justified.</p> <p>However, the changes made to proposed policy HOU4 respond to the upcoming requirement for dwellings to meet Category M4(2) of the Building Regulations. Whilst the policy</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			The JLP process is investigating the percentage of category M4(3) (wheelchair user adaptable dwellings) that should be provided by specialist elderly accommodation and C3 residential development.	remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO1 and SO2, as is not based upon this upcoming national requirement, it will need to be updated.		
DP3: Sub-Division of Dwellings	Replaced	HOU9 - Sub-division of homes	Mostly, both policies support the subdivision of dwellings; however, proposed policy HOU9 requires these dwellings to be within a location supported by the settlement hierarchy identified in proposed policy SP2. Policy DP3 also	The lack of focus in proposed policy HOU9 on the need for new subdivided dwellings to have appropriate parking reflects the active climate emergency and the desire to promote active travel throughout the emerging JLP.	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>provides an additional requirement for adequate and safe access to each of the dwellings to be provided and for appropriate parking in accordance with Core Policy 35: Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking, and for the new dwellings to be of a good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the building, street scene and surroundings in accordance with the Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	<p>Policy DP3 also references the Council's Design Guide SPD. This document has now been superseded by the Joint Design Guide, which is an updated document which takes account of the National Model Design Code. The Joint Design Guide, whilst not referenced in proposed policy HOU9 is comprehensively addressed in proposed Chapter 10 of the emerging JLP. Whilst the policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				<p>SO1 and SO2, as is not based upon this latest evidence, it will need updating.</p> <p>Additionally, whilst proposed policy HOU9 does not reference accessibility, this matter is covered more generally by Policy HOU4, which responds to the upcoming requirement for dwellings to meet Category M4(2) of the Building Regulations. As policy DP3 does not respond to this upcoming national requirement, it will need to be updated.</p>		
DP4: Residential	Replaced	HOU16 - Residential extensions and	Mostly, policy DP4 and paragraph 2 of	Changes have been made to the equivalent	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
<p>Annexes</p>		<p>annexes</p>	<p>proposed policy HOU16 are almost identical. The only additions to proposed policy HOU16 are that the new annex would not constitute the creation of a separate, independent dwelling and that within the Green Belt, and within the countryside, the annex would be no greater than 40 percent of the volume of the original dwelling. Proposed policy HOU16 also adds the additional requirement for development to have regard to the Joint</p>	<p>proposed policy HOU16 in the emerging JLP to make it more effective in dealing with residential annexes; however, the existing policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO1 and SO2.</p> <p>Proposed policy HOU16 references the Joint Design Guide, which has been prepared since the adoption of the Vale LPP2 and is an updated document which takes account of the National Model Design Code. Whilst policy DP4 is still</p>		

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>Design Guide.</p>	<p>effective, as it is not based upon this latest evidence, it will need updating.</p>		
<p>DP5: Replacement Dwellings in the Open Countryside</p>	<p>Replaced</p>	<p>HOU8 - Replacement dwellings in the countryside</p>	<p>Mostly, proposed policy HOU8 incorporates all of the elements of policy DP5, and adds additional elements from SODC Local Plan 2035 policy H18, with the additional requirement that the development takes place in accordance with proposed policy CE3 (Reducing embodied carbon) in the emerging JLP prioritising the reuse, retention and retrofit of existing buildings.</p>	<p>The introduction of the reference to proposed policy CE3 in proposed policy HOU8 reflects the active climate emergency and the ambition of the JLP to meet net zero targets. Proposed policy HOU8 also incorporates elements of the SODC Local Plan policy H18. These changes look to make proposed policy HOU8 more effective; however, the existing policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				SO1 and SO3.		
DP6: Rural Workers' Dwellings	Replaced	HOU17 - Rural workers' dwellings	Mostly, both policies provide provisions by which rural workers dwellings in the open countryside will be supported. Policy DP6 includes a requirement for the rural enterprise the rural workers dwellings are built to support to have been operational for at least 3 years, whilst proposed policy HOU17 does not place this time specific requirement.	Proposed policy HOU17 responds to changes in permitted development rights since the adoption of the LPP2 (Class MA in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development etc.) (England) (Amendment) Order 2021, by removing the permitted development right allowing extensions to properties on those properties pertinent to this policy. As policy DP6 predates the changes to permitted development rights, it is unable to properly	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				respond to them. As such, whilst the policy remains effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO1, SO3 and SO10, as is not based upon this latest evidence, it will need updating.		
DP7: Re-use, Conversion and Extension of Buildings for Dwellings in the Open Countryside	Deleted	Sufficiently covered by permitted development rights.	N/A	The policy is no longer necessary as the matter is sufficiently covered by permitted development rights.	Yes	NA
DP8: Community Services and Facilities	Replaced	HP2 - Community services and facilities	No, the intention of both policies is similar; however, proposed policy HP2 builds upon the requirements set out in policy DP8 relating to development which	Changes have been made to the equivalent proposed policy HP2 in the emerging JLP to make it more effective in dealing with community services and facilities; however,	No	No

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>results in the loss of a community facility to specify that appropriate, detailed and robust evidence will be required to satisfy the stated criteria and that the council will require the independent assessment of this evidence.</p> <p>Proposed policy HP2 also sets out that planning conditions or legal obligations may be necessary to ensure that any replacement facility and its ongoing maintenance is provided and that</p>	<p>the existing policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO2, SO4 and SO5.</p>		

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>some community services or facilities may be deemed essential.</p> <p>Proposed policy HP2 also sets out some additional requirements for development proposals relating to the provision of new or expanded community facilities, specifically in relation to access and green infrastructure.</p>			
<p>DP9: Public Houses</p>	<p>Replaced</p>	<p>HP2 - Community services and facilities</p>	<p>No, whilst the intention of policy DP9 is mostly covered by proposed policy HP2, there is not a direct comparison within the</p>	<p>Whilst there is not an equivalent policy in the emerging JLP, this is a result of the emerging JLP intending to provide fewer but more comprehensive</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			emerging JLP for the exact focus of policy DP9.	policies, rather than the original Vale LPP2 policy being ineffective. Policy DP9 is addressed comprehensively in proposed policy HP2. Policy DP9 remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO2, SO4 and SO5.		
DP10: Ancillary Uses on Employment Land	Replaced	JT2 - Protecting our employment sites	Mostly, the intention of policy DP10 is mostly repeated within proposed policy JT2. However, policy DP10 states that the policy is only relevant for uses outside of B1, B2 and B8. These use classes are no longer	The policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO5; however, as the use classes referenced are now out of date and do not reflect the current use class order, the policy should be updated to	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			applicable as per the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020. Proposed policy JT2 responds to this change in use class order.	achieve consistency with the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020.		
DP11: Community Employment Plans	Replaced	JT4 - Community Employment Plans	Mostly, both policies support the use of Community Employment Plans; however, policy DP11 is based on guidance from the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) (2014) produced as part of the Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan, whilst	Proposed policy JT4 responds to the latest evidence produced; the existing policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO2, SO4 and SO5, as this new evidence is not necessary for adhering to any updated national policy. Policy	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			proposed policy JT4 is based on the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP) produced Developers Handbook for Community Employment Plans (2023).	DP11 does not require updating.		
DP12: Rural Diversification and Equestrian Development	Replaced	JT5 - Supporting the rural economy JT6 - Supporting sustainable tourism and the visitor economy TCR4 - Retail and service provision in villages and local centres	No, both policies support rural diversification in relation to existing businesses, but proposed policy JT5 also supports the creation of new sustainable land-based or agricultural businesses in the countryside. Proposed policy JT5	DP12 is largely consistent with national policy which seeks to allow the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas and the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses.	No	No

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>also builds on DP12 in terms of conditions applied to conversion of farm buildings, specifically in response to changes in permitted development (Class ZA of Part 20 The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO)) at the national level since the adoption of LPP2.</p> <p>Proposed policy TCR4 replicates part of Policy DP12 which addresses equestrian development.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to the equivalent proposed policy JT5 in the JLP to respond to the changes in permitted development. As Policy DP12 indicates it only applies in the case of proposals, any development which is brought forward through permitted development will not need to have regard to the policy. The policy would still be effective were planning permission required.</p> <p>Changes have also been made to the equivalent proposed policy JT5 in the JLP</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				to make it more effective in dealing with the creation of new sustainable land-based or agricultural businesses in the countryside; however, the existing policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO5, S10 and SO11. Policy DP12 does not require updating.		
DP13a: Primary Shopping Frontages	Deleted	Superseded by changes to the Use Classes Order.	N/A	The policy is no longer necessary as the matter has been superseded by changes to the Use Classes Order	Yes	NA
DP13b: Secondary Shopping	Deleted	Superseded by changes to the Use Classes Order.	N/A	The policy is no longer necessary as the matter has been	Yes	NA

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
Frontages				superseded by changes to the Use Classes Order		
DP13c: Other Town Centre Uses	Replaced	TCR2 - Strategy for town and local service centres	<p>No, policy DP13c addresses other town centre uses (non-retail) within town centres specifically, whilst proposed policy TCR2 addresses the topic of town centres generally.</p> <p>Both policies do support other uses within the town centre; however, policy DP13c states that these uses will be supported so long as there is no demonstrable harm on the living</p>	The emerging JLP responds to changes in permitted development since the adoption of the LPP2 (Class MA in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development etc.) (England) (Amendment) Order 2021) and use classes referred to in policy DP13d are no longer applicable and have been superseded as of December 2020 (Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment)	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>conditions of neighbouring residents Policy TCR2 does not address these elements; however, they are covered more generally in Policy CE10.</p> <p>Additionally, TCR2 reacts to the change in use class order in 2020.</p>	<p>(England) Regulations 2020).</p> <p>Policy DP13c only applies to proposals that require planning permission, development which is brought forward through permitted development will not need to have regard to the policy. The policy would still be effective were planning permission required.</p> <p>However, whilst the policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO5 and SO7, as the use classes referenced</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				are now out of date and do not reflect the current use class order, the policy should be updated to achieve consistency with the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020.		
DP13d: Faringdon Town Centre	Replaced	TCR2 - Strategy for town and local service centres	No, both policies deal with the conversion of ground floor and upper floor uses within the town centre boundary (DP13d deals with Faringdon specifically); however, policy DP13d restricts the conversion of retail to healthcare facilities or residential to cases	The emerging JLP responds to changes in permitted development since the adoption of the Vale LPP2 (Class MA in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development etc.) (England) (Amendment) Order 2021) and use classes	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>where they retain an "active frontage". Proposed policy TCR2 instead protects ground floor retail uses unless evidence of at least twelve months active marketing demonstrates that the site is unviable.</p> <p>Additionally, proposed policy TCR2 reacts to the change in use class order in 2020.</p>	<p>referred to in policy DP13d are no longer applicable and have been superseded as of December 2020 (Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020).</p> <p>As policy DP13d indicates it only applies in the case of proposals, any development which is brought forward through permitted development will not need to have regard to the policy. The policy would still be effective were planning permission required.</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				However, whilst the policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO5 and SO7, as the use classes referenced are now out of date and do not reflect the current use class order, the policy should be updated to achieve consistency with the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020.		
DP13e: Local Shopping Centres	Replaced	TCR2 - Strategy for town and local service centres	No, proposed policy TCR2 reacts to the change in the changes in permitted development and the	The emerging JLP responds to changes in permitted development since the adoption of the Vale	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>changes of use class order in 2020.</p>	<p>LPP2 (Class MA in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development etc.) (England) (Amendment) Order 2021) and use classes referred to in policy DP13e are no longer applicable and have been superseded as of December 2020 (Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020).</p> <p>As policy DP13e indicates it only applies in the case of proposals, any development which is</p>		

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
				<p>brought forward through permitted development will not need to have regard to the policy. The policy would still be effective were planning permission required. However, whilst the policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO5 and SO7, as the use classes referenced are now out of date and do not reflect the current use class order, the policy should be updated to achieve consistency with the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment)</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				(England) Regulations 2020.		
DP14: Village and Local Shops	Replaced	TCR2 - Strategy for town and local service centres TCR4 - Retail and service provision in villages and local centres	No, policy DP14 supports proposals for village shops with less than 500 sq.m gross retail floorspace, whilst proposed policy TCR4 only supports proposals with 280 sq.m floorspace or less as per Use Class F2 Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended). Proposals over 280 sq.m may still be supported through proposed policy TCR2. Both policies address	Whilst policy DP14 is not inconsistent with national policy which seeks the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, it does not reflect the changes to permitted development rights at a national level. Proposed policy TCR2 responds to these changes effectively. Policy DP14 indicates it only applies in the case of proposals, any development which is brought forward	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>the loss or change of use of any shop or service within a village or local centre; however, proposed policy TCR4 adds the additional requirement that there is another equivalent shop or service use accessible to customers within an 800m walking distance and sets a minimum 12 month active marketing to test viability.</p> <p>Proposed policy TCR2 sets out that when determining applications for retail or commercial leisure</p>	<p>through permitted development will not need to have regard to the policy. The policy would still be effective were planning permission required.</p> <p>However, whilst the policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO5, as the use classes referenced are now out of date and do not reflect the current use class order, the policy should be updated to achieve consistency with the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment)</p>		

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>development outside of the defined town centres, consideration will be given as to whether to include conditions to restrict the usage to that in the application. DP14 has no such restriction.</p>	<p>(England) Regulations 2020.</p> <p>Additionally, the changes made to equivalent proposed policy TCR4 in the emerging JLP which restricts the loss or change of use of any shop or service use located within a village or local centre to only those cases where there is another equivalent shop or service use accessible to customers within an 800m walking distance and the it has been actively marketed for a minimum 12 months are based upon new evidence collated for</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				the development of the emerging JLP. As Policy DP14 is not based upon this latest evidence, it will need updating.		
DP15: Retail Parks	Replaced	TCR2 - Strategy for town and local service centres	<p>Mostly, whilst the intention of policy DP15 is mostly covered by proposed policy TCR2, there is not a direct comparison within the emerging JLP for the exact focus of Policy DP15.</p> <p>Policy DP15 makes reference to the impact assessment in Core Policy 32 which is largely the same as that found in proposed policy</p>	Whilst there is not an equivalent policy in the emerging JLP, this is a result of the emerging JLP intending to provide fewer but more comprehensive policies, rather than the original Vale LPP2 policy being ineffective. The topic of out of town retail and commercial leisure is addressed comprehensively in proposed policy TCR2 which itself is an update to Core Policy	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			TCR2; however, the floorspace thresholds have been updated.	32 in the Vale LPP1. Policy DP15 is still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO5.		
DP16: Access	Replaced	IN2 - Sustainable transport and accessibility IN5 - Parking Standards IN6 – Deliveries and freight	No, whilst the intention of policy DP16 is mostly covered by proposed policy IN2 and IN6, there is not a direct comparison within the emerging JLP for the exact focus of policy DP16. Proposed policy IN2 develops the requirement in policy DP16 to improve connectivity to a variety of transport options by specifying that these must be in	Whilst there is not an equivalent policy in the emerging JLP, this is a result of the emerging JLP intending to provide fewer but more comprehensive policies, rather than the original Vale LPP2 policy being ineffective. The topic of access is addressed comprehensively in proposed policies IN2 and IN6. However, proposed policy IN2 of the emerging JLP	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			line with Oxfordshire County Council's Transport User Hierarchy.	responds to Oxfordshire County Council's Transport User Hierarchy. As policy DP16 is not based upon this latest evidence, it will need updating. Policy DP16 is still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO8.		
DP17: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans	Replaced	IN2 - Sustainable transport and accessibility	No, policy DP17 only requires a Transport Assessment or Statement and Travel Plan in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council guidance for major developments whilst proposed policy IN2 requires these must be provided in	Policy DP17 is largely consistent with national policy which seeks to support opportunities to promote sustainable transport options. Policy DP17 is also still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO8 and SO9.	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>accordance with Oxfordshire County Council's thresholds for developments of different sizes/ types.</p> <p>Additionally, policy DP17 expresses that these aforementioned Transport Assessment and Travel Plan should consider opportunities to support the take up of electric and / or low emission vehicles whilst proposed policy IN2 seeks instead for a modal shift to walking, cycling and wheeling, and public transport, and seek to reduce</p>	<p>However, proposed policy IN2 of the emerging JLP responds to the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan published by Oxfordshire County Council in 2022 which aims to discourage individual private vehicle journeys. As policy DP17 is not based upon this latest evidence, it will need updating.</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			demand for travel by private cars. Support for electric, or other fuelled vehicle use, is only provided where travelling by other modes of transport would be difficult.			
DP18: Public Car Parking in Settlements	Replaced	IN5 - Parking standards	<p>No, policy DP18 focuses largely on avoiding the loss of existing parking spaces whilst proposed policy IN5 deals with the requirements for new parking spaces.</p> <p>Policy DP18 does support proposals that improve the quality of town centre parking; however, proposed policy IN5</p>	<p>Policy DP17 is largely consistent with national policy which seeks to improve the quality of parking so that it is convenient, safe and secure, alongside measures to promote accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The lack of focus in proposed policy IN5 on the loss of existing</p>	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			expands upon this to state that new development must provide cycle and car parking in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council's adopted parking standards.	parking spaces reflects the active climate emergency and the desire to promote active travel throughout the emerging JLP. Therefore, whilst Policy DP18 does not reflect the approach being taken by the council within the emerging JLP, it is still an effective policy.		
DP19: Lorries and Roadside Services	Replaced	IN6 - Deliveries and freight	Mostly, both policies support the provision of roadside facilities in appropriate locations; however, policy DP19 identifies where these appropriate locations are whilst proposed policy IN6 does not.	Policy DP19 is largely consistent with national policy which requires relevant policies to be prepared with the active involvement of local highways authorities. Several of the sites listed in the Vale policy	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			This is as a result of two of the three identified sites having been delivered in the intervening years.	are no longer relevant; however, the policy still functions effectively otherwise, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO5.		
DP20: Public Art	Replaced	DE1 - High quality design	<p>Yes, whilst the intention of policy DP20 is mostly covered by proposed policy DE1, there is not a direct comparison within the emerging JLP for the exact focus of policy DP20.</p> <p>Policy DP20 has a requirement for applicants to set out details for the</p>	Design is a key component of national policy and the NPPF expects plans to set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. Whilst there is not an equivalent policy in the emerging JLP, policy DP20 meets this expectation and	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			provision of that public art.	remains an effective policy, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO2 and SO11.		
DP21: External Lighting	Replaced	CE11 - Light pollution and dark skies	Mostly, policy DP21 includes all of the requirements set out in proposed policy CE11, but also expands considerably upon these, such as adding new requirements to meet the principal lighting guidance relevant to their Environmental Zone as shown on the Policies Map and that it does not have an adverse impact on attractive and/or sensitive views or from vantage points.	Policy DP17 is largely consistent with national policy which seeks to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. Changes made to the equivalent policy CE11 in the JLP are due to a change in approach and are an attempt to make the policy more effective; however, the existing policy remains	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO11 and SO12. Policy DP21 does not require updating.		
DP22: Advertisements	Replaced	DE1 - High quality design	Yes, whilst the intention of policy DP22 is covered fully by proposed policy DE1, there is not a direct comparison within the emerging JLP for the exact focus of policy DP22. Paragraph 5i of proposed policy DE1 addresses advertisements specifically.	Whilst the emerging JLP policy takes a more general approach to design, the effect of both policies on advertisements is similar and consistent with national policy. Policy DP22 is still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO11 and SO12.	No	No
DP23: Impact of Development on Amenity	Replaced	DE5 - Neighbouring amenity	Mostly, proposed policy DE5 is a near replication of policy DP23, with the only	Proposed policy DE5 is a near replica of policy DP23; however, the changes made are	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>changes being that proposed policy DE5 states that development proposals “must” demonstrate that they will not result in significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring uses whilst policy DP23 states that they “should” do this. Additionally, proposed policy DE5 states that development proposals should have regard to the advice within the Joint Design Guide on neighbouring amenity.</p>	<p>due to a change in approach and a response to the new evidence available.</p> <p>Specifically, the reference to the Joint Design Guide in proposed policy DE5 reflects the latest evidence available as this document was produced after the adoption of the Vale LPP2. As policy DP23 is not based upon this latest evidence, it will need updating. Policy DP23 is still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO4, SO11 and SO12.</p>		

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
<p>DP24: Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments</p>	<p>Replaced</p>	<p>CE10 - Pollution sources and receptors</p>	<p>No, the wording of policy DP24 is largely replicated in proposed policy CE10; however, proposed policy CE10 adds to policy DP24 by acknowledging that there may be circumstances whereby appropriate mitigation could be sought in order to allow development which is likely to be adversely affected by pollution, although this addressed later in policy DP25 but only in regards to noise pollution.</p>	<p>Policy DP24 is largely consistent with national policy; however, proposed policy CE10 more clearly reflects the NPPF requirement that where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development, the applicant should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.</p> <p>Equivalent policy CE11 in the emerging JLP is thus more effective in</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				responding to the NPPF; however, the existing policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO4, SO11 and SO12. Policy DP24 does not require updating.		
DP25: Noise Pollution	Replaced	CE10 - Pollution sources and receptors	Yes, both policies discuss the impact of noise pollution and the need to provide mitigation under certain circumstances.	Yes, the policy addresses the impact of noise and indicates the need for mitigation under certain circumstances, as required by the NPPF. Policy DP25 is still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO11 and SO12.	No	No
DP26: Air Quality	Replaced	CE9 - Air quality	No, both policies are largely similar in nature and ambition;	Whilst Policy CE9 replicates large parts of Policy DP26, the	No	No

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>however Policy DP26 states that all development requiring mitigation should demonstrate how the proposal would make a positive contribution towards the aims of the Council's Air Quality Action Plan. Policy CE9 states that only those development affecting an Air Quality Management Area, or for developments where mitigation cannot fully eliminate risks and it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest, should</p>	<p>few changes made, especially those relating to the Air Quality Action Plan, are due to a change in approach and are an attempt to make the policy more effective; however, the existing policy remains effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO11 and SO12. Policy DP26 does not require updating.</p>		

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>contributions be made towards the Council's Air Quality Action Plan.</p>			
<p>DP27: Land Affected by Contamination</p>	<p>Replaced</p>	<p>CE12 - Soils and contaminated land</p>	<p>Yes, the proposed replacement policy has been worded slightly differently but it is requiring the same thresholds and is materially the same policy. Proposed policy CE12 has been evolved to refer to remediation and mitigation as detailed in national policy.</p>	<p>Policy DP27 in LPP2 and proposed policy CE12 in the JLP are consistent with national policy as the NPPF requires that a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. Proposed policy CE12 has been evolved to refer to remediation and mitigation as detailed in national policy but the lack of reference to this in</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				DP27 does not render it ineffective. Policy DP27 is also still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO12.		
DP28: Waste Collection and Recycling	Replaced	DE7 - Waste collection and recycling	Yes, the proposed replacement policy is in substance materially the same.	National policy requires strategic policies to set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places (to ensure outcomes support beauty and placemaking) and make sufficient provision for waste management. The existing policy DP28 in LPP2 does this, as does proposed policy DE7 in the emerging JLP. Policy DP28 is	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				also still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO11 and SO12.		
DP29: Settlement Character and Gaps	Replaced	NH5 - Landscape	Partially, policy DP29 is a focused landscape policy covering settlement character and gaps. Policy DP29 and proposed policy NH5 from the emerging JLP have similar elements in that they both require character to be retained and physical and visual separation maintained between settlements. However, the Council have sought improvements to the policy wording and	National policy requires planning policies and decisions to support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting. Whilst the Council is seeking improvements to the policy through the emerging JLP, the policy remains generally consistent with national policy and continues to meet the strategic objectives	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			the proposed policy has evolved with greater detail in response to this. The proposed new policy also addresses other wider landscape points in addition to settlement character and gaps.	of the Local Plan 2031, specifically SO10.		
DP30: Watercourses	Replaced	HP10 - Watercourses	Yes, the proposed replacement policy in the emerging JLP in substance is materially the same. For example, they both include a minimum 10m buffer zone along both sides of a watercourse and state that major developments which are located within	The policy remains generally consistent with national policy. Policy DP30 is also still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO10 and SO11.	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			20m of a Watercourse will require a construction management plan.			
DP31: Protection of Public Rights of Way, National Trails and Open Access Areas	Replaced	IN3 - Transport infrastructure and safeguarding	Partially, the proposed replacement policy has elements which are the same. However, policy DP31 is more detailed and specific to the protection of Public Rights of Way in comparison to proposed policy IN3. Proposed policy IN3 refers to protecting Public Rights of Way, but also refers to a range of other schemes and priorities.	National policy identifies planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails. The policy is still effective, including in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO8, and is consistent with national policy.	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
DP32: The Wilts and Berks Canal	Replaced	IN4 - Wilts and Berks Canal Safeguarding	Yes, the proposed replacement policy in substance is materially the same. Both the existing policy and the proposed policy IN4 in the JLP support the restoration and reconstruction of the Wilts and Berks Canal and safeguard the historic alignments of the canal.	The policy is still consistent with national policy. The NPPF identifies that Plans should set out the contributions expected from development. This should include setting out the levels and types of affordable housing provision required, along with other infrastructure (such as that needed for education, health, transport, flood and water management, green and digital infrastructure). Such policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan. Policy DP32 is	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				also still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO10 and SO11.		
DP33: Open Space	Replaced	<p>HP5 - New facilities for sport, physical activity and recreation</p> <p>HP6 - Green infrastructure on new developments</p> <p>HP7 - Open space in new developments</p> <p>HP8 - Play provision for children and young people</p> <p>HP9 - Allotments and community food growing</p>	<p>Partially, the proposed replacement policies in the emerging JLP cover the topic of open space across a number of proposed policies.</p> <p>Policy DP33 requires proposals to be 'in accordance' with the open space standards as set out in an appendix of the Local Plan, whereas proposed policy HP7 in the emerging JLP requires proposals to 'have regard' to the</p>	The policy is due to be replaced in response to up-to-date evidence. As such, whilst the policy remains effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO10 and SO11, as is not based upon this latest evidence, it will need updating.	No	Yes

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>most up to standards set out in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and Open Spaces Study. This difference in policy approach takes account of the up-to-date evidence produced to support the emerging JLP.</p>			
<p>DP34: Leisure and Sports Facilities</p>	<p>Replaced</p>	<p>HP4 - Existing open space, sport and recreation facilities HP5 - New facilities for sport, physical activity and recreation</p>	<p>Yes, the proposed replacement policy in substance is the same. Policy DP34 requires new housing developments to provide or contribute towards indoor and outdoor leisure and sports facilities in accordance with the local standards as set out in Appendix K. On</p>	<p>The policy is consistent with national policy as the NPPF identifies planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>sites of major development a financial contributions towards providing or improving off-site provision will be required. Whereas proposed policy HP5 identifies that new residential developments will be expected to provide on-site provision where possible, or where appropriate, a financial contribution towards either off-site provision, or the enhancement of existing off-site facilities. This is proposed to be determined on a site-by-site basis,</p>	<p>surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. National policy clearly sets out that information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate. As such, whilst the policy remains effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objectives SO10 and SO11, as is not based upon this latest evidence, it will need updating.</p>		

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			informed by the councils' leisure studies and accord with the requirements set out in the infrastructure delivery plan. The proposed policy addresses the provision for the future long-term maintenance and management of new or expanded facilities, setting that it must be agreed as part of the planning application.			
DP35: New Countryside Recreation Facilities	Replaced	Policy HP5 - New facilities for sport, physical activity and recreation	Yes, the replacement policy in substance is materially the same. Policy DP35 identifies a series of scenarios where proposals for small scale countryside	The policy remains effective, however reference is made to Core Policy 13: Green Belt. Core Policy 13 is no longer consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph	No	Yes

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			<p>recreational facilities will be supported.</p> <p>Whilst proposed policy HP5 is a wider reaching policy, point 3 focuses on providing small scale recreational facilities in the countryside. The only material difference is that DP35 includes reference to green belt, through Core Policy 13: Green Belt, whereas Policy HP5 does not reference the green belt.</p>	154 and 155 of the NPPF, and therefore the policy should be updated.		
DP36: Heritage Assets	Replaced	NH8 - The historic environment	Yes, the policy is in substance materially the same. Although in a slightly different order the proposed	The policy is effective and consistent with national policy. Policy DP36 is also still effective in terms of	No	No

<p>Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2</p>	<p>Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy</p>	<p>Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?</p>	<p>If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?</p>	<p>Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?</p>
			<p>replacement policy in the emerging JLP is asking for the same things with similar thresholds.</p>	<p>meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO11.</p>		
<p>DP37: Conservation Areas</p>	<p>Replaced</p>	<p>NH10 - Conservation Areas</p>	<p>Yes, the policy is in substance materially the same. Although the proposed policy NH10 goes further to include types of development that are encouraged to enhance and better the significance of the Conservation Area and to preserve the setting. Proposed policy NH10 also more explicitly references the NPPF requirements around assessing harm.</p>	<p>The policy is effective and consistent with national policy. The policy is effective and consistent with national policy. Policy DP36 is also still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO11.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
			However, although NH10 is more explicit in explaining requirements than DP37, it is not considered in substance materially different.			
DP38 Listed Buildings	Replaced	NH9 - Listed Buildings	Yes, the policy is in substance materially the same. Proposed policy NH9 sets out more detail from the NPPF. Although policy NH9 brings more NPPF content into the policy, the supporting text of DP38 directs to the NPPF, so it is considered to be in substance materially the same.	Proposed policy NH9 has been adapted to put more detail from the NPPF into the policy wording, however, policy DP38 is still considered to be effective and consistent with national policy as the controls in the NPPF and legislation would still apply to both regardless. Policy DP38 is also still effective in terms of	No	No

Adopted policy in Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Within the Joint Local Plan is the policy being carried forward, replaced, or deleted?	Relevant policy or policies in the Joint Local Plan, or reason for the proposed deletion of the adopted policy	Is the replacement policy in substance materially the same?	If not, is the policy effective and consistent with national policy?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need deleting?	Does the LPP2 adopted policy need updating?
				meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO11.		
DP39: Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments	Replaced	NH11 - Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments	Yes, the policy is in substance materially the same. Proposed policy NH11 is a more detailed policy, for example it requires applicants to agree the scope and assessment and field evaluation with the County Council. Policy DP39 does not require this, however the substance of both policies and how development should approach archaeology and scheduled monuments are the same.	The policy is effective and consistent with national policy. However, proposed policy NH11 has been adapted to bring it up to date with national policy but this does not mean that policy DP39 is ineffective. Policy DP39 is also still effective in terms of meeting the Vale LPP1 objective SO11.	No	No

Acronyms and Links

Document	Acronym	Link
Local Plan 2031: Part 1	LPP1	https://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2020/10/Local-Plan-2031-Part-1.pdf
Local Plan 2031: Part 2	LPP2	https://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2021/03/VOWHDC-Master-1.pdf
Joint Local Plan	JLP	https://www.southoxon.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2024/01/Joint-Local-Plan-Preferred-Options-Document.pdf
National Planning Policy Framework	NPPF	https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a11af7e8f5ec000f1f8c46/NPPF_December_2023.pdf

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted