



**Vale  
of White Horse**

*District Council*



*Help us Shape the Future*

# Draft Interim Housing Supply Policy - Consultation Statement

Your Vale - Your Future

**Contents**

Contents ..... 2

Introduction ..... 3

Background ..... 3

Previous consultation on this subject..... 4

Current consultation engagement methods and timescale..... 4

Stakeholder consultation workshop..... 5

Responses from the public consultation ..... 7

Quantitative analysis of responses ..... 16

Conclusions and recommendations ..... 18

Appendix 1 – Public notice ..... 25

Appendix 2 Interim Housing Supply Policy Consultation Plan ..... 26

Appendix 3 consultation questionnaire ..... 30

Appendix 4 screening request form ..... 34

Appendix 5 list of those consulted ..... 37

## Introduction

1. Community involvement plays a key role in the development of new policies and documents for the Vale of White Horse District Council. We are committed to ensuring that the community is involved in the preparation of the Interim Housing Supply Policy document (IHSP).
2. This consultation report provides an account of the different methods of engagement used to assist in the development of the Interim Housing Supply Policy document. The report provides a summary of the main issues that have been raised as a result of the consultation. The report then goes on to indicate what changes have resulted in the document, to take account of the consultation findings.
3. A comprehensive summary of all consultation responses by respondent is available on request. Alternatively a CD containing a full copy of all the representations and site screenings in the form they were submitted can be purchased from the planning policy team. For more details please see the website on [www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/SPDS](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/SPDS) or contact the team via email at [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk) or tel. 01235 540 499.
4. The IHSP is not a formal statutory planning document. However, it was prepared to the same standard, and in accordance with the procedural guidance set out for a supplementary planning document set out within our Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)<sup>1</sup> and relevant town and country planning regulations<sup>2</sup>.
5. Following the consultation process and any necessary revisions, we will look to adopt the IHSP as a council interim policy. Once adopted by the council it will be a material planning consideration.

## Background

6. The IHSP has been prepared to respond constructively to the lack of a five year housing land supply in the Vale, arising primarily because Local Plan housing allocations have not come forward sufficiently quickly. Delays to the Vale's emerging Core Strategy Development Plan Document are a contributory factor.
7. The main aim of the interim policy is to:
  - Achieve a target of permission of 1,000 homes by March 2014 or by adoption of the core strategy if earlier.
8. This will be achieved through adoption of a statement to set aside, relax or vary selected saved Local Plan policies to:
  - Increase the size limits on development in built up areas of villages

---

<sup>1</sup> Statement of Community Involvement – The Vale of White Horse District Council, December 2009

<sup>2</sup> Town and Country Planning(Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004 amended 2008

- Relax constraints on using vacant local employment sites for housing
  - Consider rural infill and rural housing exception sites
  - It will provide guidelines to encourage proposals that are readily deliverable, proportionate to their host communities and in suitable sustainable locations.
9. Once approved the IHSP will be used by the development management team with the assistance of planning policy team members to screen and evaluate planning proposals coming through the IHSP mechanism.

### **Previous consultation on this subject**

10. This approach is a unique one and as such this issue has not been the subject of any previous consultation.

### **Current consultation engagement methods and timescale**

11. The consultation on the IHSP took place over a period of five weeks from **21 October 2011 to 25 November 2011**. A five week period was chosen, as it was felt that the issue of shortfall in interim housing supply was quite well known with the targeted stakeholder groups, namely town and parish councils/councillors, planning agents, land owners and architects. This is a week above the minimum four week consultation period, because the formal consultation period included a school half-term holiday. Our SCI states that we will try and avoid 'where practicable' consulting over known holiday periods<sup>3</sup>. The extension also allowed us the ability to accommodate the Town and Parish Council Forum, which was held on the 23 November 2011. This therefore maximised the opportunity of engaging with this group.
12. The consultation was fully advertised through a formal public notice, provided at Appendix 1. The full consultation plan is provided at Appendix 2. The tables within Appendix 2 set out the various consultation methods used. The shaded boxes indicate what we consider to be minimum requirements of consultations. The boxes without shading identify methods over and above these minimum requirements.
13. The consultation structure for this initiative was slightly different to the norm. This was because essentially two processes were at play. The first being where views were sought from stakeholders on the idea and approach to an IHSP. These views were sought largely through a questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire is available to view in Appendix 3.
14. The second process was in effect a 'call for potential sites' to be submitted for a screening opinion on their suitability to progress to planning application stage. We produced a screening request form to assist with this process (appendix 4). Although instigated at the same time as the formal consultation, the 'call for potential sites' ran in parallel with no deadline. In

---

<sup>3</sup> Statement of Community Involvement, Vale of White Horse District Council, December 2009

practical terms the site screening process will consider all site proposals received by the time (and if) the final form of the policy is agreed. Screening requests received later would provide a reserve in case

- there are insufficient potentially suitable sites within the first tranche
- sites invited to submit a planning application fail to progress and need to be replaced at a later date

## Consultation workshop

15. A stakeholder workshop was organised to complement other consultation methods. Alpha Research media consultants were appointed to facilitate and prepare an independent report of proceedings, supported by the planning policy team. The event was held on 17 November in Wantage Civic Centre. A full workshop report is available from the council's website at [www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/spds](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/spds). The main findings from the workshop are identified below, and have helped to influence the development of the IHSP.

### Workshop attendance

Town/parish councillors	26
Developers/agents	12
Residents' groups	8
Environmental groups	3
Housing association representative	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>

### Bringing forward delivery of 1,000 new homes – workshop results

16. The first major point was that the majority of attendees accepted that there was a housing shortfall within the Vale of White Horse. There were questions around the 1,000 target set and the productiveness of the current economic market to assist with house buying. The use of smaller sites to help accommodate the shortfall was put forward as a strong suggestion, due to fewer issues relating to infrastructure concerns etc. Supporting village facilities was also mentioned as a benefit. There were some concerns raised regarding development of smaller sites with expressions that, local communities and councils should be closely involved with decisions, that development is considered with regard to their individual merits and that necessary infrastructure is in place to support development. A joint approach of progressing smaller sites through the IHSP, while still continuing work on larger sites through the core strategy was seen by most participants as sensible. With the caveat that running two policies may lead to problems with administrative pressure for the local planning authority and County Council.

### Views on the IHSP – workshop results

17. Whilst most felt that the policy was realistic there were strong concerns that the IHSP would result in decisions on a 'first come first serve' basis, the need for close local consultation and whether this policy approach may be repeated in the future. There was a clear split of views on whether or not the IHSP would lead to increased or reduced amount of 'planning by appeal'. The IHSP test regarding proportionate growth was given guarded support.

Although there were concerns on how the percentage was derived and that the 6-9% target was too high, along with the fact that other factors need to be taken into consideration when assessing thresholds.

18. The relaxation of policy GS2 (Development in the countryside) received a slightly favourable response rate. With the potential to improve the edges of the built form of settlements and the developer contributions assisting in funding new community facilities, seen as benefits.
19. Policies E11, E12 and E14 (Protecting sites for business: Rural multi-user sites, Larger campus-style sites, the retention of small-scale commercial premises in settlements) was largely supported by participants, but with reservations. With the main fear being in relation to the loss of employment opportunities and the fact that it might not trigger many more housing sites.
20. The extension of developer contributions payments and village facilities surveys, were also seen as ways in which to ensure sustainable outcomes from this policy approach. This along with the inclusion of the review of policies concerning unoccupied accommodation, replacement dwellings and self-build property.
21. Consistently through all of the discussion areas there was one group that did not want to see any of the policies relaxed and did not believe in the approach being taken by the council.
22. Overall most participants who commented felt that the Vale had identified the right policies to be relaxed, as long as the caveats expressed by parties were taken into consideration.

## Responses from the consultation

23. The following summary highlights the main issues arising from the consultation. Participants are listed in appendix 5 and summarised by sector in figures 1 and 2 overleaf.

### Response breakdown

General consultation responses (01/03/12)	174
Site Screening Requests (as of 01/03/12)	146
<b>Total</b>	<b>320</b>

24. Although we have collected and presented an analysis of quantitative data on consultation responses, it is important to note that this process is **not a vote**. It is a tool to identify the weight of opinion on each issue and to highlight salient points from the consultation. This along with the qualitative responses will allow us to identify any potential issues with the IHSP and establish whether and how best it might be progressed.

Figure 1: Breakdown of respondents by sector





Figure 2: Further breakdown of organisations



25. The summary of responses follows the same structure as the questionnaire that accompanied this consultation. Under each relevant section the summaries provide points from statutory consultees, followed by key organisations such as town and parish councils, the landowners and developers and finally members of the general public. We have tried to

further categorise these groups in broad terms into areas where they agree or disagree with the different questions posed.

### **1) The council should relax selected local plan policies to improve housing supply**

#### **Agree – Organisations**

26. Natural England stated that there were sound reasons for taking this approach in that it would help ensure that development occurred in sustainable locations. Oxford City Council commented that it would help with housing in the Central Oxfordshire sub-region. Oxfordshire County Council put forward cautious support. North Wessex Downs AONB also put forward cautious support, with the caveat that market conditions may make the approach ineffectual. Oxfordshire Rural Community welcomed the commitment to promoting sustainability in local rural communities.

#### **Disagree – Organisations**

27. This issue of the policy being ineffective in current market conditions was also echoed by a range of other parish councils and individuals. The Wildlife Trust expressed concern that a non statutory document could override statutory requirements in a local plan, leading to ecological impacts. The CPRE felt the IHSP was no longer needed now that the stalled large sites had recommenced.
28. A large range of parish councils and residents' groups indicated that the approach avoided the level of public consultation and testing that the local plan would have undergone and should not be rushed. Linked to this was the fact that the problem was temporary, but would lead to permanent impact on the built form of an area.

#### **Agree – Landowners/developers/agents**

29. A significant majority of planning agents, landowners and developers agreed with this approach, citing problems with the current core strategy process being too complex, a need to get the economy moving and consistency with emerging and current national policy.

#### **Disagree – Landowners/developers/agents**

30. No significant areas of disagreement.

#### **Agree – Public**

31. Diversity of views with no common themes.

#### **Disagree – Public**

32. A significant majority of the public felt that the approach undermined the current status and long term function of the Local Plan and did not seem consistent with ethos of the Localism Act. Comments from the public also indicated that they disputed the stated housing need especially in the current economic climate, and expressed concerns that development would occur in unsustainable locations and put pressure on existing infrastructure.



**2) To boost housing completions and improve the five year housing land supply it is important that housing sites brought forward by the interim policy are capable of delivering homes quickly.**

**Agree – Organisations**

33. Oxford City Council stated that the approach will address emerging national policy on land supply. Oxfordshire County Council commented that while giving cautious support some transport measures and highways infrastructure may take time to design and implement. Oxfordshire Rural Community Council, while supporting the proposals, does not want to see speed come at the cost of good quality.

**Disagree – Organisations**

34. CPRE expressed concern that speed may lead to little consideration of whether villages have the necessary infrastructure and facilities.
35. Some parish councils commented that the approach would lead to unsustainable patterns of growth, with the driver being speed rather than quality and needs. This would be to the detriment of the settlements.

**Agree – Landowners/developers/agents**

36. A significant majority of stakeholder group comments in this section indicated support for the proposals as it addressed the shortfall in the five year land supply by ensuring short term deliverability. However a small number expressed concern over the 12 month permission period and called for more flexibility.

**Disagree – Landowners/developers/agents**

37. No significant areas of disagreement.

**Agree – Public**

38. A few members of the public indicated their support, as long as the sites coming forward were suitable and sustainable.

**Disagree - Public**

39. The majority of comments from the public highlighted the fear that the decisions will be based upon speed, economic and political factors at the expense of local communities and the environment.

**3) Bringing forward a number of smaller sites is more likely to improve short to medium term housing delivery than bringing forward additional large sites (200+ homes)**

**Agree – Organisations**

40. North Wessex Downs AONB and Oxford City Council expressed cautious support to this principle, as long as development was still broadly sustainable. Oxfordshire County Council supported the threshold, but raised concern that the overall level of growth planned for Wantage and Grove

should not be reduced from 4,900 homes in order that key infrastructure may be delivered.

**Disagree – Organisations**

41. A small amount of parish councils and residents' groups felt that the delivery issues holding up progress on existing larger sites should be dealt with first, before moving on to village sites.

**Agree – Landowners/developers/agents**

42. The main comments from this stakeholder group were largely in support of the proposals, with issues such as lead in times for larger sites being too long or smaller sites being more viable as it avoids costly infrastructure being raised. The overarching caveat to this being that smaller sites are not necessarily quicker to deliver and therefore rigorous deliverability testing will be required as part of this process.

**Disagree – Landowners/developers/agents**

43. A number felt that there should be a mixture between large and small sites including the potential of bringing forward initial phases of core strategy sites.

**Split opinion - Public**

44. There were only a small amount of comments from members of the general public and these were split in opinion. A small number identified that small sites would be less likely to be held up with infrastructure requirements. Whilst the counter argument to this was that the smaller sites will not produce the type of housing that is needed or make the appropriate scale of developer contributions.

**4) Large/strategic housing sites (200+ homes) should be tested and allocated through the core strategy process and not considered under the IHSP.**

**Agree – Organisations**

45. North Wessex Downs AONB and Oxford City Council again expressed cautious support, as long as the policy was not used to by-pass a plan-led system. The Berks, Bucks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust was concerned that smaller sites coming through this process would not trigger Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) to the detriment of the environment.

**Disagree – Organisations**

46. No significant areas of disagreement.

**Agree – Landowners/developers/agents**

47. The vast majority of comments from landowners and agents indicated support for the approach adopted by the IHSP. Many felt that larger sites should be tested through the core strategy plan making process and that

larger sites will not deliver the short term objectives needed. Whilst still agreeing to the overall approach set out in this question, there was a small selection of landowners/agents that wished that the IHSP would not rule out larger scale sites of 200 or more if they are shown to be deliverable.

**Disagree – Landowners/developers/agents**

48. No significant areas of disagreement..

**Split opinion – Public**

49. The small number of public comments received under this question varied in opinion as to whether large sites should be considered through the core strategy or brought forward via the IHSP.

**5) As a general principle, ‘proportionate growth’ should be broadly sustainable in that it would help settlements sustain their current level of facilities and services by stabilizing their population, without unduly adding to pressures on services and infrastructure over the emerging core strategy period.**

**Agree or neutral – Organisations**

50. Oxford City Council and North Wessex Downs AONB both saw the approach as a starting point, but with specific caveats, such as site specific flexibility. Oxfordshire County Council expressed concern that the proposals could potentially have a large cumulative impact particularly on infrastructure. Other organisations, such as town and parish councils accepted that some growth was necessary to help maintain viability of settlements, as long as it contributed to infrastructure.

**Disagree – Organisations**

51. Oxford Green Belt Network, CPRE and a range of other parish councils and council members felt that the proportionate growth calculation was too simplistic. They wanted to see more of a bottom up exercise take place, to help identify acceptable growth levels within communities based on local need, land availability and infrastructure capacity.

**Agree – Landowners/developers/agents**

52. There was a large amount of support from landowners/agents for proposals under this section stating that the approach could help to support local services and facilities. There were also comments that this strategy was consistent with current and emerging national policy.

**Disagree – Landowners/developers/agents**

53. There were a significant number of respondents that felt the way in which the figure was derived was too simplistic and growth should instead be based upon existing or proposed infrastructure provision.

**Agree – Public**

54. Diversity of views with no common themes.

**Disagree - Public**

55. The majority of responses from the public disagreed with this approach. Comments circled around the opinion that the approach was too simplistic and did not take into account a range of factors such as infrastructure and service provision or environmental constraints.

**6) Proposals that significantly exceed the host settlement's identified level of proportionate growth should be screened out from the interim policy approach and instead considered through the formal plan making process.**

**Agree – Organisations**

56. Oxfordshire County Council and Oxfordshire Rural Community Council indicated that greater clarification is needed on defining the term 'significantly', with regard to proportionate growth levels. North Wessex Downs and CPRE agreed in principle, but would like to see larger towns included within the screening process, along with the possibility of bringing forward the first phases of large sites outside of the core strategy process.

**Disagree - Organisations**

57. Oxford Green Belt Network disagreed, as they would like to see towns included within the process due to their brownfield potential. A small selection of parish councils felt that additional may be appropriate in some settlements notably the larger villages where it could bring added benefits.

**Agree – Landowners/developers/agents**

58. A large selection of agents put forward comments indicating that each application should be assessed on its own merits with a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Whilst agreeing with the approach, a range of agents also highlighted that small sites would not be able to secure the level of developer contributions for affordable housing and infrastructure that larger sites could, and that this should be taken into consideration.

**Disagree – Landowners/developers/agents**

59. No significant areas of disagreement.

**Agree – Public**

60. A relatively small number of representatives from the general public put forward comments supporting the approach, but those that did stated that the process should not be used as a way to get unsustainable sites through the planning process.

**Disagree – Public**

61. No significant areas of disagreement.

**7-9) What are your views on the policy relaxations proposed (policies H11, H12, H13; policy GS2; policies E11, E12 and E14)?**

**Agree – Organisations**

62. The Environment Agency sees that this approach may provide the benefit of steering development to lower flood risk areas. Oxfordshire County Council cautiously supported the approach, although they stated that it could lead to housing in unsustainable locations and that it was important that the loss of employment sites did not undermine the strategy for employment and economic development in rural areas.

**Disagree – Organisations**

63. CPRE commented that there is a need for policy GS2 (Development in the Countryside) to protect the countryside and character of villages. This comment was supported by a large number of parish councils, as many feared this relaxation could lead to the loss of important open spaces between villages.

**Agree- Landowners/developers/agents**

64. A large number of landowners/agents commented that existing policies have failed to deliver sufficient housing recently and this therefore provided a sound reason for the relaxations.

**Disagree – Landowners/developers/agents**

65. A significant number of developers commented that there was still a need for jobs and stressed that the relaxation of employment policy should be rigorously tested and only used as a last resort.

**Split opinion – Public**

66. There was no clear consensus from members of the general public, with a small yet wide range of comments both supporting and objecting to the proposals.

**10) The proposed policy relaxation to enable some edge-of-settlement development would not apply when the settlement edge is located in the Green Belt. Should the same restriction be applied to edge-of-settlement land designated AONB?**

**Agree – Organisations**

67. Natural England, CPRE and North Wessex Downs AONB indicated that restrictions to AONB should also apply. This comment was supported by a wide range of parish councils.

**Disagree – Organisations**

68. S.P.A.D.E indicated that existing policies should offer adequate protection whilst the North Wessex Downs AONB supported the reuse of brownfield land where appropriate.

- Agree – Landowners/developers/agents**
69. A large number of landowners/agents submitted comments indicating that this important landscape designation should continue to be protected under planning policy.

- Disagree – Landowners/developers/agents**
70. However a greater number of landowners/agents expressed the opinion that each application should be treated on its own merits with regard to matters such as AONB or other landscape considerations.

- Agree – Public**
71. The majority of comments from members of the public felt that retaining AONB restrictions was important to help preserve the unique landscape and character of local areas.

- Disagree – Public**
72. No significant areas of disagreement.

- General points**
73. There were a range of other issues which were commented upon by stakeholders. These covered topics such as the type of housing likely to be brought forward, any omissions, changes or additions to the policy document, a selection of general comments, accuracy of the data, sustainability appraisal work and consultation. The following sections provide brief summaries of the main points.

- Housing**
74. There were a significant number of comments from town and parish councils and residents' groups raising concerns that the policy would result in an increased number of larger homes coming forward on sites below the affordable housing threshold. It was suggested that either the affordable housing threshold is lowered or the policy is restricted to only sites that meet the current threshold. These comments were also reflected in comments from members of the general public.

- Omissions and suggestions**
75. A range of areas were put forward for inclusion within the IHSP. Natural England felt that key test five should be amended so that additional weight would be placed on existing Local Plan landscape policies. Thames Water indicated that test three should be amended so that water and wastewater infrastructure capacity exists or can be provided ahead of occupation of development. The Environment Agency suggested including text highlighting the 'promotion or improvement of the environmental well-being' of an area. Oxfordshire County Council want the IHSP to clearly reflect that the capacity of supporting infrastructure, services and facilities (including school capacity), should be taken into account. The County Council would also like the IHSP to acknowledge that there may be instances when greenfield sites are more suitable than brownfield sites. The County Council

would like to see information included in the IHSP to help assess transport implications and a sustainability test.

76. Some parish councils put forward comments that the IHSP should contain greater reference to local involvement. Oxfordshire Rural Community Council would like to see that written views of town and parish councils are obtained and made available as part of the screening process.
77. A large selection of landowners/agents indicated that the proportionate growth approach should also take account of the capacity of local services and facilities, or their ability to improve them where this is needed. A smaller selection of landowners/planning agents did not agree with the exclusion of green belt sites. There were suggestions that additional policies including H16 (mix) and H17 (affordable housing) should also be relaxed and some felt the relaxation of policy GS2 should be extended to the smallest villages.
78. A small number of the general public commented that the IHSP should include the requirement of sites to contribute towards infrastructure and affordable housing.

#### **Other comments**

79. Oxfordshire County Council indicated that they would need the support of The Vale of the White Horse District Council to help seek developer contributions for developments under their existing threshold of 10 or more homes, which the IHSP is likely to encourage.
80. A large selection of councillors and parish councils wanted assurance that the policy would remain an interim and temporary measure. They also expressed concern that the process needs to be clear and transparent to avoid a 'first come first serve' situation.
81. Only a small number of comments were made by landowners/developers who included concern that the process should not be on a 'first come first serve' basis and careful consideration of the built form of the settlement.
82. Members of the public put forward comments indicating a need to investigate how to speed up development of the larger sites, along with the need to focus on brownfield sites. As above there was concern around greater clarity of the word 'interim'.

#### **Accuracy of data**

83. There was a wide variety of comments, predominantly from parish councils, requesting clarification on specific proportionate growth calculations or identifying duplications of settlement references within the document.

#### **Sustainability Appraisal**

84. Natural England would like to see more explanation about how the relevant sustainability objectives were chosen. Natural England and Oxfordshire County Council were also concerned that the appraisal predominantly centred on the expedience of bringing these smaller sites earlier in the plan

period rather than the spatial redistribution that this approach may lead to. This potentially could lead to more dispersed patterns of development directed to areas that are more environmentally sensitive and less capable of mitigation. The Environment Agency generally supported the Sustainability Appraisal, but wanted to see recognition that environmental gain can also be obtained through development. Oxfordshire County Council identified additional objectives that should be assessed and other considerations that should be taken into account in the assessment.

### Consultation

85. A few parish councils and residents' groups felt that the consultation period was too short and lacked adequate publicity. These comments were supported by a small number of landowners/developers and a selection of the general public.

### Quantitative analysis of responses

86. The following data is taken from the questionnaire responses. There were 108 questionnaire responses, but not all respondents answered every question. The analysis below and at figure 3 is based on the count of actual responses to each question.

87. **Q1.The council should relax selected local plan policies to improve housing supply**

<b>Total number of responses 105</b>		
<b>Preference</b>	<b>Counts</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly agree	58	55.2
Agree	16	15.2
Neither agree or disagree	3	2.9
Disagree	8	7.6
Strongly disagree	20	19.1

88. **Q2.To boost housing completions and improve the five year housing land supply it is important that housing sites brought forward by the interim policy are capable of delivering homes quickly.**

<b>Total number of responses 104</b>		
<b>Preference</b>	<b>Counts</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly agree	35	33.7
Agree	37	35.6
Neither agree or disagree	13	12.5
Disagree	3	2.9
Strongly disagree	16	15.4

89. **Q3.Bringing forward a number of smaller sites is more likely to improve short to medium term housing delivery than bringing forward additional large sites (200+ homes)**



<b>Total number of responses 105</b>		
<b>Preference</b>	<b>Counts</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly agree	38	36.2
Agree	33	31.4
Neither agree or disagree	14	13.3
Disagree	6	5.7
Strongly disagree	14	13.3

90. **Q4. Large/strategic housing sites (200+ homes) should be tested and allocated through the core strategy process and not considered under the IHSP**

<b>Total number of responses 103</b>		
<b>Preference</b>	<b>Counts</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly agree	41	39.8
Agree	38	36.9
Neither agree or disagree	16	15.5
Disagree	2	1.9
Strongly disagree	6	5.8

91. **Q5. As a general principle, 'proportionate growth' should be broadly sustainable in that it would help settlements sustain their current level of facilities and services by stabilising their population, without unduly adding to pressures on services and infrastructure over the emerging core strategy period**

<b>Total number of responses 103</b>		
<b>Preference</b>	<b>Counts</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly agree	20	19.4
Agree	40	38.8
Neither agree or disagree	28	27.2
Disagree	11	10.7
Strongly disagree	4	3.9

92. **Q6. Proposals that significantly exceed the host settlement's identified level of proportionate growth should be screened out from the interim policy approach and instead considered through the formal plan-making process**

<b>Total number of responses 100</b>		
<b>Preference</b>	<b>Counts</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly agree	22	22.0
Agree	33	33.0
Neither agree or disagree	15	15.0
Disagree	16	16.0
Strongly disagree	14	14.0


93. **Q7-9. What are your views on the policy relaxations proposed (H11, H12, H13, GS2, E11, E12 and E14)?**

Policy	Counts	Support	Object
Q7. H11, H12 and H13	90	65 72.2%	25 22.8%
Q8. G2	92	67 72.8%	25 27.2%
Q9. E11, E12 and E14	72	54 75.0%	18 25.0%

94. **Q10. The proposed policy relaxation to enable some edge-of-settlement development would not apply when the settlement edge is located in the Green Belt. Should the same restriction be applied to edge of settlement land designate AONB**

Total number of responses 89		
Preference	Counts	Percentage
Strongly agree	24	27.0
Agree	16	18.0
Neither agree or disagree	25	28.1
Disagree	10	11.2
Strongly disagree	14	15.7

Figure 3: Statistical summary of questionnaire responses




95. It is important that the views of those that did not use the questionnaire are incorporated into the analysis as a further 66 representation were made that did not use the questionnaire. This equates to 38% of the total.

96. The non-questionnaire responses varied in format and do not lend themselves to direct comparison to the questionnaire. To get a sense of these views and overall opinion we split them into the categories of broadly supportive, opposed or unclear/mixed. The table below shows the weighting of opinion if these figures are then combined with the results from Question 1 above, illustrated at figure 2.

Overall	Questionnaire	Other response	Total response	Percentage
Broadly support	77	27	104	60.8%
Mixed/unclear	3	10	13	7.6%
Broadly object	28	29	57	33.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>174</b>	

Figure 4: Overall balance of support



## Conclusions and recommendations

97. The paragraphs below pull out the key issues from the responses to consultation section above. It will also provide recommendations for how we propose to address them in the revised policy.

### Q1. The council should relax selected local plan policies to improve housing supply

98. The majority of respondents agreed with this statement citing that it would promote sustainability within rural communities, help get the economy moving and was consistent with current and emerging national policy. It would also help the council better resist inappropriate development. However a range of parish councils, residents groups and members of the public expressed concern that this approach would bypass the level of

consultation and testing that local plans have been through. There was also concern that the IHSP may undermine the status of the Local Plan and emerging government policy related to Localism.

99. A number of respondents queried whether there was indeed a need for housing given the planned abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). However the majority of the workshop attendees accepted there was a housing shortfall although questioned whether the IHSP would be effective given the current economic climate.

#### Officer response and recommendation

100. The sites progressed through the IHSP would still be required to comply with all remaining national and Local Plan policies. The district's housing requirement was assessed as part of the core strategy internal review and Cabinet agreed on 9 September 2011 that the existing housing target of 578 dwellings per annum remains appropriate to 2028/9.
101. The twelve month permission time limit and strict deliverability criteria are necessary in order to ensure that all sites brought forward through the IHSP are viable in the current economic climate and have a good prospect of being built within the timeframe given.

#### **Q2. To boost housing completions and improve the five year housing land supply it is important that housing sites brought forward by the interim policy are capable of delivering homes quickly.**

102. The general consensus was once again of broad agreement and acknowledgement that sites brought forward need to be capable of addressing the short term shortfall. However concern was raised that speed should not come at the expense of due consideration of site/location suitability, availability of services/facilities, local need, design quality and infrastructure provision. Oxfordshire County Council commented that some transport measures and highways infrastructure take time to design and implement whilst some developers called for more flexibility within the twelve month permission period.
103. There was also a concern raised both during the consultation and at the workshop that with no clear deadline for site screening submissions these may be judged on a first come first served basis rather than against site sustainability.

#### Officer response and recommendation

104. Sites will be assessed during both the initial site screening and planning application process for sustainability, local infrastructure capacity and environmental constraints. The planning application process will not be speeded up, rather site promoters will need to demonstrate that their schemes are capable of being delivered quickly once permission is granted.

Sites need to have commenced within twelve months of the permission date, which is considered to be a sufficient timeframe given the amount of deliverability evidence that will be required at the planning application stage to fulfil the IHSP 3 deliverability test.

105. We have had a large number of site proposals already submitted (146) with a combined potential of almost 4,400 homes outside the Green Belt and AONB (5,100 in total). This should enable choice within the selection process to fulfil both IHSP and sustainability objectives.
106. Sites may still be submitted after the policy is adopted. These would be considered in the event we have not yet identified sufficient, suitable sites to bring forward from those already submitted. They would also be considered for future allocation in the Managing Development DPD.

**Q3. Bringing forward a number of smaller sites is more likely to improve short to medium term housing delivery than bringing forward additional large sites (200+ homes).**

107. Once again there was general agreement that smaller sites tend to be quicker to progress as they are less likely to require significant amounts of infrastructure. This was echoed at the workshop. However the point was raised that there may be instances when larger sites which are shown to be deliverable should be considered. Additionally larger sites are able to make the appropriate contributions and provide the housing mix and tenure needed that smaller sites often cannot.

Officer response and recommendation

108. We remain of the view that first priority on deliverability grounds is to bring forward suitable, smaller sites (generally up to 50 homes). Initial analysis of the sites proposed to date suggests that smaller sites alone may not supply sufficient additional housing, so there is likely to be a role for suitable and deliverable medium-larger sites (50-200 homes). This can be assessed in more detail through the site screening process. For deliverability reasons we consider that large sites (200+ homes) should be reserved as a last resort, if IHSP objectives cannot be achieved by other means.
109. Most of the sites proposed are for 10 or more homes, and would be expected to make appropriate developer contributions to infrastructure and affordable housing provision.

**Q4. Large/strategic housing sites (200+ homes) should be tested and allocated through the core strategy process and not considered under the IHSP.**

110. A large amount of respondents felt that large sites should be rigorously tested and consulted upon through the usual plan making process. However

the point was raised again that site deliverability should be considered over site size. A number of core strategy site promoters argue that initial phases of their sites should be brought forward as they both conform to the emerging spatial strategy and have already undergone a significant amount of testing, sustainability appraisal and public consultation.

111. A number of people felt that the delivery issues of existing large sites should be dealt with first and suggested potentially breaking them up into smaller sites. However the workshop attendees considered that a joint approach with smaller sites being progressed through the IHSP and larger sites through the core strategy was as a sensible approach.

#### Officer response and recommendation

112. We consider the guideline proportionate growth figures calculated for individual settlements to be, on the whole, an appropriate indication of the level of growth that we should expect to bring forward in any given settlement through the IHSP (for smaller settlements in particular). However as the draft policy indicated, this figure is a guideline that it may be appropriate to moderately vary when considering the merits of specific sites. Additionally we would look to resist any development in those settlements which have a negative proportionate growth figure.
113. It remains our view, one shared by the majority of consultation respondents, that it is not desirable to bring forward the largest and most complex sites currently being progressed through the core strategy. Their infrastructure needs are complex and best assessed and tested through the core strategy process. The option of early, partial use of some of the larger core strategy sites would complicate and could compromise the effective masterplanning of both the wider site and the settlement as a whole, and should only be considered a last resort. This position is consistent with our view that the IHSP should complement the role of core strategy within our overall and emerging housing supply approach.
114. In refining the policy we have also made the decision to accept suggestions that Wantage and Grove should be combined into a single proportionate growth figure. We agree that these settlements, whilst administratively separate, are intrinsically interlinked in terms of facilities and infrastructure requirements. They have also been assessed together throughout the core strategy process. With this amendment, all proposed core strategy sites put forward under the IHSP are within settlements that have a negative proportionate growth figure and are therefore considered inappropriate to be brought forward outside of the Local Development Framework (LDF) process.
115. There is a limited amount that can be done to further speed up the delivery of existing local plan allocations. A planning application has been submitted for Grove airfield since the draft IHSP was published, an important milestone in terms of resolving housing delivery backlogs. In addition the sewage capacity issues at Botley are currently being resolved.

**Q5. As a general principle, ‘proportionate growth’ should be broadly sustainable in that it would help settlements sustain their current level of facilities and services by stabilising their population, without unduly adding to pressures on services and infrastructure over the emerging core strategy period.**

116. This issue was by far the most contentious and drew the most comments. Many thought that proportionate growth calculations were too simplistic and did not take into account existing infrastructure, land availability, environmental constraints or local need. A number of respondents including Oxfordshire County Council also argue that this approach may lead to housing in unsustainable locations and could have a large cumulative impact on existing infrastructure. Those respondents and workshop attendees in agreement of the approach felt that it would support and could even help enhance local services although it was important that all sites made appropriate contributions to infrastructure. Oxfordshire County Council has requested our support in enabling them to collect contributions from small sites that would currently fall beneath their threshold (less than 10 homes).

#### Officer response and recommendation

117. We consider the guideline proportionate growth figures calculated for individual settlements to be, on the whole, a useful and appropriate general indication of the level of growth that we should expect to bring forward in any given settlement through the IHSP, for smaller settlements in particular. They are no more than that. We reiterate points made in the draft IHSP document: that the figure is a guideline provided suitable sites are available, not a target or requirement. The draft policy (IHSP3) fully acknowledges under the deliverability test requirements that local infrastructure and facilities are important considerations. But we suggest that this requirement be made more prominent in the final policy.
118. It is also important to bear in mind that the IHSP does not stand alone, and the final IHSP document can communicate this more strongly than it does at present. Housing proposed to be brought forward through the IHSP sits within the context of overall growth planned in the LDF as part of a balanced housing supply package, supported by a range of proposed infrastructure set out in the accompanying draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
119. Under the spatial strategy of the emerging core strategy, the main settlements would accommodate the bulk (75-80%) of housing planned to 2029. The spatial strategy also strongly supports the continued growth and vitality of the district’s villages and rural areas, home to half the district’s population. Villages (especially larger villages) are likely to provide sites for around 20% of overall housing supply. The IHSP would bring forward a part of this component of supply early.
120. Initial analysis of the sites submitted suggests that the majority of the housing likely to be brought forward through the IHSP will be from sites in

the large villages. Growth in these areas will help to support the services and facilities that already exist within these communities. Most of the sites proposed are for 10 or more homes, and would be expected to make appropriate developer contributions to local infrastructure and affordable housing provision, to complement broader, strategic infrastructure provision through the core strategy. Only a very small proportion of sites proposed are below the affordable housing threshold of 5 homes.

**Q6. Proposals that significantly exceed the host settlement's identified level of proportionate growth should be screened out from the interim policy approach and instead considered through the formal plan making process.**

121. Although there was general agreement to this principle, a number of respondents felt that there should be sufficient flexibility to enable sites to be judged on their own merits with the proportionate growth figure acting as a guideline only. This would enable development to occur in the most sustainable locations, including the main settlements, and in accordance with the spatial strategy. Considerations should include local support and the ability of the site to provide contributions, affordable housing and additional supporting infrastructure.

Officer response and recommendations

122. We consider the guideline proportionate growth figures calculated for individual settlements to be, on the whole, an appropriate indication of the level of growth that we should expect to bring forward in any given settlement through the IHSP, for smaller settlements in particular. The draft policy already indicates that this figure is a guideline that it may be appropriate to moderately exceed it if warranted by the merits of a particular site or location. Additionally we would look to resist any development in those settlements which have a negative proportionate growth figure.

123. Town and parish councils will be sent all site proposals within their area and invited to comment. Site promoters have been encouraged to approach relevant town and parish councils and this may be used as an opportunity for local residents to support those sites which they feel offer benefits to their community.

124. Initial site analysis suggests that only a very small proportion of sites submitted will fall below the affordable housing threshold of 5 homes (2%).

**Q7-9. What are your views on the policy relaxations proposed (policies H11, H12, H13, GS2, E11, E12 and E14)?**

125. There was concern, notably from town and parish councils, that the relaxation of Policy GS2 would lead to encroachment of open countryside and harm the rural character of villages. Relaxation of employment policies



also caused concern as these sites could be unsustainably located and the loss of sites could undermine economic development of rural areas thereby lessening their sustainability. A number of respondents queried the sustainability of development in smaller villages due to their lack of available facilities.

#### Officer response and recommendation

126. IHSP objectives cannot be achieved without recourse to edge of settlement sites, and we consider that the proportionate growth guideline will help to ensure that growth within the villages that is of an appropriate scale to that of the settlement. This conforms to the council's emerging spatial strategy that seeks to promote thriving villages whilst safeguarding the countryside and their character. The scale of housing proposed by site promoters in the smaller villages is modest (about 6% of the total homes proposed).
127. Relaxation of employment policies will be stringently applied to ensure that we do not create unsustainable communities. Initial site analysis indicates that very few business sites have been proposed for housing.

#### **Q.10 The proposed policy relaxation to enable some edge-of-settlement development would not apply when the settlement edge is located in the Green Belt. Should the same restriction be applied to edge-of-settlement land designated AONB?**

128. A number of respondents, including Natural England felt that greenfield sites within the AONB should also be excluded from the IHSP as we have a duty to protect the views and character of this important landscape. Whilst some felt a sequential test would be more appropriate there were a number of respondents that argued that the purpose of an AONB differs from that of Green Belt and sites should be treated on their own merit with due regard to landscape considerations.

#### Officer response and recommendation

129. It is proposed that both sites within the Green Belt and AONB are excluded from the IHSP.

#### **Housing types**

130. There was widespread concern that the IHSP may lead to sites that are below the affordable housing threshold and consisting of predominantly large and expensive housing. It was suggested that either the threshold should be lowered or a minimum site size should be introduced in order to trigger affordable housing provision.

### Officer response and recommendation

131. Town and parish councils will have the opportunity to actively engage with site promoters and may use this opportunity to give greater preference to those proposed a favourable mix of housing. Additionally through the planning application process, officers would wish to see a design that was in keeping with the surrounding character and built form of the settlement. As indicated above the majority of sites submitted so far exceed the affordable housing threshold.

### **Other comments**

132. There were concerns raised that the policy should remain an interim measure and that the screening process was clear and transparent with local involvement from an early stage. A number of respondents felt that brownfield sites should be preferred wherever possible although Oxfordshire County Council argues that the IHSP should acknowledge that greenfield sites can sometimes be more suitable than brownfield.

### Officer response and recommendation

133. The document is clear that the policy will run until either 1,000 homes are permitted or the core strategy is adopted. It is also explicit that in order to invoke the policy, applicants would need to be invited to submit a planning application. Any submitted without prior invitation would be assessed according to the existing Local Plan.

## Appendix 1 – Public notice



Vale of White Horse District Council  
PUBLIC NOTICE  
Local Government Act 2000 Part 1(2)1  
Planning Policy Document

### **Subject matter**

The Vale of White Horse has developed an Interim Housing Supply Policy to assist with tackling the shortfall that has occurred with its existing housing delivery target. The document sets out to relax certain policies contained within the Vale of White Horse Local Plan, on sites that qualify for this approach. It outlines a set of guiding principles and tests for potential new sites. This is to help ensure that these sites are sustainable, deliverable and that the level of proposed growth is proportionate for the location. The Interim Housing Supply Policy (IHSP) will operate until the Vale of White Horse Core Strategy is adopted (anticipated adoption 2013), or until 1,000 homes are permitted under the IHSP. The IHSP is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal. The consultation lasts until **Friday 25 November 2011**.

### **Availability of documents**

Copies of the draft IHSP and Sustainability Appraisal are available on the council's website [www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/spds](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/spds) and from 21 October 2011 for public inspection at the council offices, Abbey Close, Abingdon, OX14 3JE, weekdays from 8.30am – 5.00pm Monday to Thursday and Friday's 8.30am – 4.30pm, along with all local libraries across the district.

### **Comments**

Please e-mail your comments through to [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk) or alternatively send to

Planning Policy  
Vale of White Horse District Council  
Abbey Close  
Abingdon  
OX14 3JE

### **Future action**

After the consultation the council will look to make any necessary amendments and formally adopt the policy document.

## Appendix 2 Interim Housing Supply Policy Consultation Plan

# Draft Interim Housing Supply Policy: Consultation Plan



**Vale  
of White Horse**

*District Council*

**This consultation plan outlines the various methods of engagement that will be utilised for the production of an Interim Housing Supply Policy. This document does not sit within the Town and Country Planning Local Development Framework Regulations as amended 2008. However, for the purposes of this consultation and to give the document greater robustness in terms of process and weight as a material consideration for the determination of planning applications, we will prepare and consult on this document in the same way we would for a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).**

### Introduction

1. The Interim Housing Supply Policy (IHSP) policy has been prepared to respond constructively to the lack of a five year housing land supply in the Vale, arising primarily because Local Plan housing allocations have not come forward sufficiently quickly. There have also been significant delays to the Vale's emerging Core Strategy Development Plan Document. As mentioned previously, although not a formal supplementary planning document that sits within the local development framework regulations, this document will undergo the same preparatory processes (sustainability appraisal, public consultation and formal adoption) as a supplementary planning document.
2. The main aim of the interim policy is to:
  - Achieve a target of permission of 1,000 homes by March 2014 or by adoption of the core strategy if earlier.
3. This will be achieved through adoption of a statement to set aside, relax or vary selected saved Local Plan policies to:
  - Increase the size limits on development in built up areas of villages
  - Relax constraints on using vacant local employment sites for housing
  - Consider rural infill and rural housing exceptions sites
  - It will provide guidelines to encourage proposals that are readily deliverable, proportionate to their host communities and in suitable and sustainable locations.

### Previous consultation

4. This issue has not been the subject of any previous consultation.

**Current consultation and timescale**

- 5. This consultation is the first on this subject matter and a six week consultation period would usually be suggested. However, this issue is quite well known with the target stakeholders (town and parish councillors, planning agents, land owners and architects). It is these groups who are more likely to contribute significantly to this consultation period. Therefore a consultation period of five weeks should provide a satisfactory timescale and fits within the normal timescales of an SPD consultation, a week above SPD minimum to allow for the half-term period and to accommodate the Town and Parish Council Forum meeting on 23 November 2011. Where possible we will try to accommodate any late responses received, within a reasonable time period.
- 6. The potential consultation period we have identified runs from 21 October to 25 November 2011. A breakdown of the overall timescale follows:

Lead member decision	By 22 September 2011
Scrutiny call-in period	23-30 September 2011 (Scope to slip a week if changes required to the draft policy)
Press adverts submitted	7 October 2011
Formal consultation period (5 weeks)	21 October – 25 November 2011
Workshop event(s)	
Town & Parish Council Forum	23 November 2011
Processing of responses and revisions arising	18 November – 9/16 December subject to volume
Report back to Cabinet Briefing	TBC
Report back to Council	TBC

- 7. The following table highlights the various consultation methods that will be used. As we are treating this document, as that of a similar status to a SPD, we have shown differences in the consultation requirements based on regulation. The shaded boxes denote regulatory minimum requirements of consultation considered in the context of an equivalent of an SPD. The boxes without shading identify methods over and above the minimum requirements, which we will use. We feel that these additional methods are an appropriate level of consultation for this subject.

## Principal methods of consultation

8. The table below outlines the methods of consultation that we will look to use for the IHSP document. The table provides further information on the main aim that we are looking to achieve with each identified consultation activity. We have provided specific dates for some events, but also date ranges for some activities, where appropriate.

Proposed method of Consultation	Description and Aim	Date
Wider councillor involvement discussion session/workshop	To provide councillors with an opportunity for discussions prior to the formal consultation beginning.	Preferably in advance of the main consultation period or near to the start w/c 17 October 2011 <b>TBC (dependent on interest)</b>
Letters and e-mails to statutory consultees	Correspondence sent out to statutory consultees to notify them of the consultation period and meet regulatory requirements. Also provides opportunity to notify consultees of any associated consultation events. Statutory consultation list will be tailored from the prescribed list set out in the regulations, to those that we see as most suitable for this consultation.	17-20 October 2011
Letters and e-mails to non statutory consultees	Correspondence sent out to non statutory consultees to notify them of the consultation period and meet regulatory requirements. Also provides opportunity to notify consultees of any associated consultation events. We identify non-statutory consultees through the use of our stakeholder consultation database. A main focus of this consultation will be targeting town and parish councils, along with agents, landowners and key organisations.	17-20 October 2011
Formal Press advert and equivalent SPD matters statement online and local newspaper (Herald series & Oxford Times)	To set out formal requirements of the consultation (both local newspapers and online), as identified in the regulations. This will also provide an opportunity to promote the consultation period and associated activities. The press advert will cover the formal requirements, which will be equivalent to a SPD matters.	Adverts to run: Herald on 19 October 2011 and Oxford Times on 20 October 2011 (deadline for submission 14 October 2011)
Hard copy documents provided at the council offices, local libraries and local service points	To allow access to consultation information for those without online facilities. Reference copies of the document will be held at various locations across the district, including those previously mentioned.	Dispatched to named destinations 18-19 October 2011
Standard questionnaire	To capture qualitative data for analysis. Comment forms will be available online on, libraries, town and parish councils.	As above, to form part of the consultation document, and live online by 21 October 2011.

Stakeholder workshop – Town and parish councils, agents and land owners, other key agencies and bodies	To provide an opportunity for key stakeholders including potential land owners to discuss matters relating to the interim policy document with council officers. Provide further opportunity to collect feedback on the document. Mixed attendance facilitated workshop sessions, one or two subject to demand. Break-out sessions structures around consultation questionnaire questions.	TBC (possible dates w/c ....
Town and Parish Council Forum – presentation	To provide a brief reminder on the key elements of the interim policy, while at the same time encouraging town and parish councils to respond promptly before the scheduled close of the consultation on 25 November. The forum is also generally well attended.	23 November 2011
Press release	To increase publicity and maximise opportunity for those not viewing the consultation electronically. Press releases also provide an improved method of presenting the consultation information compared to the more formal press adverts.	Press releases to run: Herald 19 October 2011 and Oxford Times 20 October 2011.

## Appendix 3 consultation questionnaire

### Interim Housing Supply Policy

Draft for consultation

### Public consultation questionnaire



Planning Policy Team  
IHSP consultation  
Abbey House, Abbey Close  
Abingdon OX14 3JE

CONTACT OFFICER: **Laura Howard**  
planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk  
Tel: 01235 540 499

Please return this form by email if possible, to arrive by 4:00pm 25 November 2011.

Please email the address above for a copy of questionnaire in electronic form.

#### A. Your contact details

Contact name	Organisation (if applicable)	Telephone	Email	Mobile
Address for correspondence				Post code

#### B. Are you promoting or looking to promote a particular site or sites for housing development?

Yes / No

If YES please indicate the site area ..... hectares

And the name of the host or nearest town or village .....

#### C. Do you intend to submit a request for a site screening opinion for possible interim policy consideration (form at IHSP annex C)?

Yes / No



## Consultation Questions

*Continue on an additional sheet if necessary*

1. The council should relax selected local plan policies to improve housing supply

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral or unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Reasons/comments.				

2. To boost housing completions and improve the five year housing land supply it is important that housing sites brought forward by the interim policy are capable of delivering homes quickly.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral or unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Reasons/comments.				

3. Bringing forward a number of smaller sites is more likely to improve short to medium term housing delivery than bringing forward additional large sites (200+ homes).

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral or unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Reasons/comments.				

4. Large/strategic housing sites (200+ homes) should be tested and allocated through the core strategy process and not considered under the IHSP.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral or unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Reasons/comments.				

5. As a general principle, 'proportionate growth'<sup>13</sup> should be broadly sustainable in that it would help settlements sustain their current level of facilities and services by stabilising their population, without unduly adding to pressures on services and infrastructure over the emerging core strategy period

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral or unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Reasons/comments.				
5(a). If you disagree, what additional or alternative tests or indicators of sustainability do you suggest be applied?				

6. Proposals that significantly exceed the host settlement's identified level of proportionate growth should be screened out from the interim policy approach and instead considered through the formal plan-making process.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral or unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Reasons/comments.				
6(a). If you disagree, what additional tests or considerations might be applied to justify exceeding the level of proportionate growth?				

7. What are your views on the policy relaxations proposed?

Support / Object	Policies H11, H12 and H13, relaxation to the size thresholds currently permitted on sites within the built up area of towns and villages
Support / Object	Policy G52, relaxation to consider housing on sites outside but abutting the defined settlement boundary of the towns or the built up area of the larger and smaller villages which are not located within the Green Belt
Support / Object	Policies E11, E12, E14, relaxation to consider housing on currently vacant, former employment sites within or adjoining a settlement
Reasons/comments.	

<sup>13</sup> For IHSP purposes this is defined in the context of declining average household size, as: the level of housing provision sufficient to maintain at 2026 the 2011 settlement population, at the average Vale household size projected for 2026.

7(a). Are there any other saved Vale Local Plan policies that should be considered for relaxation?

3. The proposed policy relaxation to enable some edge-of-settlement development would not apply when the settlement edge is located in the Green Belt. Should the same restriction be applied to edge of settlement land designated AONB?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral or unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Reasons/comments.				

3. How could the IHSP be improved?  
Any other comments?

- Thank you for participating -

# Interim Housing Supply Policy



Planning Policy Team  
Abbey House, Abbey Close  
Abingdon OX14 3JE

**CONTACT OFFICER: Laura Howard**  
planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk  
Tel: 01235 540 499  
Textphone: 18001 01235 540 499

## Request for a site screening opinion

- Screening requests are invited at any stage including during the consultation period.
- Screening requests must be made with the knowledge and consent of the land owner(s).
- Site promoters should first carry out their own assessment against the IHSP tests and requirements
- You are encouraged to apply by email.
- Screening opinions will be issued after the final policy is formally adopted, anticipated early in 2012.

Your details			
Contact name	Organisation (if applicable)	Telephone/mobile	Email
Address for correspondence			Post code

Site details <span style="color: red;">Enclose a plan or aerial photo clearly identifying the location and boundaries of the site and proposed point(s) of vehicular access</span>				
Address or description of location		Town/village name	Post code (if applicable)	
Site area (hectares)	Current use	Permitted use(s) if any	Land use designations e.g. AONB	Is the site previously developed land? If in part, specify PDL area.

Indicative development proposal <span style="color: red;">You may attach supporting documents but if hard copies these will not be returned.</span>	
Estimated number and type of homes	Other uses (approximate area or floorspace, for information only)

Describe how and where you propose to provide vehicular access to the site. Informal discussion with Oxfordshire County Council is recommended.

If invited to proceed, when would you envisage submitting a full planning application (allowing sufficient time for detailed design work and preparation of any necessary technical reports)?

Provide a justification if you consider that the site / proposal meets some but not all of the IHSP requirements but should still be considered under the IHSP approach.

### Statement of self assessment of compliance with IHSP policy requirements

**I/ we have assessed the above site against the IHSP tests and consider that it meets them and submit it for a screening opinion on suitability for determination under the Interim Housing Supply Policy approach.**

**I/ we understand that if invited to proceed following screening that a planning application would need to include at the point of application statements to satisfy the three deliverability tests of Policy IHSP 3, and any relevant technical reports.**

**I/we understand that if invited to proceed following screening that the application must be for full planning permission, which if granted will be for a fixed 12 month period and would not be renewed if development does not commence within that 12 months.**

**I/we confirm that this expression of interest is made with the knowledge and consent of the land owner(s).**

Signed

Name

Date

## Appendix 5 list of those consulted

Group	Name	Group	Name
<b>Statutory</b>	British Gas Plc (Southern)	<b>Businesses</b>	Wantage & District Chamber of Commerce
	Southern Electric		Faringdon Chamber of Commerce
	English Heritage (South East Region)		UKAEA and STFC
	Health & Safety Executive		Grove Technology Park
	Defence Estates Operations South		Didcot Chamber of Commerce
	Mobile Operators Association		Science Vale UK
	National Grid Gas Distribution Plant Protection Team		Choose Abingdon Partnership
	National Grid UK Transmission Land and Development		Abingdon & District Chamber of Trade
	The Coal Authority		
	Oxfordshire County Council, Property & Facilities		
	Oxfordshire County Council Library Services		
	Oxfordshire County Council County Archaeological Services		
	SSE Power Distribution, Network Dev. Planner		
	All town and parish councils		
	Neighbouring Authorities		
	Natural England		
	Environment Agency		
	Highways Agency		
	Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust		
	Thames Water Property Services Town Planning Manager		
		<b>Group</b>	<b>Name</b>
		<b>Developers</b>	Home Builders Federation
			Banner Homes Group plc
			Bellway Homes Ltd
			Berkeley Homes
			Bovis Homes (South West) Ltd
			Holburn Homes
			Pegasus Planning Group
			Stansgate Planning Consultants
			Morgan Cole

Persimmon Special Projects Western
Woolf Bond Planning LLP
Bidwells
RPS Planning
Cluttons LLP, Planning & Regeneration
White, Young, Green Planning
Carter Jonas LLP
Turley Associates
University of Oxford
Barton Willmore
Cranbourne Homes Ltd
Croudace Homes
David Wilson Homes
Taylor Wimpey Southern Counties
Martin Grant Homes
McCarthy & Stone
J A Pye (Oxford) Ltd
The Hendred Estate
The Planning Bureau Ltd
Kemp & Kemp Property Consultants
West Waddy ADP
Barratts Strategic
Earl of Plymouth Estates
Boyer Planning Ltd
Bidwells
Bluestone Planning Ltd
DPDS
Thomas Merrifield Ltd, Oxford
JWPC Limited (Mr Paul Semple)
Web Paton Chartered Surveyors
Hives Planning
Dijksman Planning
DPP

Smith Gore
Stewart Ross Associates
A K Harris Partnership
The Showmans' Guild
David Wilson Homes Ltd
Country Land and Business Association
Bewlay Homes
Silk Planning
Savills
Malcolm Judd & Partners
Paul and Company
Harmers Ltd
Terence O'Rourke
SCP
Robert Hitchins Ltd
Vincent and Gorbing
G L Hearn Ltd
Christopher Strang Associates
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultant
Easton Bevins
Hepher Dixon
Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd
CALA Homes (Mids) Ltd
Smith Stuart Reynolds
Esso Petroleum Company
Consensus Planning
Green Issues Communications
Tetlow King Planning
White, Young and Green
PMP
Edgars Limited
The Trustees of W E Gale
Cecil Pilkington Trust (Charitable Trust)
Croudace Strategic Ltd c/o Portchester Planning Consultancy
RPS Planning & Development
Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance

Jewson Holdings
Cornwall House Developments Ltd
Grove Technology Park
G R Planning Consultancy Ltd
Elmore Homes
Fairview Homes
Fisherman Properties
Gallagher Estates Ltd
M J Gleeson Matt Richardson/Sophia Thorpe
Kimberley Development
Persimmon Homes (Western) Ltd deleted
Pinecrest Limited
Westbury Homes
Barratt Homes
Rob White Consulting Ltd
Gazeley UK Ltd
All Souls College
The Castle Family
JJ Gallagher and Gleeson Developments
W M Wasbrough & the Trustees of the WM Wasbrough
Rydon Homes
Strutt & Parker LLP
Turnberry Consulting
Jones Lang LaSalle
Pegasus Planning
Bushbuy Ltd
Leith Planning Ltd Shan Dassanaike
Mays Properties
Colliers CRE
Martineau
RPS Bristol Mr Denis Barry
Addison Associates
Jones Lang LaSalle
Covenant Management Chartered Surveyors
Adkins (Mr P Pocock)
G L Hearn
Welbeck Strategic Land Ltd
Knight Frank

Knight Frank FAO: Jenny Offord
Allen Duff Property Consultant
Savills
Hunter Page Planning
PRP Architect
Fusion Online Ltd, Beverley Butler
Hallam Land Management
Lucas Land and Planning
NorthernTrust
Turley Associates, Sarah Stevens, Director
JPPC thomas homes

**Group**

**Name**

**Environment**

BBOWT
Oxfordshire Geology Trust
The Woodland Trust
RSPB VWH Local Group
World Wide Fund for Nature (Oxon)
Oxfordshire Nature Conservation Bureau
North Wessex Downs AONB Office
Keep Harwell Rural Campaign
Oxford Green Belt Network
Council To Protect Rural England
Forestry Commission
Inland Waterways Association, Oxfordshire Branch



	Didcot Community Forum		Albert Park Residents Association
	S.P.A.D.E.		Long Furlong Community Association
<b>Group</b>	<b>Name</b>		North East Abingdon Community Association
<b>General interest</b>	Oxfordshire Architectural & Historical Society		Hids Copse Road Residents Association
	Oxford Preservation Trust		Stockham Park and Local Area Residents Association
	Land Access & Recreation Association		Old Botley Resident's Association
	South Abingdon Voluntary Action Group		Harcourt Hill Resident's Association
	Campaign for a Sustainable Didcot		Cumnor Rise Road Resident's Association
	Thames Valley Police		Fitzharry's Manor Estate Residents Association
	Friends of Abingdon		Tithe Farm and Ladygrove Residents Association
	Friends of The Ridgeway		Charlton Residents Association
	Wilts & Berks Trust		Residents of North Drive
<b>Group</b>	<b>Name</b>		
<b>Housing</b>	Sovereign Housing Group		
	Vale Housing Association		
	Catalyst Housing Group		
	SOHA Housing Ltd		
	The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups		
<b>Group</b>	<b>Name</b>		
<b>Residents' Groups</b>	Church Close Residents' Association		
	Faringdon Association of Residents		

# Draft Interim Housing Supply Policy - Consultation Statement

---

Please contact

Development Policy  
Vale of White Horse District Council  
Abbey House  
Abingdon  
OX14 3JE  
[www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

Telephone 01235 520202 ex 7499  
Fax: 01235 540396  
Email: [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

