

CHAPTER 3 – GENERAL STRATEGY

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM MAP8 – Policy GS1 Development in Existing Settlements	
<p>Support</p> <p>330/PM/1 Cranfield University support the inclusion of Sudbury House within the development area of Faringdon as logical as it uses previously developed land and is contiguous with the existing development boundary.</p>	Noted
PM 3.6 – Para 3.14 Development in the Oxford Green Belt	
<p>Support</p> <p>489/PM/1 Oxford Brookes University remains appreciative of the support of the District Council as expressed in the Plan and as such supports the Proposed Modification.</p>	Noted
PM 3.8 – Policy GS5 Safeguarded Land	
<p>Support</p> <p>291/PM/8 University of Oxford support deletion of policy GS5 in light of the Inspector's recommendation and in relation to the allocation of land for housing at Botley.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>902/PM/1 Dr Paul Sutton, 950/PM1 Mrs C Trafford and Mr L Trafford, 949/PM1 M Nash, 989/PM1 Mrs M Hayle, 954/PM1 Mr Peter A Harper-Smith, 995/PM1 Mr & Mrs Hall, 901/PM1 Maureen Elliot, 906/PM1 Mrs S Dyson, 913/PM1 V Campo, 912/PM1 NJ Campo, 943/PM1 Mr G Allsworth, 947/PM1 Mr T Foster, 907/PM1 AJ O'Leary, 992/PM1 K Neller, 904/PM1 Mr S Waite & Ms K Alderson made the following objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land should remain safeguarded, • It is not a sustainable location for housing, • Development will increase congestion on Botley Rd/A34/A420, • Modification is a bad compromise destroying safeguarded land because land in Grove can't be developed as quickly, • No evidence that alternative sites will not be developed in time, • Land not needed as other areas of Cumnor/Botley are already to be developed (Timbmet), • There has been no proper risk assessment, • Agricultural land will be lost, • Biodiversity and local wildlife will be harmed • It will lead to flooding • Sewerage system is not adequate, • Schools/Nurseries do not have enough places • Health provision is already inadequate, • Car parking in the area is already at capacity, • Development will increase local traffic/parking 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Land was safeguarded for development and was excluded from the Green Belt under policy GS5 in the draft Local Plan. The land was therefore considered to be suitable for development and had been previously excluded from the Green Belt for that reason. Indeed the Council's Sustainability Appraisal showed that the sites at Tilbury Lane and Lime Road Botley were sustainable locations for development. However, because of the capacity of other allocations in the draft Local Plan, the Council considered that the land did not need to be developed to meet the Vale's housing allocation and should remain safeguarded for development beyond the plan period.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that sites allocated in the draft Local Plan at Grove and Faringdon would not be developed sufficiently quickly to meet the Vale's housing requirements and therefore considered that other allocations were required. In reaching this conclusion he considered evidence in relation to the likely speed of development on the allocated housing sites. Given the results of the Council's Sustainability Appraisal in relation to the safeguarded land the Inspector further considered that land at Tilbury Lane and Lime Road Botley might be suitable for allocation as housing sites to meet the expected shortfall on other sites. The representations which relate to the suitability of the safeguarded land for housing development were then dealt with under policy H3 in the Inspector's report. Similarly the representations made in response to the proposed modification allocating land at Tilbury Lane and Lime Road Botley for housing which are listed opposite are dealt with</p>

Response to the Proposed Modifications to the Draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

CHAPTER 3 – GENERAL STRATEGY

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>problems and decrease road safety/lead to more accidents,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current residents' quality of life will be reduced, • Development will affect Human Rights via loss of views, • Anti-social behaviour and crime will increase, • Mixing private and local authority housing will cause problems, • New houses will be affected by overhead power lines, • Effect on OAP housing in Seacourt Rd, • Unsuitable cycle/pedestrian access arrangements, • Hazel Rd is unsuitable for access, • No sports facilities for children, • Loss of greenfield land, • Health and safety risks, • Loss of Green Belt, • Land should be a nature reserve, • Effect on water table, • Loss of allotments, • Increase in noise, particularly during construction, will disturb residents, • Public transport is not adequate, • Using Hazel Rd, Seacourt Rd, Poplar Rd or Elms Rd will cause problems, • Alley off Hazel Rd is not suitable for pedestrian or cycle access, • Development will lead to short cutting along existing roads, • Taxis will drop off fares at alley late at night, • Hazel Rd will be used as a car park, • Hazel Rd will not be safe for children to play in, • Flooding of roads will increase, • Development should be kept to the Fogwell Road side of Tilbury Lane. • Vandal proof fencing will be needed between the development and existing housing. 	<p>under policy H3 elsewhere in this schedule.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the one remaining area of safeguarded land did not justify the retention of the policy. The Council agreed with this recommendation and policy GS5 has been deleted from the draft Local Plan via a modification. None of the objections which have been made justify continuing to safeguard the sites for development against the Inspector's recommendation or retaining the policy in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change</p>

CHAPTER 4 – GENERAL POLICIES FOR DEVELOPMENT

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM 4.8 – Para 4.20 – Provision of Infrastructure and Services	
<p>Objection</p> <p>1004/PM/1 George Wimpey UK Ltd and Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd. This is a joint objection that Local Plan para 4.20 does not fully reflect the guidance in Circular 5/2005 (para B18-B19) that the requirement for maintenance in perpetuity only applies to facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development and where assets are intended for wider public use, the costs of maintenance should normally be borne by the body in which the asset is to be rested. Additions to para 4.20 are proposed to clarify this distinction</p>	<p>This objection correctly points out that Circular 5/2005 makes this distinction and para 4.20 states that improvements will be secured through planning obligations in accordance with Circular 5/2005. Para 4.20 adds that maintenance “may be required in perpetuity” and if this is qualified as suggested below it will give clarity in accordance with the Circular and refer to the distinction that the objectors are seeking.</p> <p>Recommendation: Para 4.20, penultimate sentence, after “in perpetuity” add “where the facilities are predominantly for the users of the associated development.”</p>
PM 4.9 – Policy DC8 – Provision of Infrastructure and Services	
<p>Objection</p> <p>1003/PM/1 Thames Water comments that legal agreements cannot be made to secure water and waste water infrastructure upgrades, but that it is essential that upgrades are in place to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding and low water pressure. Thames Water is therefore seeking to modify policy DC8 to clarify that a planning condition will be used to ensure that infrastructure is provided ahead of development.</p>	<p>Local Plan para 4.20 notes Structure Plan policy G3 which states that development will not be permitted unless the necessary infrastructure is available. Government advice in PPS12 explains that one purpose of the planning system is to co-ordinate new development with the infrastructure it demands (para B4). Local Plan policy DC8 provides in summary, that development will only be permitted where the necessary infrastructure can be secured in time to serve the needs of the development and it requires that infrastructure must be provided to ensure co-ordination with development. In some cases this may be before development starts. The policy as worded therefore covers Thames Water’s concerns.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
PM 1.12 – Policy DC13 – Flood Risk and Water Run-off	
<p>Support</p> <p>403/PM/1 Environment Agency</p>	<p>Noted</p>

CHAPTER 5 - TRANSPORT

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM5.5 – Policy TR1A Integrated Transport Strategy	
<p>684/PM/1 Maurice and Patricia Hyde reiterate their opposition to a new road from Mably Way to the A417 east of Wantage.</p>	<p>The new road was examined in detail at the local plan inquiry and the Inspector who was fully aware of all the objections concluded that removing direct reference to the A417 either side of Wantage would permit wider consideration of all possible opportunities to relieve Wantage town centre and through traffic in the review of this plan in the near future. Policy TR1A now refers to a 'relief road scheme for Wantage' as recommended by the Inspector and not to a new road from Mably Way to the A417 east of Wantage.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
PM5.6 - Paras 5.21-5.24	
<p>Objection</p> <p>323/PM/1 Williams F1 object to the deletion of the reference to the road north of Grove following a route south of Bellinger's Garage. This route is preferable to an alignment north of Bellinger's Garage and the reference should be retained as an indication of such preference.</p>	<p>The Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry concluded that the reference would restrict highway design options in the light of the WAGASTS Phase 2 outcome and saw no need for references to 'the south of Bellingers Garage' to be added to the plan. The modification is in accord with his recommendation and there is no reason to modify the plan further.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
PM5.2 - Para 5.13	
<p>Comment</p> <p>815/PM/2 Gloucestershire County Council noted that since the consultation began Local Highway Authorities have had to submit their second LTP's 2006-2011 and the plan should reflect this.</p> <p>1002/2 Mr M Hocken objects that this modification needs to be updated as a result of the submission of the full LTP.</p> <p>Mr Hocken goes on to conclude that the final paragraph of the proposed amendment PM5.2 para 5.13 is factually incorrect in a number of respects and a new concluding paragraph should be added along the lines:</p> <p>"The Local Transport Plan recognizes that measures taken to date will be insufficient to address exceedences of airborne pollutants resulting from traffic emissions in central Abingdon. As a result, consultation on the declaration of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Abingdon town centre has begun, with a view to the adoption, within a 12-18 month timeframe, of an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) for integration into the new Local Transport Plan. This Action Plan will be required to set "ambitious but realistic"</p>	<p>Agreed. A minor change to the wording would correct and update the plan. It would not be a substantive change and it is not necessary to advertise it as a further proposed modification.</p> <p>Recommendation: Second Deposit Draft Local Plan incorporating the Proposed Modifications March 2006, page 62, para 5.13, first sentence: delete 'produced' and insert 'submitted'.</p> <p>The Local Plan re-iterates the agreed ambitions of the Transport Plan which the Proposed Modifications correctly include. This as set out in para 5.14 is purely to set the framework for planning decisions affecting land use. The text suggested by Mr Hocken is a level of detail not appropriate for inclusion in a land use plan.</p> <p>Development proposals which would unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and their wider environment will be considered in the context of policy DC9.</p>

Response to the Proposed Modifications to the Draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

CHAPTER 5 - TRANSPORT

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>targets to reduce exceedences and show that all appropriate traffic management measures to bring about such reductions have been considered. As a consequence of the AQMA declaration, the authority will be required to assess the impact of any proposed development on air quality levels within the AQMA, and ensure that <u>both</u> air quality <u>and</u> traffic assessments/travel plans will be required in respect of all development plans that could adversely affect air quality within the AQMA (see section 5.64 and 65 and TR7 [which should be amended accordingly]). The relevant development and planning guidance will be strictly enforced by the authority (in particular PPS13, PPS23 and DC10). All sustainability appraisals conducted under the Plan will need to factor in this material consideration. Should it moreover transpire that there was no public advertisement of the May 2005 decision by the Executive not to conduct an environmental assessment of the emerging Local Plan, the legal implications thereof will need to be elucidated before the Plan is finalised.”</p>	<p>Public notices were displayed in the local press and Mr Hocken has been advised of this.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
PM5.4 - Para 5.19	
<p>815/PM/3 Gloucestershire County Council comment that this modification needs updating due to the submission of the LTP.</p>	<p>Agreed. A minor change to the wording would correct and update the plan. It would not be a substantive change and it is not necessary to advertise it as a further proposed modification.</p> <p>Recommendation: Second Deposit Draft Local Plan incorporating the Proposed Modifications March 2006, page 65, para 5.19, first sentence delete: ‘provisional’ and insert ‘submitted’.</p>
PM5.5 - Para 5.24	
<p>Objection</p> <p>276/PM/1 Grove Parish Council consider that the latter part of paragraph 5.24 is not consistent with PM8.24 and PM8.29 and should be reworded.</p>	<p>Agreed. A minor change to the wording would make the Proposed Modifications consistent. This is not a substantive change and it is not necessary to advertise it as a further proposed modification.</p> <p>Recommendation: Second Deposit Draft Local Plan incorporating the Proposed Modifications March 2006, page 67 para 5.24 amend final sentence to read ‘The Council will also require the development to fund the construction of a new road from the strategic housing site west of Grove to join the A338 north of Grove to be started early in the second phase of development and completed before any more than 1500 dwellings in total have been built on the site.’</p>
PM5.17 and PM 5.18 – Policy TR9 Lorries and Roadside Services	
<p>Support</p> <p>333/PM/1 Mr J Bray supports the clearer definition of roadside facilities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM 7.3 – Para 7.27 – The Need for Ecological Appraisals	
<p>Support</p> <p>403/PM/2 Environment Agency</p>	<p>Noted</p>

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM8.8 - Table 8.2	
<p>815/1 Gloucestershire County Council comments that it would be clearer if the second column were changed to read 'Dwellings constructed 31/3/96 – 31/3/2005 and sites with planning permission at 31/3/05.</p>	<p>It is accepted that the heading to the column could be clearer and it would be a minor change that would not need to be advertised as a further proposed modification.</p> <p>Recommendation: Page 127 of the second deposit plan incorporating the proposed modifications, table 8.2 column 2: amend to read “Dwellings built since 01.04.96 and dwellings permitted at 01.04.05”.</p>
PM8.14, PM8.15 & PM8.16 – Policy H3 iv) – Housing on Land South of the A420 (both sides of Tilbury Lane)	
<p>Support</p> <p>291/PM/2-6 University of Oxford</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>943/PM/2-5 Mr Allsworth, 961/PM/1 Mr Amor, 924/PM/1 Mr Asker, 925/PM/1 Mr Aspel, 981/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Barrett, 983/PM/1 E Beaves, 964/PM/1 Miss J Bolder & Mr Coates, 999/PM/1 Mr Bowell, 920/PM/1 Mrs Bragg, 922/PM/1 Mr Bragg, 956/PM/1 Mr Bunt, 919/PM/1 Mrs Byford, 912/PM/2-5 N J Campo, 913/PM/2-5 V Campo, 914/PM/1-4 Z Campo, 968/PM/1 A Carter, 935/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Cartwright, 985/PM/1 Mr Carver, 917/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Crampton, 285/PM/1 Cumnor Parish Council, 966/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Durham, 406/PM/2-5 Mrs Dyson, 962/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Edwards, 901/PM/2-5 M Elliott, 955/PM/1 M Erskine, 938/PM/1 M R Evans, 900/PM/1 Dr P Fisher, 930/PM/1 A Ford, 947/PM/2-5 T Foster, 948/PM/1 Mrs Gardner, 931/PM/1 G Goble, 987/PM/1 Cllr J Godden, 958/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Gordon, 942/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Griffiths, 995/PM/2-5 Mr & Mrs Hall, 954/PM/2-5 Mr Harper-Smith, 934/PM/1 M Harris, 989/PM/2-5 Mrs Hayle, 1000/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Hayward, 997/PM/1 Hazel Road Kids, 973/PM/1 A Herbert, 908/PM/1 M Holroyd, 929/PM/1 S Harper, 936/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Jackson, 909/PM/1 Mr Jones, 959/PM/1 T Lee & D Rescarle, 960/PM/1 L M & V E Lee, 967/PM/1 H Millar & J McGrath, 957/PM/1 P Milton, 972/PM/1 M G & J A Maloney, 963/PM/1 Mr & Mrs P Maloney, 932/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Moore, 926/PM/1 Mr J Murphy, 928/PM/1 I & H Naqib, 949/PM/2-5 M Nash, 939/PM/1 Dr M Neil, 992/PM/1 K Neller, 945/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Newport, 965/PM/1 M Nicks, 107/PM/1-3 North Hinksey Parish Council, 998/PM/1 Mrs O'Dell, 940/PM/1 Mr & Mrs O'Donoghue, 982/PM/1 G Ogle, 907/PM/2-5 A O'Leary, 915/PM/1 K O'Rourke, 911/PM/1 Oxford Association of Hotels & Guest Houses, 933/PM/1 C Pearson, 952/PM/1-4 S & R Pickles, 988/PM/1-5 J Porter, 977/PM/1 A Poynter, 980/PM/1 A & P Pritchard, 916/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Puffett, 937/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Purbrick, 976/PM/1 E Rankin, 903/PM/1-3 Dr A Reeve, 991/PM/1 Mrs R Reid, 986/PM/1 Mrs Rivers, 984/PM/1 B Roberts, 923/PM/1 M G & J M Roberts, 970/PM/1 C Ross, 944/PM/1-3, C & S R Ryde, 941/PM/1</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Many of the objections cover matters that the Inspector considered in detail at the local plan inquiry and reported in his report, e.g. the sustainability of the site, the landscape and visual contexts of the site and whether the site should continue to be safeguarded (paras 8.7.11-8.7.18). Evidence submitted by the Council to the inquiry confirmed that major service providers had no objections to the principle of development on the H3 Botley sites. These major service providers have been reconsulted following the Inspector's recommendation to allocate the Botley sites. None objects to the principle of development subject to further comment on the details of the housing schemes. Many of the objections relate to detailed concerns that will be examined in more detail at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The objections have been listed in the left hand column. In order to structure the Council's response, a number of issue headings have been set down below.</p>

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>V Sadler, 921/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Seggin, 918/PM/1 G Sheppard, 946/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Smith, 978/PM/1 D Stevens, 927/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Sutherland, 902/PM/2-5 Dr P Sutton, 979/PM/1 M Swain, 993/PM/1 C Tasker, 975/PM/1-3 P & L Terry, 910/PM/1 Tilbury Lane Neighbourhood Watch, 950/PM/2-5 Mr & Mrs Trafford, 904/PM/2-5 S Waite & K Alderson, 990/PM/1 J & M Walker, 905/PM/1-3 Mr & Mrs Webb, 951/PM/1 JD Webb, 996/PM/1 K & T Weston, 969/PM/1 Mr & Mrs Woodley, 971/PM/1 C Wortham, 994/PM/1 J Wright, 974/PM/1 Mrs B E Young made the following objections:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land should remain safeguarded; • It is not a sustainable location for housing; • Development will increase congestion on Botley Road/A34/A420; • Modification is a bad compromise destroying safeguarded land because land in Grove can't be developed as quickly; • No evidence that alternative sites will not be developed in time; • Land not needed as other areas of Cumnor/Botley are already to be developed (Timbmet); • There has been no proper risk assessment; • Agricultural land will be lost; • Biodiversity and local wildlife will be harmed; • It will lead to flooding; • Sewage system is not adequate; • Schools/nurseries do not have enough places; • Health provision is already inadequate; • Car parking in the area is already at capacity; • Development will increase local traffic/parking problems and decrease road safety/lead to more accidents; • Current residents' quality of life will be reduced; • New development will reduce the value of existing houses; • High density housing will be out of character with the area; • Development will affect Human Rights via loss of views; • Antisocial behaviour and crime will increase; • Mixing private and local authority housing will cause problems; • New houses will be affected by overhead power lines; • Effect on OAP housing in Seacourt Road; • Unsuitable cycle/pedestrian access arrangements; • Hazel Road is unsuitable for access; • No sports facilities for children; • Loss of greenfield land; • Health and safety risks; • Loss of Green Belt; • Land should be a nature reserve; • Effect on water table; • Loss of allotments; • Increase in noise, particularly during construction, will disturb residents; • Public transport is not adequate; • Using Hazel Road, Seacourt Road, Poplar Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarded Land: This land has never been part of the Green Belt. Its location between the built-up area and the edge of the Green Belt meant that it was safeguarded for future development to be released for development through the development plan process at the appropriate time. The Inspector has taken the view that this site should now be released for development (para 8.7.17). • Sustainability: In his report the Inspector accepts that this is a sustainable site (para 8.7.11) and accordingly, it can be allocated. • Land Supply: One of the reasons the Inspector allocated the site was because he concluded that more land needed to be identified to meet the strategic housing requirement. In coming to this conclusion the Inspector sets out, principally in paras 8.2.6, 8.2.7 and 8.2.8, his reasoning with regard to the development of these sites and other sites such as Grove. Further comment with regard to this matter is set out in the Council's response to PM3.8 on policy GS5. • Highways: The County Surveyor accepts that there is no objection to the principle of 150 dwellings on the site subject to a transport assessment and technical and safety audits. These assessments and audits would, in total, cover technical issues with respect to the design of the junction and access issues in the wider area. When a more detailed housing scheme has been prepared it will be possible to more critically assess how the site's footpaths and cycle paths should link to the surrounding area. It is not currently proposed that there would be any vehicular access to the site from Hazel Road, Seacourt Road, Poplar Road or Elms Road. Vehicular access will be along Fogwell Road. During the construction phase there will be some disturbance and the Council will use its planning and other powers to ensure that this is kept to a minimum and that no construction work takes place outside agreed times. • Local Infrastructure: In commenting on the site's sustainability, the Inspector noted its proximity to a range of services and facilities (para 8.7.12). As referred to above, none of the major service providers has an 'in principle' objection to the development. One of the purposes of the planning system is to enable those responsible for the provision of infrastructure and facilities to plan on the basis of a clear picture of development in the community. Where new infrastructure is required, local plan policy DC8 seeks to ensure the coordination of its provision with the needs arising from the development. • Pylons: National Grid, which is responsible for these overhead power lines, has commented that the balance of scientific evidence is against the electric and magnetic fields from the power lines resulting in adverse health impact although it recognises that there are concerns about this issue. The Council's Environmental Health Officers do not disagree with this view. The proposed

Response to the Proposed Modifications to the Draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>or Elms Road will cause problems;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alley off Hazel Road is not suitable for pedestrian or cycle access; • Development will lead to short cutting along existing roads; • Taxis will drop off fares at alley late at night; • Hazel Road will be used as a car park; • Hazel Road will not be safe for children to play in; • Flooding of roads will increase; • Development should be kept to the Fogwell Road site of Tilbury Lane; • Vandal proof fencing will be needed between the development and existing housing; • Notification of this proposed development to local residents was unsatisfactory. 	<p>housing is the same distance from these power lines as the Fogwell Road housing estate to the west.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foul and Surface Water Drainage and Water Supply: These matters are all the responsibility of Thames Water. As referred to above, Thames Water has no "in principle" objection although together with the Environment Agency it will investigate these matters in more detail at the planning application stage. The identification of these sites in the local plan will enable Thames Water to plan on the basis of a clear picture of development in the community. • Parking: The County Council, as the Highway Authority has published parking standards which the Council will apply to the new development. Indiscriminate parking is always a possibility in the neighbourhood but it would be unreasonable to require the new site's parking to be in excess of the County Council's standards. • Density: A development of 150 dwellings on this site is approximately 40 dwellings to the hectare. This is consistent with the advice in Government guidance (PPG3) and with policy H14. • Character of Area: In his report the Inspector took into account many factors, including the existing character of the site and the surrounding area and the agricultural quality of the land (para 8.7.13-15) and his recommendation to allocate the site was a balanced view of all these factors. The Inspector concluded that the land on both sides of Tilbury Lane was required to help meet the strategic housing requirement. The Government believes it is important to create inclusive communities. It does not accept that different types of housing and tenures make bad neighbours. The Local Plan's policies need to provide dwellings that will meet the needs of existing and future residents. Other local plan policies seek a high standard of design which will have regard to the existing character of the area and neighbouring amenities and the provision of landscaping and open space for outdoor play and informal recreation. • Crime: As referred to above, the development will be designed to a high standard, and the Council has a policy which seeks to reduce crime through careful design (DC3). • Wildlife: The land is not identified as having any special nature conservation value and consultation with the County Ecologist has not revealed anything that would prelude development. Policy NE1 can require an ecological appraisal to be carried out if necessary. • Water Table: The Environment Agency notes that the site lies above a minor aquifer, but has no "in principle" objection to the development. A flood risk assessment will be required with any planning permission. • House Values: The end result of the local plan includes provision for additional development in the most sustainable way. How new development may or may not affect property values is not a material consideration in the allocation of land for housing. • Scheme Design: The Inspector's recommendation to allocate this site establishes the principle of housing. The details of the development will be the subject of public comment when the planning application is submitted to the Council.

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Objection to H3 iv) allocation boundary</p> <p>291/PM/1 University of Oxford objects that the north-eastern boundary of the allocated land is not consistent with the northern most extent of the existing housing in Hazel Road to the east of the site, as recommended in the Inspector's report (para 8.7.18).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Rights: As referred to above, the Inspector's recommendation to allocate the site was a balanced view having taken into account all the factors involved. The landscape surrounding the settlement was one of the factors considered. The Local Plan has been prepared accordingly to the legal context. • Notification: In the earlier stages of the Local Plan's preparation, no housing development was proposed on this site. It is only as a result of the Inspector's recommendations that the site is now allocated. The feelings of the local residents that such a significant change should not take place at such a late stage in the plan making process are recognised. However, the publication of the proposed modifications was an opportunity to inform the public of this change to the Local Plan in accordance with the appropriate legal procedures. <p>Recommendation: No change.</p> <p>In allocating this land the Inspector did refer to consistency with the northern most extent of the existing housing. However, the Inspector also explained that this land should be released (from its safeguarded status) to meet housing needs (Report para 8.217). The north-eastern boundary of the allocated land is exactly the same as the former boundary of the safeguarded land and the boundary of the Green Belt. To change the allocation as the objector suggests would encroach on land currently designated as Green Belt. As the Inspector did not recommend that land should be released from the Green Belt, it is considered that the Inspector's recommendations have been properly interpreted.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change</p>
PM8.14, PM8.15 & PM8.16 – Policy H3 v) – Land south of Lime Road	
<p>Support</p> <p>137/PM/2-5 Bovis Homes</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>943/PM/1 G Allsworth, 956/1 D Bunt, 912/2-5 N J Campo, 913/2-5 V Campo, 914/2-5 Z Campo, 406/2-5 Mrs S Dyson, 901/2-5 M Elliott, 955/1 M Erskine, 900/1 Dr P Fisher, 947/2-5 T Foster, 987/1 Cllr J Godden, 985/2-5 Mr & Mrs Hall, 954/2-5 P Harper-Smith, 989/2-5 Mrs M Hayle, 949/2-5 M Nash, 939/1 & 2 Dr M Neil, 992/2-5 K Neller, 107/1-3 North Hinksey Parish Council, 907/2-5 A O'Leary, 988/1 J Porter, 977/1 A & M Poynter, 903/1-3 Dr A Reeve, 944/1 C & S Ryde, 941/1 V Sader, 902/2-5 Dr P Sutton, 950/1 C & L Trafford, 904/2-5 S Waite & K Alderson, 905/1-3 Mr & Mrs Webb, 970/1 & 2 C Wortham</p> <p>Objections</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>These objectors made representations to the proposed modifications which referred to both the Lime Road and Tilbury Lane sites. Technically, therefore, they made objections to the Lime Road site. However, having looked at these objections in detail, it is clear that none of these objections is to the allocation at Lime Road. Their objections to the Tilbury Lane site are considered in the section above.</p> <p>Recommendation: To note that these objections have been addressed in the section dealing with H3 iv) above.</p>

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>987/PM/1 Cllr J Godden, 939/PM/1-2 Dr M Neil, 107/PM/1-3 North Hinksey Parish Council object to the allocation at Lime Road for the reasons which are summarised below;</p> <p>Highways: The site is at the inner end of a suburban residential estate & development could have an adverse effect on the existing pleasant residential roads which are inadequate to support such a large number of additional houses.</p> <p>Local Facilities / Infrastructure: Botley is not a sustainable area for development in terms of local facilities, which are already stretched and an increase in housing would over- burden them.</p> <p>Foul Drainage: The existing foul drainage infrastructure is already under pressure in the Botley area. The system will be further stretched with the additional dwellings.</p> <p>Surface Water: The drainage infrastructure is already under pressure in the Botley area. The system will be further stretched with the additional dwellings especially after heavy rain.</p> <p>Bridle Path: Concern that the proposed development would cause the loss of the bridle path which links to Lime Road.</p> <p>Parking: There are already parking problems on the roads near the proposed development. It will be important that the proposed development includes adequate off-street parking.</p> <p>Density: The proposed density of the development (total 130 dwellings) is considered to be excessive.</p> <p>Landscape: The Inspector noted that the hedgerows and woodlands provided visual containment which screened the site to the west. However, some of these trees have</p>	<p>Highways: Oxfordshire County Council's 'Residential Road Design Guide' notes that a major access road (a type 3 road) is one of the principal access roads into a neighbourhood. A minor access road (type 4) may take access from a type 3 road and, as a loop, may serve up to 200 dwellings. The guide also prescribes the design of the junction of the two roads (by reference to the 'X' & 'Y' distances). The objector's evidence to the local plan inquiry included a drawing which showed the proposed access arrangements to the site. Lime Road is a major access road (type 3) and the minor access road into the site is a type 4 road. The objector's access arrangements comply with the guidance given in the County Council's guide.</p> <p>Local Facilities/Infrastructure: In commenting on the site's sustainability, the Inspector noted its proximity to a range of services and facilities (para 8.7.4). The Council is not the providing agency for these services but, by identifying the site in the local plan, the various agencies will be able to plan on the basis of a clear picture of development in the community. There have been no objections in principle from the service providers to housing development on this site.</p> <p>Foul and Surface Water Drainage: Thames Water has a legal duty to receive and treat the foul drainage in its area and to provide surface water drainage. The identification of the site in the local plan will enable Thames Water to plan on the basis of a clear picture of development in the community. There has been no objection from Thames Water to the principle of 130 dwellings on this site.</p> <p>Bridle Path: A public bridleway runs along the north western boundary of the site. This bridle way lies outside the site and will not be lost when the site is developed.</p> <p>Parking: The County Council, as the Highway Authority has published parking standards which the Council will apply to new development.</p> <p>Density: Government guidance (PPG3) on residential densities encourages development at between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare. The objector's evidence to the local plan inquiry explains that the site has an area of some 3.8 ha and that, in line with the government advice, it would yield between 160 -200 dwellings. However, given the site's irregular shape and the need to provide a landscaped context, the objectors proposed a site capacity of 130 dwellings. This is the figure that the Inspector has chosen. It represents a density of just over 34 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>Landscape: The Council's Arboricultural Officer visited the site in mid 2003 and again following the reports that some of the trees were being felled. In 2003 he reported that none of the trees was worthy of a Tree Preservation Orders and recommended to the planners that the outer fringe of growth around the site should be</p>

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>been cut down. The proposed development should be conditioned to ensure that the associated trees are preserved.</p> <p>Consultation: Objection on the basis that the proposal for the development has been made without proper consultation.</p>	<p>left. At a recent visit, he observed that a lot of activity had been going on but that no trees had been felled that he would have objected to and the outer row of trees had been retained. When the detailed proposals for the site's development are submitted, the Council will require a landscaping scheme to be submitted as part of the application.</p> <p>Consultation: The proposed modification allocating the site has been made following the Inspector's recommendation. The publication of the proposed modifications has been carried out in accordance with the appropriate legislation. The Council is satisfied that it followed the legally required procedures.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>

PM8.17 – 8.19 - Policy H4 – Housing Sites in Faringdon

<p>The Former Nursery</p> <p>882/1 Bernadette Disborough objects to development as the existing Folly Park with its beautiful wild flowers, birds, badgers and muntjacs will become a walk through area with litter and noise. It will lose its beauty, tranquillity and wildlife. The new residents will not work in Faringdon, there is poor public transport, the doctors surgery is full and water pressure is poor. More business units are not needed as half the existing ones are empty and people don't want to lose the existing cricket ground. The Council should tidy up the entrance to Faringdon which is unwelcoming.</p> <p>Land at Winslow and Coxwell House</p> <p>339/1 Mr & Mrs Knapp support the allocation of land at Winslow and Coxwell House as a residential site and its inclusion within the development boundary of the town. It will provide a sustainable urban extension to the town.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered that the major extension to Folly Park would significantly improve the availability of public open space and protect the environmental and ecological interest of the area for future generations. He also considered that the part of the site identified for employment development was suitable for that use and that additional land would help arrest the town's relative economic decline and retain its role as a service centre. He also considered the relocation of the cricket ground should result in a material enhancement of local sporting facilities. Although people walk on the land allocated for housing and leisure use there is no public right of access except the permissive path from Nursery View to the existing Folly Park.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--

PM8.20-8.32 – Policy H5 – Housing West of Grove

<p>PM 8.20 Para 8.23</p> <p>Support</p> <p>397/PM/4 Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) and 291/PM/1 University of Oxford support PM 8.20</p> <p>PM8.23 Para 8.29</p> <p>Support</p> <p>334/PM/1 Crown Technology and 406/PM/1 Grove 2000 plc support PM 8.23</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>1001/PM/1 Grove RFC consider the proposed modification is in contradiction with policies DC8; DC9; NE10; H9; CF1; L1; L3; L13 and to the intentions behind other relevant</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The local plan Inspector considered that the first phase of new housing at least ought to be served principally from the south to Mably Way. He concluded that the realignment of Denchworth</p>
--	---

Response to the Proposed Modifications to the Draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>paragraphs of the plan.</p> <p><u>PM8.24 Para 8.29a</u></p> <p>Support</p> <p>397/PM/6 Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) support PM 8.24</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>276/PM/1 Grove Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ask that attractiveness is defined in the first sentence. • what improvements are envisaged to the Mably Way /A338 junction/roundabout because they have concerns on the traffic management and the ability to improve access to this junction. 	<p>Road south or a suitable alternative road, as suggested in the Council's pre-inquiry change to para 8.29, to facilitate a safe and satisfactory main vehicular access into the site from Mably Way would be an essential component of the first phase of development, rather than any increased use of Newlands Drive or Cane Lane. The Inspector did not recommend the specific line that has been proposed by the developers and other options can be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This is clarified in paragraph 3.3 of the SPG for the site which makes it clear that the attractiveness of the link from Grove to Mably Way to vehicular traffic will help to reduce the tendency for traffic to access the site through Grove village.</p> <p>The precise improvements to be carried out are too detailed for the local plan. They will be considered in the Traffic Impact Assessment and form part of the planning application for the site. The Inspector fully endorsed the need to increase the attractiveness of the southern link to the A338 via Mably Way but did not consider it necessary to specify the exact nature of such improvements. There is no reason to disagree with the Inspector's recommendation.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change</p>
<p><u>PM8.25 Para 8.33</u></p> <p>Support</p> <p>397/PM/1 Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) supports the deletion of the requirement for the payment of commuted sums for 25 years.</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>397/PM/2 Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) objects to the requirement that "in the case of outdoor playing space this may be required in perpetuity".</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>See response to Rep No 1004/PM/1 under the General Policies for Development Section of this schedule.</p>
<p><u>PM8.26 Para 8.33</u></p> <p>Support</p> <p>397/PM/5 Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) support PM 8.26</p> <p><u>PM8.29 – Policy H5 – Strategic Housing Site West of Grove</u></p>	<p>Noted</p>

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Objection</p> <p>397/PM/3 Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) object as they do not consider that policy H5 needs to refer to the commencement date for the road but just the deadline by which it must be completed. They consider there are no benefits in specifying an early start date if completion is not required until 1,500 dwellings are built. Practically, this means the road would be built in its entirety and building it in phases will only add to disruption during construction. For practical purposes the road is likely to be built in one phase, which will be determined by the planning and construction programme, and is more properly dealt with in the Environmental Statement. This might determine that the road should be built early for other reasons but the only policy requirement should be when the road is completed. The policy should be amended to read “xiv) A new road from the site to the A338 North of Grove to be completed before any more than 1,500 dwellings in total have been built on the site.”</p>	<p>The Local Plan Inspector felt that in the interests of clarity and certainty for all concerned for the policy and text to also refer to a specific number of new units being built before the new road link from the site to the A338 is completed. He was essentially content that reversion to the revise deposit version of part xiv a) should ensure that the provision of the new road to the north of Grove would come at a time before the development of the new housing to the west creates significant highway safety or congestion issues within the existing built up area of the settlement or at the A338 junction to the east. He considered for a number of reasons that no more than 1,500 dwellings should be built before the new road is completed. This he concluded would place start of construction squarely within the (amended) second phase of development from 2011 to 2016. The start date ‘early in the second phase’ is not specific and flexible. Given the land ownership issues, and particularly the Common Land it is important that these issues are addressed as early as possible. There is therefore no reason to disagree with the Inspector’s recommendation which gives clarity to the plan by giving some flexibility to the start date but clearly setting out the timing for the completion of the road.</p>
<p>684/PM/2 Maurice & Portia Hyde reiterate their opposition to the new road from Mably Way to the A417 east of Wantage.</p>	<p>Recommendation: No change See response to Rep No 684/PM/1 under the Transport Section of this Schedule.</p>
<p><u>PM8.32</u></p>	
<p>Objection</p> <p>317/PM/7 Persimmon Strategic Land (Western) object because they do not consider it reasonable to seek contributions towards an unquantified, unplanned and uncosted road until there is a defined timed, published route and programme in place.</p>	<p>The Inspector was satisfied that the reference in para 5.23 to the hoped for relief road for Wantage is appropriate as a long term objective, providing that it remains a general reference to a scheme, rather than to any specific route or proposal. It was his view that it is reasonable in the circumstances to have a policy seeking contributions towards such provision as a result, even if construction does not commence within the plan period, so that all new development in the locality may be assessed for pro-rata contributions, in accordance with the levels of additional traffic to be generated. The Council has no reason to disagree with the Inspector’s recommendation.</p>
<p>1007/PM/1 Mr Wooster in commenting on the proposed modifications raises the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan does not include a whole site sustainability plan for the UKAEA Harwell site, and considers it important because the County Council has allocated another 1,400 dwellings to Grove. The area for future industrial expansion at UKAEA Harwell does not need the large area north, about 47 hectares. Will the Council explain the use of the other brownfield sites too. 	<p>Recommendation: No change</p> <p>The Inspector gave consideration to the proposition put forward by Mr Wooster and other objectors that new housing should be located at empty employment sites outside settlements, such as the Harwell Campus rather than on the edge of Grove. He concluded ‘Overall I have no doubt that such a dispersed distribution of new housing would lead to a less sustainable pattern of development’ (para 3.1.10. of his report). The Council understand that UKAEA is intending to have an approach where the views of all the landowners of the site can be taken into account in producing a whole site approach for the future of the site. There is however, no reason for this local plan to contain a sustainability appraisal of that site.</p> <p>The County Council has not allocated another 1400 dwellings to Grove. The draft South East Plan proposes 3,400 dwellings at</p>

Response to the Proposed Modifications to the Draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planning windfall at St Mary's School will provide another massive development area within Wantage. <p>Mr Wooster shares the concerns of the 286 members of the public listed by BDOR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Flooding concerns 2 Respect for the canal 3 Connections between main roads and the development site 4 General increase in numbers and congestion 5 Access from the South East 6 Need to improve transport infrastructure 7 There being no economic linkage to where people might work 8 Concerns about supporting funding 9 Shared sports facilities 10 People having too many bad experiences left from the past when you have been involved with developers promising and then not delivering on the other two large housing estates built at Grove 11 There is a serious issue of lack of public trust in what is taking place <p>Concern that the SPG for Grove reads that the land slopes to the south, while the reverse is true.</p> <p>The Minister of State does not support opening more main line stations nor is any rail operator interested in this proposition.</p> <p>The planning officers have never visited Steventon to monitor the existing impact current rail operators have on this village and the likely impact additional traffic could have on the operation of two level crossing gates.</p> <p>Contributions towards off site strategic road building cannot be justified and within S106 contracts.</p> <p>Questions the lack of connection the major development at Grove will have to appropriate employment prospects, whilst water customers cannot be expected to pay for a road to connect Grove to the A34, there is no certainty of a reservoir its drainage or location. This project (at Grove)</p>	<p>Grove and Wantage over the next 20 years which is 900 more than the allocation on the airfield.</p> <p>The Inspector also had before him the concerns of Mr Wooster and his views on the potential of St Mary's School and UKAEA Harwell, as well as many alternative sites put forward by other objectors but he endorsed the allocation at Grove.</p> <p>Except for items 10 and 11 all these matters were considered in depth by the Inspector at the Local plan Inquiry.</p> <p>Only part of the site slopes to the south and the officers will be recommending changes to the draft SPG to reflect this.</p> <p>The Inspector recognised that the station was not a pre-requisite of the H5 allocation scheme proceeding, as Grove is a sustainable location in its own right. The Inspector was fully aware of the uncertainty surrounding the re-opening of the station but recognised that the allocation of the land for the station does not require or assume that it will be completed within the plan period to 2011. Similar conclusions were reached by the Panel at the EiP into the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016.</p> <p>No technical reasons have been raised either by Network Rail or the County Council as Highway Authority to the allocation of land for the station and any potential impacts that it may have on these level crossings. It is unlikely that the opening of Grove Station would result in an increase in the number of trains because the line is already operating at capacity.</p> <p>The Inspector confirmed the transport improvement required in policy H5. Notably the Inspector confirmed that it was reasonable in the circumstances to have a policy requiring a link road to the A338 north of Grove and seeking contributions towards a relief road scheme for Wantage. The Inspector in his report at para 8.11.7 stated "In conclusion I accept the Council's judgement that the proposed urban extension to the west of Grove is in a sustainable location in PPG3 terms. I also agree with the EIP Panel that major housing development here would help serve the needs of the expanding employment base in southern Oxfordshire, eg at H/C, MP and Didcot."</p>

Response to the Proposed Modifications to the Draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>questions both the validity of sustainability credentials along with the survey methodology used to select this site for development in the first instance, rather than the abundant brownfield land available.</p> <p>The amount of flood water from a large Grove development is of no use to a canal, the land drains in the opposite direction towards the railway and Hanney village.</p>	<p>The Inspector having had considerable evidence put before him at the Inquiry about flooding, relating to both on site and off site drainage concerns considered at para 8.12.4 of his report, 'that there need therefore be no objection in principle to the development of the site for new housing.'</p> <p>The Council has previously agreed with the Inspector's recommendations as they relate to Mr Wooster's comments and as all the matters raised by the objector now have been put to the Inspector there is no reason to amend the plan at this stage.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change</p>
Policies H5 and H5 – Proposed Housing at Didcot and Grove	
<p>299/1 GOSE comments that for these two large sites to be developed successfully the plans of other organisations will have to be aligned. This includes the Local Transport Plan recently submitted to the Department of Transport and GOSE which should be explicit about what it will do to enable the proposals to be fully implemented. All parties should work together in a pro-active and co-ordinated way.</p>	<p>Noted. The Integrated transport strategies should help ensure that all parties work together in a co-ordinated way.</p>
PM8.44 - Policy H8A – Housing on the Harwell/Chilton Campus	
<p>837/1 Ken Messer and 1006/1 Dilys Messer object to housing at Chilton Field as it is mainly greenfield, encroaches on the AONB and will be very visible from the Ridgeway. It is not advisable to bring so many houses close to a nuclear establishment, the Rutherford Appleton Laboratory and the Diamond Synchrotron. Would like to see a risk assessment or health and safety report.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered that providing the eastern part of the site is retained as open space the development would be no more harmful to the landscape of the AONB than the original scheme and from the Ridgeway would be seen against the back drop of the extensive buildings on the Harwell Campus. Accordingly he endorsed the revised siting of the scheme proposed in the second deposit plan. An Environmental Impact Assessment for landscape impact is being carried out as part of the current planning application. Moving the allocation further south from that in the adopted and first deposit plans puts a greater distance between the housing and the Rutherford/Appleton Laboratories and the licenced nuclear site. The Health and Safety Executive has not objected to the application for 275 dwellings on the site.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change</p>
PM8.45 - Policy H8B – The Former Dow Agro Sciences Site in Letcombe Regis	
<p>166/1 Letcombe Manor Estate supports the allocation of the former Dow site for up to 100 dwellings in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation. It meets the minimum density requirement of 30 dwellings a hectare and is on previously developed land which could be re-used for employment purposes. The Inspector concluded that it would not harm the character or appearance of the settlement, the conservation area, listed buildings, AONB, the amenities of neighbours or the interests of highway safety.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>284/1 Letcombe Regis Parish Council objects to policy H8B and its related text which should be removed from the Local Plan. It considers that the proposed modification for 100 dwellings has been based solely on the Inspector's recommendation and the Council has failed to take account of more detailed technical information.</p> <p>Traffic – When considering the application for 99 dwellings the County Council objected because the site could generate between 787 and 1049 trips a day. This is significantly more than the previous use which generated about 635 trips a day.</p> <p>Fallback position – The fear of the Inspector that the site would fall into decay is unlikely to materialise given the investment made to purchase it. If permission for 99 dwellings was refused there would be another application for a lower number or a residential care village.</p> <p>The site has been vacant for a number of years and a legal position could be taken that the employment use has been abandoned. The buildings do not lend themselves easily to an alternative or more intensive business use. In any application to redevelop the site for business use matters such as operational practices, job numbers and traffic generation could be controlled so as not to cause undue harm. The Inspector's concern that the site could be used for a more intensive employment use is unlikely to materialise.</p> <p>Landscape – The Inspector noted that the site was not prominent within the AONB because of the 'berm' along the southern boundary. However, the applicants propose to remove the 'berm'. The AONB officer objected to the application for 99 dwellings and its likely impact on the AONB was one of the reasons for refusal.</p> <p>The Call In – The Inspector noted that the application for 44 dwellings was called in mainly because of the low density proposed. This is not strictly the case as the call in letter refers to a number of issues.</p> <p>Perceived benefits – The Inspector notes that a large scheme would be more likely to support local facilities, but that additional residents might not prevent further losses, let alone reverse recent trends. The Parish Council considers the retention of open spaces would exist whether</p>	<p>The Council carefully considered the Inspector's recommendation and the concerns of the Parish Council before taking its decision. Most of the points made by the Parish Council were fully debated by members in March when decisions were taken on whether to accept the Inspector's recommendation.</p> <p>During the local plan inquiry the County Council as highway authority was sent the objector's traffic assessment relating to some 100 dwellings on the former Dow site. The County Council accepted the evidence was sound and although there were concerns about the level of growth proposed in a small village with very few services and facilities no objections were made by the County on transport grounds. In response to the subsequent application for 99 dwellings an objection was lodged on transport grounds. When the County Council was asked to clarify its position it considered that a B1 use could generate some 1547 trips a day - significantly more than 100 dwellings, and that even if the business traffic was halved the difference between it and the trips that could be generated from 100 houses would not be of such significance that a refusal could be confidently sustained. The Highway Authority advised they would not object to the allocation of up to 100 dwellings in a letter dated 10 March 2006.</p> <p>The Council did not base its decision on whether to accept the Inspector's recommendation of up to 100 dwellings on a belief that the site would otherwise fall into decay. An application for a residential care village has now been made, however the proposed allocation of the site for housing development should be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>The site has been vacant for about four years, but its use has not been abandoned. Further advice will be given on this at the meeting. In view of the existing buildings on the site and their previous use the Council considered that it would not be possible to refuse an application for a well designed office scheme of about 8,000 square metres. On a floorspace for floorspace replacement basis a requirement to restrict job numbers and traffic generation on the site could not be justified. It may also be possible to refurbish and adapt the existing buildings for employment use without the need for planning permission.</p> <p>The retention or removal of the berm is a detailed matter that could be resolved at the planning application stage. Its retention as part of a landscaping scheme could be required and would not preclude the development of 100 houses on the site.</p> <p>It is accepted that the call in related to a number of matters. However, in relation to the density issue, after careful consideration, the Inspector concluded the site would be suitable and appropriate for a well designed housing scheme at the PPG3 minimum density of 30 dwellings a hectare.</p> <p>The Inspector and the Council did not base their decisions solely on the perceived benefits referred to by the Parish Council. The Inspector also took into consideration the benefits of: resolving the future of a vacant site and the removal of a number of unsightly structures through a redevelopment that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area, the AONB and the</p>

Response to the Proposed Modifications to the Draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>this development went ahead or not and the provision of additional affordable housing should not over-ride the principle of developing at a smaller scale.</p> <p>Historic Buildings – The Inspector considered the Manor House and stables were not worthy of retention, but he did not have available to him documents from Dow suggesting that these buildings make a positive contribution to the conservation area and should be retained.</p> <p>The Appeal – Allocating the site for 99 dwellings would destroy the Council’s chance of successfully arguing against the development, possibly to such an extent that costs would be claimed by the appellants.</p>	<p>character of the village as a whole; making the best use of previously developed land; retaining the Lodge; contributions to improving local bus services and cycling and walking links to Wantage; and identifying a site that could make an early contribution to the dwellings requirement in the district. The Council took into these factors into account when reaching its decision and also the Inspector’s view that achieving the PPG3 minimum density need not be harmful to the character or appearance of the settlement, the conservation area, the AONB, the setting of listed buildings, the amenities of neighbours and the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>The Manor House and stables are not listed buildings. A scheme for 100 dwellings could be developed to incorporate these buildings. It is a detailed matter that does not preclude an allocation for 100 dwellings on the site.</p> <p>If the residential care village is permitted the applicants have stated that this appeal will be withdrawn. If the appeal goes ahead and if the Local Plan is adopted with policy H8B as proposed to be modified, the Council would alter its reasons for refusal, making an award of costs against it unlikely.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
PM8.47 – 8.48 - Policy H10 – Development in the Larger Villages	
<p>342/1 DPDS Consulting supports the increase from 9 to 15 dwellings and the deletion of criterion i) as both will allow best use to be made of previously developed and unused land.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
PM8.50 – 8.51 - Policy H11 – Development in the Smaller Villages	
<p>342/2 DPDS and 3 Consulting supports the increase from 1 or 2 dwellings to 4.</p> <p>342/7 and 8 DPDS Consulting objects to all the dwellings in smaller villages having to be small dwellings, which according to the definition in policy H15 would have one or two bedrooms. This is inflexible, could have design implications where the site is surrounded by larger properties and may not give choice where there are already a good number of such properties. It is inconsistent that four dwellings in an H10 village do not have to be small, but they all do in an H11 village. Both large and small dwellings could support the social and economic well-being of these villages. The policy could lead to land and buildings remaining unused. It is an over complicated interference in the housing market and expecting all dwellings to be of one type is unreasonable. Even without the reference to ‘small’ dwellings there may be circumstances where small dwellings would be provided. Rather than defining ‘small’ in this context it would be preferable to delete the references to small in paragraph 8.58 and policy H11 and the sentence in 8.58 referring to it being consistent with the housing needs survey.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In the context of this policy small need not necessarily mean having one or two bedrooms. The Inspector considered that limiting a site to one or two dwellings would tend to encourage the provision of large detached properties when the site was capable of taking more and this would not meet the need for smaller units. He considered the approach to the size of dwellings in this context should take account of site specific factors including comparability with nearby properties. It is considered that further advice could be given in the lower case text to say that in the context of this policy ‘small dwellings’ will include up to three bedroom properties. This change is a minor clarification which is not necessary to advertise as a further proposed modification.</p> <p>Recommendation: Page 155 of the second deposit plan incorporating the proposed modifications, paragraph 8.58: change the sentence starting “This is consistent with” to read “In the context of this policy schemes may include dwellings which are not overly large of up to three bedrooms where this is consistent with the objective of</p>

CHAPTER 8 - HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
widening housing opportunity and choice”.	
PM8.52 – 8.54 - Policy H12 – Development Elsewhere	
<p>342/4 DPDS Consulting supports allowing 1 or 2 dwellings within the built-up areas of the smallest villages.</p> <p>342/9 and 10 DPDS Consulting objects to the inclusion of the word ‘small’ in the policy and supporting text for the reasons given in relation to their objection to policy H11 above.</p> <p>815/4 Gloucestershire County Council note a spelling mistake in ‘equestrian’.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See response to objection 342/7 and 8 to policy H11 above.</p> <p>Noted. This will be corrected.</p>
PM8.55 – 8.59 - Policy H15 – Widening Housing Opportunity	
<p>342/5 and 6 DPDS Consulting supports the replacement of ‘requirement’ with ‘expectation’ and the deletion of the proposed removal of permitted development rights.</p> <p>342/11 DPDS Consulting objects to setting the threshold for small dwellings with 1 or 2 bedrooms on sites as small as 5 dwellings. The threshold should be increased to 10 dwellings. This would give a sufficient critical mass to be amenable to notions of dwelling mix.</p> <p>137/1 Bovis Homes the requirement for 50% of the dwellings to have two bedrooms or less is contrary to PPG3 which requires mixed and balanced communities and a choice of housing. Each application should be negotiated on a site by site basis at the planning application stage. The policy should be amended to accord with paras 9 and 10 of PPG3. Failing this the words ‘where appropriate’ should be inserted at the start of the criterion for small dwellings.</p> <p>299/2 GOSE comments that the policy and text do not clarify which settlements have a population greater or less than 3,000 people.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In the interests of achieving one and two bedroom dwellings in villages (principally those in policy H10) the Council considered that a five dwelling threshold was appropriate. The objector has not put forward any sound evidence as to why this is not feasible.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p> <p>The policy is proposed to be modified so that the ‘requirement’ for 50% one and two bedroom properties is an ‘expectation’ which gives more flexibility. The policy will help to achieve mixed and balanced communities and is in accordance with the housing needs survey which shows a significant shortage of one and two bedroom dwellings in the coming years. The Inspector specifically supported the inclusion of a policy seeking that around 50% of new dwellings are of two bedrooms or less in principle. The rewording of the policy suggested by the objector does not accord with the Inspector’s recommendation and would not give certainty and clarity.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p> <p>This could be included as a footnote to the policy for information. As it is not a substantive change but a matter of fact it would not need advertising as a further proposed modification.</p> <p>Recommendation: Page 161 of the second deposit local plan as proposed to be modified, policy H15: add a footnote against ‘3,000’ to say ‘Those settlements with more than 3,000 people are Abingdon, Botley, Faringdon, Grove, Wantage and Kennington’.</p>
Policy H16 – Affordable Housing	
<p>299/3 GOSE comments that there is also a need for clarification with this policy regarding those settlements with more or less than 3000 people.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Add a footnote to policy H16 as for policy H15 above.</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM9.6 Para 9.36	
Objection	

CHAPTER 9 – COMMUNITY SERVICES & FACILITIES

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>838/PM/1 Mono Consultants Ltd object to the retention of the first line in para 9.36 as a means of making clear the Council's attitude to telecommunications development on its own land. They point out that the Inspector in his report made it clear that policies relating to the Council's own land should not form part of a development plan. The policies should relate to all new development.</p>	<p>The Inspector in his report recommended the deletion of the whole of para 9.36. The remaining line in para 9.36 however is merely a statement of fact regarding the Council's corporate policy for telecommunication development on its own land and is retained for completeness.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
PM9.7 Para 9.37	
<p>Objection</p> <p>838/PM/2 Mono Consultants Ltd object to the retention of the last line in para 9.37 to make clear how the Council will scrutinise proposals that site telecommunications equipment near children. They point out that the Inspector in his report recommended the deletion of the entire paragraph as PPG8 states that Councils should not impose their own precautionary policies and that para 9.35 adequately addresses the issue of health and sensitive locations.</p>	<p>The Inspector in his report did recommend the deletion of the whole of para 9.37. The remaining line in para 9.37 (now at the start of para 9.38) however usefully explains to Local Plan users that the Council will carefully scrutinise proposals for the installation of telecommunication equipment near children. It is not a precautionary policy but complements the health information set out in para 9.35.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM10.7 – Para 10.71 – Use of Canal to Alleviate Drainage Problems in the Area	
<p>Objection</p> <p>403/PM/3 Environment Agency object to using the canal to alleviate drainage problems because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • drainage problems and increased risk of flooding elsewhere; • difficult maintenance and management of water levels and flood flows; • water levels having a negative effect on wildlife and ecology (wildlife and habitat on the banks and ecologically sensitive areas); • pollution from surface water run-off; • erosion of banks causing bank instability 	<p>The Inspector in his report considered the Environment Agency's objection to the statement that the Wilts and Berks Canal could be investigated to alleviate local drainage problems. He concluded that as the Environment Agency would be a formal consultee in relation to any such proposals it need not therefore be concerned that any potentially negative impact on the land drainage network, including ecology, pollution, erosion or flooding would or could be ignored. He therefore proposed para 10.71 of the local plan should remain.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
PM10.8 – Paragraph 10.72a	
<p>403/PM/4 Environment Agency support this proposed modification.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
PM10.9 & PM10.10 – Development Close to the Canal will be expected to contribute to its restoration	
<p>403/PM/4, 403/PM/5 Environment Agency object to these proposed modifications for the same reasons as to 10/7 above.</p>	<p>See response to PM 10.7 above.</p>

CHAPTER 11 – THE ECONOMY OF THE VALE

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM 11.6 – Policy E4 Grove Technology Park	
<p>Support</p> <p>406/PM2 Grove 2000 plc supports the deletion of the restriction on single users occupying more than 2.4ha of Grove Technology Park from para 11.41 and Policy E4.</p>	Noted
PM 11.7 – Para 11.59 Harwell/Chilton Campus	
<p>Support</p> <p>398/PM2 UKAEA, CLRC, NRPB & MRC support the deletion of paragraph 11.59.</p>	Noted
PM 11.9 – Policy E7 Harwell/Chilton Campus	
<p>Support</p> <p>398/PM3 UKAEA, CLRC, NRPB & MRC support the deletion of criteria i) from policy E7.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>406/PM1 Grove 2000 plc objects to the deletion of criteria i) from policy E7 on the basis that the removal of the 240,000m² floorspace limit would be unsafe and unsatisfactory given that the council has yet to conduct an Employment Land Review and there is no evidence base for making decisions about either the scale or location of employment sites.</p> <p>321/PM1 MEPC Ltd objects to the deletion of criteria i) from policy E7 on the basis that the removal of the 240,000m² floorspace limit would be unsafe and unsatisfactory given that the council has yet to conduct an Employment Land Review and there is no evidence base for making decisions about either the scale or location of employment sites.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Inspector was fully aware of the need to conduct an Employment Land Review but considered that he had sufficient evidence before him in relation to employment to make recommendations about the scale or location of employment sites. The modification is in accord with his recommendation and the council has no reason to disagree with the Inspector's recommendation. Recommendation: No change</p> <p>The Inspector was fully aware of the need to conduct an Employment Land Review but considered that he had sufficient evidence before him in relation to employment to make recommendations about the scale or location of employment sites. The modification is in accord with his recommendation and the council has no reason to disagree with the Inspector's recommendation. Recommendation: No change</p>
PM 11.17 – Policy E12 Main Single User Employment Sites at Grove and Wantage	
<p>Support</p> <p>406/PM3 Grove 2000 plc supports the deletion of policy E12 but considers that there is no case for inclusion of the employment sites in policy E10. Such sites should only be included under policy E10 following an Employment Land Review which the Council has yet to carry out.</p>	<p>The Inspector was fully aware of the need to conduct an Employment Land Review but considered that he had sufficient evidence before him in relation to employment to make recommendations about employment sites. The modification is in accord with his recommendation and the council has no reason to disagree with the Inspector's recommendation. Recommendation: No change</p>

CHAPTER 11 – THE ECONOMY OF THE VALE

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM 11.18 - Policy E14	
<p>Support</p> <p>321/PM3 MEPC Ltd supports the deletion of the phrase “AND NOT TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE WIDER AREA” from criteria i) as otherwise the policy would be unwieldy and impractical.</p> <p>398/PM1 UKAEA, CLRC, NRPB & MRC support the deletion of the final 10 words of criteria i) of policy E14.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
PM 11.20 – Policy E16 Steventon Storage Facility	
<p>Objection</p> <p>321/PM2 MEPC Ltd objects to the deletion of the reference to relocation of the storage facility to another site within policy E16, as it provides the policy basis for moving forward with the idea of relocation. It would be much harder to achieve this with no policy framework. Also the modification countenances the loss of 44,540m² of employment floorspace without the evidence from an Employment Land Review.</p>	<p>The Inspector was fully aware of the need to conduct an Employment Land Review but considered that he had sufficient evidence before him in relation to employment to make recommendations about employment sites. The modification is in accord with his recommendation and the council has no reason to disagree with the Inspector's recommendation.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change</p>
<u>Informal Comments</u>	
PM 11.7 – Policy E7 Harwell/Chilton Campus	
<p>479/PM1 The Highways Agency is concerned about the deletion of the floorspace limit from criteria i) of policy E7. However the Agency considers that these concerns may be better addressed as part of the development of the Local Development Framework. The Agency agrees that there is merit in expanding employment in this area but considers that work is needed to ensure that the campuses transport needs can be serviced in a sustainable manner and that there is a local balance between housing and employment. Phasing of one or both may be required.</p>	<p>The concerns of the Highways Agency are noted. The Agency will be consulted as part of the development of the Local Development Framework in relation to the Harwell/Chilton Campus.</p>

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
PM12.1 - Para 12.8	
<p>Objections</p> <p>1005/PM/1 W M Morrison Supermarkets Plc object that the wording does not correctly reflect the guidance in PPS6.</p>	<p>Agreed. A change to the wording of para 12.9 would update the plan. As it is merely a description of PPS advice it would not be a substantive change and it is not necessary to advertise it as a further proposed modification.</p> <p>Recommendation: Draft Local Plan March 2006, incorporating the Proposed Modifications, page 268, para 12.8 from the second sentence to end of paragraph substitute ‘ PPS6 emphasises the role of existing town centres, clearly stating that the government’s key objective for town centres is to promote the vitality and viability by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning for the growth and development of existing centres; and • promoting and enhancing existing centres, by focusing development in such centres and encouraging a wide range of services in a good environment, accessible to all. <p>There are other Government objectives which need to be taken into account in the context of the key objective above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhancing consumer choice and allow genuine choice to met the needs of the entire community; • supporting efficient, competitive and innovative retail, leisure, tourism and other sectors, with improving productivity; and • improving accessibility, ensuring good access by a choice of means of transport.’
PM12.3 - Para 12.17	
<p>Objections</p> <p>1005/PM/2 W M Morrison Supermarkets Plc object as the paragraph should be updated to reflect the update of the 1996 retail study.</p>	<p>Agreed. A further change to the wording of para would correct and update the plan. As it is merely a factual description of the completion of the study it would not be a substantive change and it is not necessary to advertise it as a further proposed modification.</p> <p>Recommendation : Draft Local Plan incorporating the Proposed Modifications March 2006 page 271, para 2.17: delete the paragraph and replace with ‘In 2004 the Council commissioned Nathaniel Lichfield to carry out a review of their 1996 study. This, together with the recent town centre composition study, underpins the shopping policies in this chapter, as set out below.’</p>