# South Oxfordshire's Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal of its Local Development Framework



# Feedback report on the public consultation and participation undertaken from December 2005 to February 2006

# The purpose of this report

In December 2005 South Oxfordshire District Council published a draft Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal of its Local Development Framework. The Council undertook public consultation and participation on the draft Scoping Report in accordance with the legal requirements and government guidance set out in the report. The purpose of this feedback report is to inform those persons and organisations who made representations during the consultation period how the Council has responded to their representations. Schedule 1 contains a summary of each representation received and the Council's response to it. The Council has agreed to make changes in response to some representations, but not to all. Schedule 2 details the changes which the Council has agreed to make.

### **Evaluation of the Consultation**

The consultation exercise enabled the Council to make some important changes to the context review and baseline information contained in the Scoping Report. The Council was also reassured that consultees supported the methodology proposed for carrying out sustainability appraisal. The Council incurred costs in arranging the consultation event at Crowmarsh, but the feedback obtained from this event more than justified the expenditure incurred.

Schedule 1: Representations made following consultation on South Oxfordshire's Draft Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal of its Local Development Framework. The Council's Cabinet approved the responses contained in this Schedule on 1 June 2006. The changes are in Schedule 2.

Comment No.	Organisation	Organisation's Comment	Council Response	
Gene	ral comments			
3	Federation of Small Business	General – Issues regarding economic sustainability are given only cursory attention.	This is not the case. Economic issues are given significant attention in the Scoping Report.	
4	Government Office for the South East (GOSE)	You may wish to include diagrams or text along the lines of those in PPS12, the SA guidance or your own SCI to provide information for non-experts on the structure and processes of the new planning system and how it and the SA/SEA regime inter-connect.	Figure 1 in the Scoping Report does this. The structure and processes of the new planning system are complicated and difficult to explain to non-experts. Figure 1, however, shows clearly the work stages which must be completed.  Recommendation: No change.	
10	Wallingford Town Council	Community involvement is a crucial part of sustainable development. Easy to read information should be made available to parish councillors and the general public.	Noted. The Draft Scoping Report tries to explain a complicated process in as simple language as possible and the report is relatively short in length and sparing of excessive detail. At later stages in the process parish councillors and the public will be consulted on further reports on SA and we shall try to make these easy to read.	
	Introduction. Paragraphs 1 and 2			
4	GOSE	You may wish to provide a list of those organisations consulted on the SA at its various stages either within the SA itself or elsewhere so that those interested can easily view such as your website.	Agreed. Consultees will be notified with details of the Council's responses to their representations and given details of changes to the Report approved by the Council. These details will also be published on the website. <b>Recommendation:</b> See Change No.1	

	is SEA/SA? graphs 3 to 7 and Fig	gure 1.		
4	Government Office for the South East (GOSE)	You may wish to include diagrams or text along the lines of those in PPS12, the SA Guidance or your own SCI to provide information for non-experts on the structure and processes of the new planning system and how it and the SA/SEA regime inter-connect.	Figure 1 clearly shows how the SA/SEA process inter-connects with the plan (development plan document) preparation process and the sequence of stages and tasks are described in simple language which should be readily understood by non-experts. It is not thought necessary to include further diagrams or text. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.	
8	CPRE	In paragraph 7 use of 'Guidance' with a capital G would make it clear that the document of November 2005 is being referred to.	The guidance, in fact, is contained in both the government publications mentioned in paragraph 7. The document published in November 2005 does not supersede the document published earlier in September that year. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.	
	A1: Identifying other	er relevant plans, programmes and sustainability objectives.		
3	Federation of Small Businesses (Oxon)	The report entitled: 'Barriers to Growth in UK Small Businesses' should be included in Appendix 1.	Agreed. The objectives which flow from the findings of this survey report should be included. <b>Recommendation:</b> See Change 2	
		PPG3 and PPS6 propose the conversion of commercial premises in town centres into new homes and a review of land allocated for employment development to determine its suitability for housing. The Council must maintain a proper balance between provision of housing and provision of land and premises for business. The replacement of employment sites by housing reduces weekday customers using town centre shopping facilities and reduces important business use of town centre commercial/professional services. This process undermines the vitality and commercial viability of town centres.	The Council cannot change government policy summarised in Appendix 1. However, PPG3 must be read together with other government policy statements in PPG4 and PPS6 which seek to achieve a proper balance in local provision of housing and employment sites and the enhancement of town centre viability. The Council will ensure that the LDF contains appropriate policies to seek to achieve this balance and the enhancement of town centre viability, thereby meeting the concern of the Federation. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.	
		PPG3 seeks to reduce car dependence by ensuring good accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport to jobs, education health facilities, shopping leisure and local services. Add home working as an alternative to transport. Adopt ICT strategies to reduce the need for physical access to services.	The Council cannot change government policy summarised in Appendix 1. The LDF can create a positive planning framework for home working, but the planning system is not the mechanism for implementing service provision by means of IT. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.	

		Set up access points to services in surrounding villages and communities.  PPG4 requires development plans to ensure that sufficient land and a variety of sites are available, with the necessary infrastructure, to meet the needs of business and industry, including small firms. The Federation would wish PPG4 to differentiate between industrial and medium/large office set ups and small businesses that enhance town centres.	The Council cannot change government policy summarised in Appendix 1. PPG4 already requires development plans to ensure that sufficient premises are available to meet the needs of small firms and PPS6 supports business development in town centres of a scale appropriate to the size of centre concerned. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
5	Oxfordshire County Council	The following PPPs should be included in Appendix1:  • UK Energy White Paper, 2003	The Energy White Paper informed government planning policy statements contained in PPS22. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		National Waste Strategy, 2000	The National Waste Strategy informed government planning policy statements contained in PPS10. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		BREEAM/EcoHomes	The Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Model (BREEAM) for non-residential buildings and the Building Research Establishment environmental rating for homes (EcoHomes) are not government plans, policies or programmes to be considered in Appendix 1. However, the LDF can contain policies requiring the achievement of 'Very Good' or 'Excellent' BRE ratings in new buildings and reference to this possibility is made in indicators 2, 3 and 4 for Objective 10 in the SA Framework. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Proposed changes to RPG9	There are no changes currently proposed to RPG9. Appendix 1 refers to the draft South East Plan which will replace RPG9. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Economic Development Strategy for Oxfordshire 2001/05	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No.3

	•	<del>-</del>	
		Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 1996	The Minerals and Waste Development Framework containing Minerals and Waste Development Documents is prepared by county councils and the objectives of these documents should not be duplicated in the LDF prepared by district councils. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		The Rights of Way Improvement Plan	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No 4
6	English Nature	We welcome the broad range of references that have been made to the plans and programmes relevant to nature conservation within Appendix 1 of this document. We are pleased that PPS1 and PPS9 have been referenced along with the Oxfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan.	Support Noted
14	Environment Agency	You state that PPS23 has no specific objectives. Paragraph 26 states that 'opportunities should be taken wherever possible to use the development control process to assist and encourage the remediation of land already affected by contamination.' In our opinion this is an objective.	The statement quoted constitutes advice rather than an objective. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		You should consider the objectives of draft PPS25 which states that strategic flood risk assessments should be carried out to determine the variations of flood risk across an area.	Draft Planning Policy Statements have no status until they are adopted by government. We have, therefore, avoided reference to them in Appendix 1. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Appendix 1 should review Catchment Abstraction Management Plans and the Thames Waterway Plan.	Recommendation: Agreed. These draft plans will be reviewed when they have been obtained from the Agency.  Recommendation: Change when plans supplied.
7	The Countryside Agency and Practical Workshop Comments	The Chilterns and North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plans should be included in Appendix 1.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change Numbers 5 and 6
8	CPRE	The LDF response to the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 should record that in December 2005 the County Council rejected post 2016 housing development in the Green Belt south of Oxford.	The Structure Plan does not contain proposals for the scale and distribution of new housing in the county after 2016. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to record the recent council decision in this context.

			Recommendation: No change.
10	Wallingford Town Council	The report: Wallingford Town Centre: The Future (Vision Strategy and Action Plan) should be included in Appendix 1.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No 7
13	Chalgrove Parish Council	There is a lot of duplication in Appendix1 and it would be great if all directives can be reached.	There is inevitably a lot of duplication in the objectives proposed in the various plans, policies and programmes.  Recommendation: No change.
12	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	The following documents should be included in Appendix 1:  • "Working with the Grain of Nature: A Biodiversity Strategy for England"	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 8
		"Action for Biodiversity in the South East" by the South East England Biodiversity Forum (SEEBF)	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 9
		LDF Monitoring in Berkshire & Oxfordshire – Core and Contextual Biodiversity Indicators (TVERC)	The Council has obtained advice from the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC) on appropriate indicators to use for monitoring the objective to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the district (see objective 7 in Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report). This advice is not supplied in a published document and it is not appropriate, therefore, to refer to it in Appendix 1. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change
	Practical Workshop Comments	Many towns and villages have published parish plans and village appraisals which are encouraged under the Countryside Agency's 'Vital Villages' programme. These are relevant plans to be considered in Appendix 1.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 10
	Practical Workshop Comments	The Code for Sustainable Homes should be included in Appendix 1.	The ODPM published proposals for introducing a Code for Sustainable Homes for consultation in December 2005.  Adoption of the Code by householders and developers would be on a voluntary basis. The Council has not assessed consultation versions of PPPs in Appendix1 because these have no status until they are finally approved or adopted.  Recommendation: No change.

	Key messages for South Oxfordshire from the context review Paragraph 10 and Table 1		
	Practical Workshop Comments	Message 2 should seek to 'create' biodiversity as well as to 'conserve and enhance' it.	The message already includes considering the provision of new habitats in planning new developments. This would amount to creating biodiversity.  Recommendation: No change.
	Practical Workshop Comments	In Message 3 reducing car dependence could also be achieved by facilitating home working.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 11
	Practical Workshop comments	In message 9 it is important that meeting places are also accessible by sustainable modes of transport.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No.12
	Practical Workshop comments	In message 10 local communities should also be provided with meeting places, including places of worship.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 13
9	Thames Water Property Services	In message 10 local communities should also be provided with utility infrastructure and this should be put in place ahead of development, to minimise potential adverse effects on the environment.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No 13
		In message 17 reference should be made to sewer flooding.	Message 17 records the planning objective to avoid placing people and property at risk in areas liable to flood. It is unnecessary here to record sewer flooding and other causes of flooding from surface waters and groundwaters as this would introduce too much detail into the message.  Recommendation: No change
3	Federation of Small Businesses	In message 3 the LDF should also seek to achieve other aspects of mobility such as moving services to the consumer through the use of ICT.	The planning system is not the mechanism for implementing service provision by means of IT. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		In message 9 include the encouragement of home working to reduce the need for transport and commuting.	The encouragement of home working will reduce commuting by car and this is recorded in a proposed change to message 3 (see change No. 11). Message 9 is about locating employment-generating development in places which are accessible by sustainable modes of travel. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.

		Messages 19 and 20: The use of brown field sites for housing has had the effect of driving employment out of town centres and bringing in commuters who have to travel out of town to employment. This has adversely affected town centre business by reducing the pool of customers and viability of shops especially on weekdays.  Message 27: Scientific and education establishments need to be more strongly encouraged to engage local small businesses	Messages 19 and 20 are derived from the national planning policy statements recorded in Appendix 1 and cannot be disregarded. It is the role of the planning system to strike the right balance between provision of new homes on previously-developed land and maintaining local employment and provision of services for local people. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.  The planning system cannot require scientific and education establishments to do this. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		in their activities.  Message 28: Tourism is essential to the sustainability of town centre and local economies.	Noted.
	Practical Workshop comments	In message 21 it is also important to enhance the natural beauty of AONBs.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No 14
4	Government Office for the South East	Message 25: Given the guidance in PPS12 and emerging PPS3 your LDF and hence SA/SEA will need to be looking at least 10-15 years ahead from the likely date of adoption of individual DPDs (ie. beyond 2016).	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 15
	Practical Workshop comments	In message 27 the Structure Plan also supports development which meets the needs of small firms. Small businesses employing less than 25 people cover a wide range of activities and are important to the local economy.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 16
	Practical Workshop comments	In message 30 development should be designed to be socially- inclusive meeting the needs not only of disabled people but also the needs of other 'hard to reach' groups of people.	There is nothing in the context review to indicate what these other needs may be. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
Task	A2: Collecting base	eline information. Paragraphs 11 to 18, Table 3 and Appendix 2	: Baseline Review and Sustainability Appraisal Framework
1	RSPB	The 17 objectives are agreed.	Noted.
		Delete Objective 7, Indicator 1 which measures change in populations of farmland birds. The LDF can only have a limited effect on farmland bird populations.	When farmland is developed, then there is an effect on farmland bird populations. The indicator is being monitored by TVERC. The RSPB suggest no alternative indicator and the farmland bird indicator should be retained in Appendix 2. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.

3	Federation of Small Businesses	The 17 objectives are agreed.	Noted.
	Official Education	Objective 15(b) seeks to assist in the development of small firms. This includes small firms in town centres engaged in retail and entertainment activities. Introduce two new indicators to measure this: footfall on consumer business premises and local income retention in towns.	The measurement of changes in pedestrian flows (footfall) in town centres is unlikely to be a good measure of the development of small firms. It is the development of large firms, such as supermarkets, which is the main cause of change in pedestrian flows in South Oxfordshire towns.  Local income retention or 'market share' of local expenditure is also not a good indicator of the development of small firms. A town centre is likely to increase its share of local expenditure by the development of both large and small firms.  Recommendation: No change.
		Paragraphs 17 & 18 – These paragraphs display a keen attention to the politically correct environment issues, including a general hostility to road transport. This view seems to be primarily focused on the car, but there is little recognition of the importance of road transport with regards to their economic importance in facilitating logistics and sales, which are essential to economic competitiveness.	The key message stated in paragraph 18 has real substance and is not based on any 'general hostility' to road transport. Objective 6 seeks to improve travel choice, particularly for those who use private cars. Less use of private cars would free up some capacity in the road network for use by lorries. There is no denial that efficient commercial road transport is essential to the economy. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
5	Oxfordshire County Council	The 'Action for the LDF' proposed in Indicator 1 of Objective 1 in Appendix 2 needs to reflect likely strategic housing requirements in addition to those contained in Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016. For example, the LDF will need to consider the emerging housing requirements in the South East Plan and the results of Housing Market Needs Assessments being proposed in draft PPS3. Re-word the action for the LDF as follows: "Ensure that a Housing Allocations DPD is prepared at an early stage to identify sufficient land to meet strategic housing requirements".	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 17
		The action for the LDF should not refer to identifying sufficient land 'outside Didcot' given the emphasis in planning policy on development in urban areas. Perhaps what is meant is "on the periphery of Didcot"?	There is a misunderstanding here. The present wording of the action for the LDF states the fact that no further housing allocations are required at Didcot to meet the strategic housing requirements of Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016, but such allocations are required elsewhere in the district ie. 'outside

The 'Action for the LDF' proposed in Indicator 7 of Objective 1 in Appendix 2 should also refer to energy efficient measures such as insulation and draft proofing for social housing.

The casualty figures and targets given in Indicator 4 of Objective 2 should be updated using new information supplied by the County Council.

Indicator 1 of Objective 3 in Appendix 2 should refer to detailed data on accessibility in South Oxfordshire contained in Chapter 9 of the Local Transport Plan.

The 'Action for the LDF' proposed in Indicator 1 of Objective 6 should include a reference to design layouts of developments giving consideration to road, footpath and cycleway layout. Policies that encourage or require provision of secure cycle parking at new homes and commercial/public buildings is another key element for addressing traffic on non-motorway roads

Indicator 2 of Objective 6 should include travel to work trends in South East England. There has been no significant change in the proportion travelling by car or in the proportion travelling by public transport. A trend to add here is that there has been a significant increase in home working. Developments supporting housing, employment and home working could potentially reduce the need for commuting.

Didcot'. It is acknowledged that further allocations at Didcot will be required to meet the housing requirements of the emerging South East Plan. Change No 18 would avoid this misunderstanding. **Recommendation:** See Change No.18

The presence of insulation and energy efficiency measures in a home are not measures of fitness for habitation under this indicator. **Recommendation:** No change.

Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 19

The data on accessibility presently given in Appendix 2 relates to a Core Output Indicator which the ODPM requires councils to monitor. No reason is seen at this stage to depart from the ODPM indicator. The County Council has not related its data in the Local Transport Plan to this Core Output Indicator and has not yet supplied the relevant data on the ODPM indicator to the districts. **Recommendation:** No change.

Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 20

It is not worth showing the regional travel to work trends as the regional trends are not significantly different from those in South Oxfordshire which are shown in the indicator. The significant increase in home working should be recorded in column 2. The Action for the LDF in column 5 should also record that mixed-use developments should be planned as these have the potential to reduce the levels of car commuting to work.

			Recommendation: See Change No. 21
		Energy use in the built environment is a significant source of CO2. Indicator 1 of Objective 10 covers all energy use (not just transport) but the indicator status refers to only transport and the action for LDF refers to a transport objective. Action points for the LDF should include the development of policies for energy efficiency and renewable energy requirements in new developments and extension along the lines of the wording in indicator 2.	Agreed. <b>Recommendation:</b> See Change No. 22
		Objective 12 – Replace 'or energy recovery' with 'and help achieve sustainable waste management.'	The present wording of the objective describes more clearly what is involved in 'sustainable waste management' than use of this technical description on its own. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Indicator 1 of Objective 12 should include reference to composting facilities in Action for the LDF.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No. 23
6	English Nature	We support the sustainability objectives in Table 3 in particular objectives 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10.	Noted.
		Indicator 2 of Objective 7 does not have a target taking into account enhancement or re-creation of these habitat types. It deals with preventing reduction in extent of UKBAP priority habitats, but not in increasing extent. This indicator doesn't provide a relevant measure in its current form. Extent alone doesn't indicate healthy biodiversity that is sustainable. The indicator should include some measure of habitat condition as well. The target should include a specific target of the extent of each habitat that will be restored/re-created over a specific time period. This should be based on data indicating former extent of these habitats in the District, and on information on the current area of land available for restoration/re-creation. This should also be linked to the LBAP and Regional BAP targets, and prioritised if necessary, including consideration of linking together existing blocks of habitat and designated sites.	The indicator does measure both increases and decreases in the extent of these habitats. Comprehensive survey data on priority habitat condition is not available and is unlikely to become available. Targets for restoration and re-creation of habitats are under review. When the Oxfordshire BAP has been reviewed we will consider including positive targets for restoration or re-creation in this indicator to meet English Nature's requirements. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.

The wording for Indicator 3 of Objective 7 for UKBAP priority species should be changed from "Change in the number of UKBAP priority species" to read "Changes in the population size/ number of breeding colonies of UKBAP species." A target could be to prevent any reduction in population sizes or breeding colonies of these species through development. The LDF process could protect priority species by avoiding site allocation for development on sites with known important populations of these species. Another target could be for new development to improve or create suitable habitats for priority species.

The TVERC cannot provide comprehensive survey data on the population levels of priority species, but it is improving links with the recording groups to improve this data. This is noted in column 2. The Action for the LDF proposed in column 6 explains the specific role of the planning system in securing habitat creation. **Recommendation:** No change.

Locally designated sites should also be used as indicators of biodiversity including the extent and condition of Local Nature Reserves and County Wildlife Sites. It should be an objective to increase the area of non-statutory sites by designating new sites as well as preventing encroachment on the present ones. English Nature considers the quality of second tier sites as an important issue and it would be beneficial to put a monitoring programme in place to address this issue. It is important to protect locally important biodiversity and not to solely focus on national targets which may not be specifically relevant in the local context.

Local Nature Reserves and County Wildlife Sites will be designated where priority habitats exist or can be created and where resources are identified for their future management. Indicators 2 and 3 will measure the extent of priority habitat and the number of priority species in LNRs and CWSs and a separate indicator for these sites is considered to be unnecessary. **Recommendation:** No change.

The extent and condition of ancient woodland would act as an important indicator of the biological resource within the area. A target for this would be "no reduction in condition or extent of ancient woodland"

Areas of ancient woodland in South Oxfordshire are, in many cases, priority habitats and their extent is already being monitored under Indicator 1. A separate indicator for ancient woodland is, therefore, unnecessary. **Recommendation:** No change.

Geodiversity should be considered with equal weight to biodiversity especially in the South Oxfordshire district where there are a number of geological Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS). The target for geological SSSIs would be covered under the indicator There is only one RIG in South Oxfordshire which is not designated an SSSI (at Wheatley). A separate indicator monitoring the extent of RIGS is not, therefore, justified. **Recommendation:** No change.

"% of SSSI land in favourable condition" but a separate target would need to be set for maintaining and enhancing geodiversity on RIGS Sites.

We welcome the positive targets for open space (Objective 8) where reference has been made to both the quantity and quality of local open space in relation to new development proposals.

Indicator 3 of Objective 8: quality open space should incorporate "wildspace". English Nature considers access to nature as important for well-being and quality of life. Everyone should be able to enjoy this contact without having to make a special effort to do so. The English Nature Guidelines for Access to Green space would act as a good reference point for creating targets under this indicator. English Nature has developed long term standards for access to nature. They are:

- an accessible natural greenspace less than 300 metres from home
- Statutory Local Nature Reserves provided at a minimum level of one hectare per thousand population
- At least one accessible 20 hectare site within 2 kilometres of home; one accessible 100 hectare site within 5 kilometres of home; and one accessible 500 hectare site with in 10 kilometres of home

Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs) is an important issue that could be used as an indicator under several of the specified objectives. It could relate to flood defence, sustainable construction or protection of natural resources. An appropriate target for this could be for a certain proportion of all new developments to incorporate SuDs.

Objective 13 encourages the use of previously developed land and whilst we support this in general terms, consideration must be given to sites which have developed an importance for biodiversity. Such sites can often provide a haven for protected Noted

Accessible natural greenspace or 'wildspace' is one of several types of open space being monitored in Indicator 3 of Objective 8. It is considered unnecessary to make specific reference to this typology in that indicator. However, it would be appropriate to specify an Action for the LDF in Indicator 2 of Objective 7 stating that the LDF should contain a standard for the provision of accessible natural greenspace in new developments where it will be possible to create new UKBAP priority habitats.

Recommendation: See Change No 24

The Action for the LDF under Indicator 3 of objective 5 notes a 'need to ensure that water quality management measures are implemented on new developments.' Such measures would include SuDs on sites where it is appropriate for them to be installed. A separate indicator for SuDs is not required.

Recommendation: No change.

Noted.

		species where there is a lack of open or wild space within urban areas.	
7	The Countryside Agency	We support particularly the objectives 8, 9 and 13. Overall we endorse the environmental objectives	Noted.
		We recommend a further key service in Objective 3 (Indicator 1) "accessibility to countryside".	The list of key services and facilities in Indicator 1 of objective 3 is derived from a core output indicator recommended in government guidance on LDF monitoring. The core output indicator does not include 'countryside' as a key facility which should be readily accessible by public transport from new homes. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		The indicators for protection and enhancement of landscape under objective 8 are not sufficiently developed, particularly as South Oxfordshire contains large areas of AONB. The impact of the LDF on the character or quality of landscapes should be assessed.	The Agency has not yet produced guidance on how impact on landscape character and quality should be assessed. Indicator 1 of objective 8 measures the number of major developments permitted in AONBs. Major developments have significant impact on landscape character and quality. This indicator is directly related to planning and can be easily measured. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Objective 9: There is no indicator to assess the quality of design and the reinforcement of local distinctiveness in new development.	An indicator of this kind would be useful in relation to Objective 9 and the Council will investigate what form such an indicator should take and will consider introducing such an indicator when further investigations have been completed. In the meantime, the Council will monitor awards for new development in the district made by bodies with acknowledged expertise in design matters. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
8	CPRE	The injunctions 'to ensure,' to 'seek to address etc.' require careful assessment. For example, objectives 6 and 11: how can the Council improve these matters? Surely these aims should be put in the category of encouragement instead of actually doing the necessary? Thus objective 14 as worded is the job of the Chancellor, but the Council can help achieve the aim by its planning decisions.	Column 6 of Appendix 2 shows precisely how the LDF can act positively towards achieving these sustainability objectives. The LDF would be ineffective if it merely 'encouraged' particular actions relating to the development and use of land. Planning policies and proposals must specify the course of action to be taken and not merely encourage that action.  Recommendation: No change.

The objectives should be classified under a number of topics such as 'people', 'environment'.

Although not stated it is likely that Councillors will not ascribe equal weights to each of these objectives. Recognition of this aspect would assist when Stage B1 is reached.

Objective 3: Many of these desirable things are not managed by the Council, thus Ms Hewitt decides if a hospital is to close and raise journey distances.

Objective 8: It is suggested that the words following 'in particular', be deleted on the understanding that such areas are adequately protected by national legislation and that for emphasis the words 'the Oxford Green Belt' be inserted instead.

Objective 10(b): Delete 'maximising' and insert 'increasing.'

Some objectives cover more than one topic and thus classification has been omitted. **Recommendation:** No change.

Planning policies and proposals should aim to achieve all the sustainability objectives together as far as possible, but it is often necessary for the achievement of one objective to be made at the expense of others. This process involves the exercise of judgement by elected representatives advised by experts and it is not appropriate to pre-judge such decisions by indicating in the Scoping Report the extent to which some objectives should take precedence over others. The weight to be afforded to the objectives will vary from decision to decision. Government guidance gives no instruction that the objectives should be weighted in importance or that any reference should be made to weighting in the Scoping Report.

Recommendation: No change.

This objective is not about securing delivery of new or retaining existing key facilities, such as hospitals, but about improving people's accessibility to key facilities by sustainable modes of travel. **Recommendation:** No change.

The Countryside Agency is likely to object to deletion of reference to the designated countryside (including AONBs) from this objective because there is a 'particular' legal requirement in the designated areas to protect and enhance the beauty of the AONB landscape. The reference to 'designated areas' in the objective includes both AONBs and the Oxford Green Belt. There is no need, therefore, to make specific reference to the Green Belt. **Recommendation:** No change.

Agreed. PPS 22 proposes that development of renewable energy be 'increased' rather than 'maximised.' **Recommendation:** See Change No 25

Objective 12: Delete 'minimise' and insert 'reduce.'	Agreed. PPS10 proposes the 'reduction' of waste produced
Collective 12. Delete minimise and meet reduce.	rather than the 'minimisation' of waste produced.
	Recommendation: See Change No 26
Objective 13: Presumably 'land use' does not mean land use in general but land use for construction, transport routes and even recreation areas and a qualifying adjective, if such can be found, would help to emphasize this.	There is nothing in the wording of the objective to suggest that recreation areas are under threat from improved efficiency in land use. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
Objective 14: Delete 'ensure' and insert 'encourage actions seeking to maintain.'	The regional objective relating to levels of employment uses the word 'ensure' and it is repeated, therefore, in Objective 14.  Recommendation: No change.
Objective 16: It is questionable whether the District Council has sufficient influence to justify the inclusion of the words 'raising education achievement levels.'	The LDF is the mechanism which ensures that education facilities are delivered in parallel with new housing developments. This indirectly affects achievement levels. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
Objective 1, Indicator 1: The local trend is for long lead-in times for delivery of homes in major development areas. The Action for the LDF does not say what should be done about this.	The complexity of planning major development areas means that long lead-in times are inevitable and there is no action which can be suggested to remedy this. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
Objective 1: What is the difference between Indicators 2 and 3?	The difference is that Indicator 2 includes a count of all affordable homes delivered in the district including those not delivered through the planning system (ie. the purchase of existing homes).
Objective 1, Indicator 3: The choice of targets for the proportion of affordable homes is a political one.	The targets have been approved by elected representatives informed by expert advice.
Objective 5, Indicator 5: Is the reference to 'those in work' to income of employees in work in the district or to income of working residents of the District?	Answer: The income of working residents of the District.
Objective 1, Indicator 5, Action for the LDF: A political point is	The point is economic not political. The delivery of new homes

being made in the first sentence. It is not clear how this advances the LDF.

Objective 2, Indicators 1,2,3 and 4: It is fair to say that that design of a development can influence crime, but the connection is indirect. One might, and possibly would get increases in crime (if there was a rise in unemployment for instance) while the Council was working wonders with design all the time. Should the indicator be the extent of improved design rather than the incidence of crime?

Objective 4, Indicators 1 and 2: It is the Secretary of State for Health who is the principal determinant of change in these indicators.

Objective 5, Indicator 2: The reference to 'transport infrastructure' in the Action for the LDF column is too wide since the bulk of this is under County or Government direction.

Objective 6, Indicator 1: No evidence has been adduced on the consequences of different locations of development on car use.

Objective 8, Indicator 1: The indicator is too permissive. It should read: 'Policies which permit major developments in the designated areas only in exceptional circumstances.'

Objective 13, Indicator 3: The Environment Agency has a target for regional self-sufficiency. Since one of the largest infrastructure projects nearby that will impinge on the District is the potential Hanney reservoir, it is for discussion whether the District should accept EA policy.

does not advance the LDF – rather the LDF advances the delivery of new homes.

It is unclear how 'the extent of improved design' could be measured. Until this problem is resolved, then we shall continue to measure the incidence of crime in accordance with the draft indicators. **Recommendation:** No Change.

The incidence of disease and people's lifestyles as well as government intervention are probably the principal drivers of change in life expectancy and mortality.

Transport infrastructure such as roads are an integral part of many new developments and the effect of these on Objective 5 is an action point for the LDF. **Recommendation:** No change.

Transport research backs up the Action for the LDF proposed in this indicator.

The indicator is not a permissive planning policy. It measures the number of major developments permitted in the AONBs and Green Belt with the target being that none are permitted. **Recommendation:** No change.

The Environment Agency is the regulatory body responsible for water resources and the Council should take the EA target into account in LDF preparation. The Action for the LDF proposes a LDF policy framework for 'water demand management measures' and makes no reference to support for major infrastructure projects. These would need to be appraised for their effect on all the objectives in Appendix 2.

9	Thames Water Property Services	Objective 5, Indicator 3: We support the references to water utility infrastructure in this indicator.	Noted.
		Table 3: Objective 10: This should include a reference to securing sustainable objectives through design.	The objective to secure sustainable building practices can only be achieved through control over the design of buildings in the development control process. It is unnecessary to make specific reference to design in this context. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Table 3: Objective 11: This should also refer to the risk of sewer flooding.	It is unnecessary to refer in detail to all the possible causes of flooding in this objective. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Table 3: Objective 12: This should refer to water quality.	The effect of final disposal of waste to landfill on water quality is a matter for the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework and not the LDF. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Objective 13, Indicator 3: The Action for the LDF should state that development will be planned and phased to consider the impact that it will have on wastewater treatment and potable water provision.	The Action for the LDF proposed in Objective 5, Indicator 3 already requires impact on wastewater treatment to be taken into account. The utility company has a duty to deliver drinking water to new developments, but it is relevant for the LDF to consider phasing of these developments if there is to be a time lag in the delivery of water to a site. <b>Recommendation:</b> See Change No 27
10	Wallingford Town Council	Objective 1, Indicator 1: Land identified for development should be suitable and available.	Noted. Sustainability appraisal will determine whether land is suitable for housing and landowners will need to advise whether they are willing to make their land available.
		Objective 1, Indicator 2: Should affordable housing sites contribute by way of 106 agreement to sustainable needs such as education?	Yes. A body delivering affordable housing has the same obligation as any other developer to mitigate impact on local infrastructure and services, including schools.
		Objective 2, Indicator 1: This should include a policy to cover town centres.	Agreed. The Action for the LDF should contain a positive planning policy framework for works and measures designed to create safe town and village centres. <b>Recommendation:</b> See Change No. 28

		Objective 3, Indicator 2: Should mention Youth clubs and NHS dentist capacity	The list of key services is taken from a core output indicator in government guidance on LDF monitoring. There are a number of other key services which might be considered but limiting the number to six makes collection of data manageable.  Recommendation: No change.
		Objective 4, Indicator 5: This is fine district wide but what about differences between towns e.g. Wallingford has a more elderly population than Didcot?	The creation of a more balanced age structure in a community can improve social cohesion in that community. The Action for the LDF should include a planning framework which enables a more balanced age structure to be created, where appropriate. <b>Recommendation:</b> See Change No. 29
		Objective 7, Indicator 1: There should still be a policy statement to encourage a friendly environment for farmland birds.	Noted.
11	Didcot Town Council	We consider that the objectives are generally sound although meeting them will be a challenge.	Noted.
		Objective 6, Indicator 1: We agree with the comments about the cumulative effect of traffic growth associated with many new developments, although it should be recognised that public transport is currently not viable even between major employment sites such as the Oxford Science Park or the Harwell site, and the major housing site (Didcot).	Noted.
		Objective 10, Indicator 1: We do have reservations about the reference to the cumulative effect of emissions from many small developments in column 5. Although this effect cannot be ignored, major developments are more likely to cause major vehicle pollution.	Major developments sited close to employment and service centres are likely to generate shorter road transport movements and hence less vehicle pollution than many smaller developments sited farter away from those centres.
		Objective 11, Indicator 1: Please note that the Environment Agency doesn't monitor all major causes of flooding. Throughout the District there is a spring line below the chalk and greensand horizons. Planning applications need to be monitored (e.g. Great Western Park, Didcot) to ensure that the drainage proposals are adequate.	Noted.

	T		
12	Berkshire.	Objective 12, Indicator 1: Consider that recycling of commercial waste and demolition waste also need to be monitored since these contribute more than half of the total.  Objective 7: It would seem that this objective is broadly based	We consider that it is not essential to monitor the percentage of all waste that is recycled to assess progress towards achieving this objective. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.  There is no need to have more than one objective seeking to
12	Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	on the core indicators specified in the ODPM guidance for Local Development Framework Monitoring. However, there is a lack of consistency in that it also includes one of the contextual indicators specified by the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC), which have been agreed by all local authorities in Oxfordshire and Berkshire.  This objective should either include provision for all core and contextual indicators, or there should be separate objectives for each. This is important as the SA will be expected to cover elements of the LDF including the AMR, which will report on the Council's performance in relation to these indicators. Further to this, in light of new national policies for biodiversity set out in PPS9, there should also be specific Provisions (in addition to those for UK BAP habitats and species) setting out the Councils objectives for CRoW Act Section 74 habitats and species.	conserve and enhance the District's biodiversity. Our choice of four indicators is sufficient to enable us to assess progress towards achieving this objective. We must economise in the number of indicators and choose indicators where there is a realistic prospect of local performance data being collected.  Recommendation: No change.
		Objective 7, Indicator 2: The Action for the LDF should record that LDF plans and proposals with the potential to significantly affect a European Site (either within or outside the district) should be subject to Appropriate Assessment in accordance with the European Habitats Directive.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No 30
13	Chalgrove Parish Council	Objective 1, Indicator 2: There is a great need for affordable housing, which should be a priority.	Noted.
		Objective 2, Indicators 2 and 3: Anti-social behaviour is a problem which requires education and citizenship, not relying just on Police.	Noted.

14	Environment Agency	Your objectives are very good and our vision for the future of the environment is well represented.	Noted.
		Objective 5: The risk to groundwater pollution needs to be considered under this objective.	Objective 5 seeks to minimise pollution to all components of the environment, including groundwater, and it is unnecessary to list all the components in the objective. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Objective 10: It is good to see that you will be seeking new developments to meet BREEM ratings which cover water efficiency measures. However, we would like to see indicators and targets specifically relating to the use of water saving devices. Sustainable drainage schemes can also be included here because in some cases they can recharge groundwater levels.	The issue of water efficiency is covered in Indicators 3 an 4 and a separate indicator for this issue is unnecessary. Sustainable drainage schemes ancillary to new development make only a very marginal contribution to the recharging of underground water resources and it is not worth introducing an indicator for these schemes in relation to Objective 10. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Objective 11: We consider it important that this objective is informed by strategic flood risk assessment as required by draft PPS25.	Noted.
		Objective 13: This objective contains no indicators for biodiversity or soil quality. To help keep this assessment clear and uncomplicated, the biodiversity element should be deleted as it has already been covered under Objective 7.	There are indicators for biodiversity under Objective 7. Soil quality is a key factor in the designation of best and most versatile agricultural land and this is covered by Indicator 4. Reference to biodiversity should be retained in this objective. It is a natural resource which is affected by development in the countryside. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Objective 13: Re-development of brownfield land can have a positive effect in restoring damaged, contaminated land. Introduce specific indicators to measure how much land has been remediated following development.	There is comparatively little contaminated land in South Oxfordshire. It is not worthwhile, therefore, introducing an indicator measuring its remediation. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Objective 5: Introduce an indicator measuring the clean up of contaminated land.	There is relatively little contaminated land in South Oxfordshire and thus such an indicator is not justified. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.

	Practical Workshop Comment	Objective 5: Introduce an indicator measuring soil pollution.	Most soil pollution occurs through activities beyond the control of the planning system or as a result of improper waste disposal activities, which are the concern of the Waste Development Framework. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
	Practical Workshop Comment	There is a conflict between Objectives 6 and 17.	Noted. Such conflicts are inevitable and the SA process will make them explicit.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Objective 9: Reinforcing local distinctiveness should include reference to use of local materials in new buildings.	Local distinctiveness can be achieved in many ways and not just by specifying use of local materials. It is unnecessary to make specific reference to one way in the objective.  Recommendation: No change.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Objective 9: The Council should introduce design award schemes as an indicator of high quality design.	There is a difficulty in making design award schemes objective in their assessment of quality. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Objective 13, Indicator 1: Many sites comprising previously-developed land are of importance for biodiversity.	Noted.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Objective 17: The meaning of 'sustainable' in this objective is obscure.	The adjective ensures that a buoyant tourism sector is achieved through development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
Task	A3: Identifying sust	tainability problems: Table 2, paragraphs 19 and 20	
4	GOSE	It is unclear why the issues in Table 2 appear in this order. This should be clarified even if only to say no priority order.	Agreed. Recommendation: See Change No.31
3	Federation of Small Businesses	Under "Economic Problems"  Decline in Town Centre usage for shopping and entertainment.  There is a growing issue regarding usage of town centres for retails and entertainment activities, which is having an increasingly adverse effect on small local businesses.	Agreed. Maintaining the viability of small businesses in town and village centres is an economic problem in South Oxfordshire.  Recommendation: See Change No.32

6	English Nature	We agree with the key messages for South Oxfordshire, which have come out of the baseline review, in particular the priorities for reducing environmental effects by reducing the growth of road traffic and in reversing the decline in wildlife habitats and species. We strongly support the case that these issues must be considered within the LDF, but that it is by working with partner organisations that many of these goals will be achieved on the ground	Noted.
8	CPRE	Concern over the scale and location of gravel working is as important as putative effects of global warming.	Table 2 describes existing environmental problems being faced in this district. Sand and gravel working is not at present a problem. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
10	Wallingford Town Council	Table 2, Problem 8: Key worker policy does little to help people afford a property in South Oxon as levels of lending criteria are unrealistic e.g. buyers are only allowed to borrow 3.5 x main salary plus 1 x second salary. Most lending institutions will work on affordability. Key workers need more realistic assistance	Noted.
		Table 2, Problem 12 – Lack of Youth Clubs should be mentioned.	The Council has no evidence of this suggested problem. If there is a lack of Youth Clubs in the district or a more general lack of facilities for young people, then evidence of this may emerge from the current consultation being undertaken on the Council's Draft Youth Strategy. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
11	Didcot Town Council	Table 2, Problem 5: Flooding fails to acknowledge that problems occur elsewhere than on the low lying flood plains.	Reference is made to 'low-lying parts of the Thames Valley' and this is a sufficiently broad regional description to cover areas near Didcot in the Thames Valley region where flood risk may exist. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Table2, Problem 8: Really two problems, shortage of low cost housing and the high price of market housing.	Both problems of affordability are mentioned in Problem 8. There is no justification to separate them. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Table 2, Problem 11: Reference is made to "small settlements, where public transport services are limited". In fact, public transport services are limited in the largest settlement in the District, Didcot, since they do not link to a number of major	Didcot has relatively good local public transport services when compared with many smaller settlements in the district.

		employment sites.	
		Table 2, Problem 17: At certain times of the day, the principal road network is operating <u>beyond</u> capacity.	Reference is made to the principal road network being 'at near capacity' and this would include occasions when the network is operating beyond design capacity. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
		Table 2, Problem 19: The Town Council agrees, but SEERA is pursuing a policy of making matters worse by requiring many new homes to be built 16km or more away from the areas of greatest employment demand.	The Town Council's concerns about transport infrastructure are noted. These concerns will need to be addressed in planning future expansion of the town in accordance with the emerging South East Plan.
13	Chalgrove Parish Council	How much does cost have a bearing on problems?	The cost of improvement measures is always a relevant factor.
14	Environment Agency	You have identified all the major environmental problems facing your district.	Noted.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Table 2, Problem 7: Climate change will not be a problem in South Oxfordshire as it is only likely to reduce rainfall.	Climate change is recognised to be a serious global problem and many international and national plans and programmes indicate that we should not ignore it. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Another problem is the lack of expertise in sustainable industries.	No evidence has been found to support this assertion.  Recommendation: No change.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Table 2, Problem 9: We should not provide too much 2-bedroom accommodation. It is not good for people to live on their own and there is a need for family homes.	The evidence shows a need for provision of a large proportion of small homes in new developments. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Table 2, Problem 15: Ageing resident population will not be a problem everywhere, for instance in Didcot.	Noted.
	Practical Workshop Comment	Table 2, Problem 16: Major investment is needed in education to improve all skills in the working population and not just academic skills.	Noted.

4	GOSE	Using only ticks and crosses in Table 5 may be rather over- simplifying the issues and impacts. For example, it is not the case that providing a decent home will axiomatically be incompatible with other objectives such as avoiding flood risk or minimising waste or tackling climate change. You may wish to consider other symbols to indicate severity, uncertainty or neutrality where appropriate.	Table 5 is simply a means of showing where an objective <u>may</u> be either compatible or incompatible with other objectives. Government guidance does not require any more refined assessment of the degree of incompatibility between objectives in the SA Framework. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.
Next	Steps: SA in the p	roduction of Local Development Documents, paragraphs 27 to	40.
5	Oxfordshire County Council	The appraisal framework is robust but could benefit from some sort of outside stakeholder involvement rather than being an inhouse assessment with consulting support. It would be helpful to specify the approach that you envisage using to carry out the appraisal e.g. from Paragraph 27 onwards. The Forum that you have set up is an excellent sounding board and will generate public awareness of and inputs to the process. In addition it might be useful to invite experts or stakeholders to take part in some of the appraisals. We have found that it works well to invite a few experts for a half day to help officers fill out an appraisal matrix.	See main report. Recommendation: No change.
14	Environment Agency	Paragraph 32. We would like some clarification as to why you feel it will be unnecessary to consider options for some documents. Our understanding is that options have to be considered for DPDs.	We wish to retain the ability not to devise options in the particular circumstances described in paragraph 32. It is acknowledged, however, that options will be devised and appraised in most circumstances. <b>Recommendation:</b> No change.

# **SCHEDULE 2: PROPOSED CHANGES**

### **CHANGE No. 1** - Delete paragraph 2 and insert new paragraph 2 to read:

'A European Union Directive sets out certain statutory requirements for formal consultation on this Scoping Report and this includes:

• seeking the views of the Government Office for the South East and the four statutory bodies with environmental responsibilities in England: The Environment Agency, English Nature, English Heritage and the Countryside Agency.

We prepared a Response Form with a list of questions relating to key issues and used this to obtain the views of the statutory bodies. We also used this Response Form to seek:

- the views of people interested in SA by making the Scoping Report available at our offices in Crowmarsh Gifford and by placing it on our website <a href="https://www.southoxon.gov.uk">www.southoxon.gov.uk</a>
- the views of local organisations that have environmental, social and economic responsibilities and a practical workshop was held on 24 January 2006 to enable them to understand the SA process.

We received 14 written responses and a number of further responses were made orally at the practical workshop. 20 people attended the workshop representing the following organisations: The South Oxfordshire Partnership, The Federation of Small Businesses, Oxfordshire Council, Vale of White Horse District Council, Cherwell District Council, Chilterns AONB Conservation Board, North Wessex Downs AONB Partnership, Didcot Town Council, Wallingford Town Council, Watlington Parish Council, Oxfordshire Churches Together, Council for the Protection of Rural England, SODC Housing and Sustainable Development Services, The Northmoor Trust and Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust.'

## **CHANGE No. 2** - Insert the following table in Appendix 1:

Lifting the Barriers to Growth in UK Small Businesses 2004 (Federation of Small Businesses, 2006)				
Key aims, relevant objectives or targets/indicators	Implications for SA	LDF response		
The Federation of Small Businesses carries out regular surveys of small businesses in	The objectives arising from the	The LDF should contain a		
the UK and publishes reports based on the findings of these surveys. From the findings	findings of the survey have	positive planning framework for		
of the latest survey (2004) the Federation will be seeking to:	informed objectives 2, 14, 15, 16	the development of premises for		
<ul> <li>reduce the harmful effects of new regulations on small businesses;</li> </ul>	and 17 in the SA Framework	small businesses, including		
<ul> <li>promote the use of the home as a business incubator;</li> </ul>		working from home.		
<ul> <li>ensure that increases in the national minimum wage do not adversely affect</li> </ul>				
small businesses, especially in the hotel/catering sector;				

<ul> <li>to increase the development of e-commerce in small businesses;</li> <li>to reduce the impact of crime on business;</li> <li>to increase the take up of government sources of business advice; and</li> <li>to improve local authority services to small businesses</li> </ul>	
Targets: None.	

# **CHANGE No.3** – Insert the following table in Appendix 1:

Economic Development Strategy for Oxfordshire 2001 – 2005 (Oxfordshire Economic Partnership, 2001)				
Key aims, relevant objectives or targets/indicators	Implications for SA	LDF response		
<ul> <li>The Strategy aims to: <ul> <li>improve the competitiveness of the Oxfordshire economy to achieve a GDP per capita that ranks among the top ten sub-regions in Europe;</li> <li>achieve growth in productivity, whilst sustaining the county's environment; and</li> <li>fulfil the employment potential of all the citizens in Oxfordshire by increasing participation in the labour market and matching skills to job opportunities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Strategy deals with three main issues: competitiveness and innovation, sustainable</li> </ul>	The aims and objectives have informed objectives 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 in the SA Framework.	The seventeen objectives should be taken into account when the LDF is prepared.		
development and social inclusion. Within these issues seventeen objectives are identified which the Partnership seeks to forge a consensus around. They are:  • spread innovation best practice;  • exploit the commercial and creative potential of the science and technology base;  • invest in workforce development;  • refine support services for new and growing businesses;  • nurture business clusters and support networks;  • drive e-commerce forward, through a communications infrastructure;  • exploit new export opportunities;  • achieve a more equitable housing market;  • secure adequate investment in transport infrastructure;				
<ul> <li>protect the county's important environmental assets;</li> <li>maximise the benefits of brown field land in appropriate locations;</li> <li>build and sustain viable rural economies;</li> <li>improve the environmental performance of all employers;</li> </ul>				

<ul> <li>invest in learning especially early years and adult basic skills;</li> <li>widen participation in education, training and the labour market; change community attitudes towards enterprise; and promote enterprise development within disadvantaged areas.</li> </ul>	
Targets: None.	

# **CHANGE No. 4** - Insert the following in Appendix 1:

Oxfordshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2006		
Key aims, relevant objectives or targets/indicators	Implications for SA	LDF response
The plan is in two parts. Part 1: Statement of Action, sets out a vision and aims. Part 2 analyses the extent to which local rights of way meet present and future needs.	The aims have informed objective 6 in the SA Framework	positive planning framework for proposals to improve and extend
Targets: None.		the rights of way network.

# CHANGE NO 5 - Insert the following table in Appendix 1:

Chilterns AONB Management Plan and Framework for Action 2002-2007 (Chilterns Conservation Board, 2005)		
Key aims, relevant objectives or targets/indicators	Implications for SA	LDF response
The Management Plan contains a Vision for the Future of the Chiltern Hills and sets out broad aims and detailed policies under a number of themed headings to achieve this Vision. The themes are: landscape; nature conservation; the historic environment; the built environment; the water environment; people, jobs and services; agriculture and forestry; minerals and waste disposal; recreation and access; and travel and transport. The Action Plan contains projects and targeted proposals under each theme which are to be implemented over a three-year period.		The LDF should contain a planning framework which seeks to protect and enhance the landscape and other environmental assets of the AONB and at the same time fosters a sound rural economy
Targets: None.		and sustainable communities.

CHANGE No. 6 - Insert the following table in Appendix 1:

North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2004 (North Wessex Downs Council of Partners)

Key aims, relevant objectives or targets/indicators	Implications for SA	LDF response
The Management Plan comprises three Books. Book 1 entitled 'Landscape and	The themes have informed	The LDF should contain a
Context-Ambition for the Future' contains 14 themes which are aimed at conservation	objectives 7, 8, 9, 13 and 15 in	planning framework which seeks
and enhancement of natural beauty, nurturing sustainable rural economies and	the SA Framework.	to protect and enhance the
communities, and rising to the challenge. Book 2 entitled 'Policies for Delivery' contains		landscape and other
15 means of delivery for the 14 themes in Book 1. Book 3 is an Action Plan setting out		environmental assets of the
90 actions to be pursued by the AONB partners over a three to five year period.		AONB and at the same time
		fosters a sound rural economy
Targets: No specific targets but priority actions are identified.		and sustainable communities.

CHANGE No 7 - Insert the following table in Appendix 1:

Wallingford Town Centre The Future: Vision Strategy and Action Plan 2006 (Civic Trust, Wallingford Town Council and SODC)		
Key aims, relevant objectives or targets/indicators	Implications for SA	LDF response
This Plan examines the key social, economic and environmental strengths, weaknesses opportunities and threats faced by Wallingford town centre. The Plan contains six programmes which need to be acted upon to secure a sound future for the centre. These include improvements to parking and accessibility generally, creating new investment in and around the former Waitrose store, strengthening the role of Market Place as the heart and hub of the town centre, realising the potential of Wallingford's historic assets, raising the standard of the environment and setting up a town centre management partnership.	The programmes have informed objectives 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 14 and 15 in the SA Framework.	The LDF should contain a planning framework which will assist the Vision Strategy and Action Plan's proposals to be achieved.
<b>Targets:</b> No specific targets but the Indicative Action Plan contains a number of projects to be delivered by a new partnership over the short term (1 to 3 years) and longer term (4 to 10 years).		

CHANGE No. 8 – Insert the following table in Appendix 1

Working with the grain of nature: a biodiversity strategy for England 2002 (DEFRA)		
Key aims, relevant objectives or targets/indicators	Implications for SA	LDF response
The Strategy sets out a series of actions to be taken by Government wnd its partners to	The Strategy has informed	The LDF should contain a
make biodiversity a fundamental consideration in:	objectives 5, 7, 8, 9, and 13 in the	planning framework which seeks
<ul> <li>agriculture: managing farming and agricultural land so as to conserve and</li> </ul>	SA Framework.	to protect and enhance
enhance biodiversity;		biodiversity resources.
water: aiming for a whole catchment approach to the wise, sustainable use of		

water and wetlands;	
<ul> <li>woodland: managing and extending woodland so as to promote enhanced</li> </ul>	
biodiversity and quality of life;	
<ul> <li>marine and coastal management: so as to achieve the sustainable use and</li> </ul>	
management of coasts and seas using natural processes and the ecosystem-	
based approach;	
<ul> <li>urban areas: where biodiversity needs to become a part of the development of</li> </ul>	
policy on sustainable communities and urban green space and the built	
environment.	
The Strategy also looks at ways of engaging society as a whole in understanding the	
needs of biodiversity and what can be done to help conserve and enhance it.	
Targets: None.	

# CHANGE No 9 - Insert the following table in Appendix 1:

CITATOL ITO CONTROL AND THE POPULAR TE			
Action for Biodiversity in South East England 2001 (South East England Biodiversity Forum)			
Key aims, relevant objectives or targets/indicators	Implications for SA	LDF response	
This document provides an overview of 25 regional priority habitats in the South East	The Strategy has informed	The LDF should contain a	
and sets out targets for the maintenance, restoration or re-creation of these habitats.	objectives 5, 7, 8, 9, and 13 in the	planning framework which seeks,	
The document sets out the main impacts, opportunities and policy issues for each sector	SA Framework.	where appropriate, to protect,	
of the economy/regulatory bodies.		maintain, restore or re-create	
<b>Targets:</b> The targets for the following regional priority habitats are relevant to action for		priority habitats.	
biodiversity in South Oxfordshire: lowland meadows, lowland calcareous grassland,			
cereal field margins, lowland beech and yew woodland, ancient semi-natural woodland,			
lowland wood pasture and parkland, ancient and/or species rich hedgerows, reedbeds,			
fens, chalk rivers and mesotrophic standing water.			

# CHANGE No. 10 - Insert the following table in Appendix 1:

Village appraisals and Parish Plans		
Key aims, relevant objectives or targets/indicators	Implications for SA	LDF response
The following towns and villages have published Village Appraisals and Parish Plans	The Village Appraisals and Parish	Policies and proposals in the LDF
under the Countryside Agency's Vital Villages Programme: Benson (1992), Chinnor	Plans have informed objectives 1,	should take into account the
(1997), East Hagbourne (2000), Goring and Streatley (1992), Kidmore End (2000),	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14 and 15 in the	planning-related proposals
North Moreton (1989), Stoke Row (1995), Shiplake (2001), Whitchurch-on-Thames	SA Framework.	contained in the Village
(1992), Woodcote (2000), Warborough and Shillingford (1999), Wallingford (2002) and		Appraisals and Parish Plans.

Brightwell-cum-Sotwell (2004).
These Appraisals and Plans, which have been prepared with the involvement of local people, identify social, economic and environmental problems which affect quality of life in the settlements and contain proposals to overcome or mitigate them.

CHANGE No. 11 - Insert 'homeworking' after 'facilitating' in Message 3 in Table 1.

CHANGE No. 12 - Insert 'meeting places' after 'leisure facilities' in Message 9 in Table 1.

**CHANGE No. 13** - Amend Message 10 in Table 1 to read: 'Ensure that local services such as shops, transport and utility infrastructure, open space, health and leisure facilities, community meeting places and places of worship are delivered when needed by local communities.'

CHANGE No. 14 – Insert 'and enhance' after 'conserve' in Message 21 in Table 1.

CHANGE No. 15 - Insert 'and the emerging South East Plan.' after '2016' in Message 25 in Table 1.

CHANGE No. 16 - Insert 'and small businesses' after 'services' in Message 27 in Table 1.

**CHANGE No. 17** – Appendix 2, Objective 1, Indicator 1: Delete 'Ensure that a Housing Allocation DPD is prepared at an early stage to identify sufficient land outside Didcot to meet the Structure Plan's housing requirement to 2016.' Insert: 'Ensure that DPDs are prepared in good time to identify sufficient land to meet strategic housing requirements.'

**CHANGE No. 18** - Appendix 2, Objective 4, Indicator 5: Insert a third bullet point in Action for the LDF to read: 'where appropriate, the provision of housing development which would create a more balanced community age structure.'

**CHANGE No. 19** - Appendix 2, Objective 2, Indicator 4: Delete casualty information in column 2. Insert updated casualty information in column 2 as follows:

- total number of casualties in South Oxfordshire in 2004 were 564 and in 2005 they were 575
- total number of pedestrian casualties in 2004 were 30 per 100,000 and in 2005 they were 29 per 100,000

• total number of cyclist casualties in 2004 were 25 per 100,000 and in 2005 they were 18 per 100,000. Insert in column 2: 'Oxfordshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 contains targets to reduce by 2011 all serious road casualties by 50% and all serious child road casualties by 60%.'

Delete 16% in column 4 and insert 26%.

**CHANGE No. 20** - Appendix 2, Objective 6, Indicator 1: Insert the following in column 6: 'Mixed-use developments and designing all new developments to incorporate facilities for walking, cycling and public transport will enable choice of more sustainable modes of transport than the private car.'

**CHANGE No. 21** - Appendix 2, Objective 6, Indicator 2: Insert the following in column 5: 'The LDF should propose mixed-use developments, where appropriate, as these have the potential to reduce commuting to work by private car.'

**CHANGE No. 22** - Appendix 2, Objective 10, Indicator 1: Insert the following after the text in column 6: '...and the action points proposed in the following indicators of Objective 10.'

CHANGE No. 23 - Appendix 2, Objective 12, Indicator 1: Insert the following after the text in column 6: ' and composting.'

**CHANGE No. 24** - Appendix 2, Objective 7, Indicator 2: Insert a further Action for the LDF in column 7 to read: 'The LDF should also contain a standard for the creation of accessible natural greenspace in new developments where the opportunity should be taken to create UKBAP priority habitats.'

CHANGE No. 25 - Appendix 2, Objective 10(b): Delete 'maximising' and insert 'increasing.'

CHANGE No. 26 - Appendix 2, Objective 12: Delete 'minimise' and insert 'reduce.'

**CHANGE No. 27** - Appendix 2, Objective 13, Indicator 3: Insert in Action for the LDF: 'New developments of all kinds may need to be phased to take into account planned provision of water supply infrastructure.'

**CHANGE No. 28** - Appendix 2, Objective 2, Indicator 1: Insert the following second sentence in Action for the LDF: 'A positive planning framework is needed for works and measures designed to create safe town and village centres.'

**CHANGE No. 29** - Appendix 2, Objective 4, Indicator 5: Insert a third bullet point in the Action for the LDF to read: 'a more balanced age structure to be created in a community, where appropriate, to achieve well-being and social cohesion.'

**CHANGE No. 30** - Appendix 2, Objective 7, Indicator 2: Insert the following sentence in Action for the LDF: 'LDF proposals with the potential to significantly affect a European Site should be subject to Appropriate Assessment in accordance with the European Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC).'

**CHANGE No. 31** - Paragraph 20: Insert new final sentence: 'The numbering of the problems is for reference purposes only and does not indicate any order of priority.'

**CHANGE No. 32** - Table 2: Insert new economic problem to read: 'Threats to the vitality and viability of town and village centres.' The evidence for this problem is: 'Recent studies have shown that the vitality and viability of town and village centres in South Oxfordshire is being challenged. The threats to these centres include changing patterns of consumer spending and travel, increasing competition from larger town centres and relocation of businesses to out-of-centre locations (*South Oxfordshire Shopping Study 2000, Wallingford Town Centre: The Future, 2006*)'