<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woolf Bond on behalf of Croudace Strategic and Reading University (5991)</td>
<td>The draft seems fine to us ref North East Didcot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franky Cookson (2959)</td>
<td>I can understand the dilemma involved in juggling the national policy with the interests of existing residents. There is bound to be a conflict of interests between the developers, who now believe they should have automatic rights of approval - and local residents who believe that the infrastructure of road and rail transport and parking is already stretched to the limits, and that even the water supply could be threatened, if the housing stock and population were to grow significantly in this already crowded area. My worry is that the balance has now swung too far in favour of the developers. However, that does not address your question, since you have to work with the law as it now stands. I therefore feel that the Model Policy might work, so long as the phrase ‘unless material considerations indicate otherwise’ is meaningful – and allows time for local objections, in every case, to be heard and assessed. In my view, without this consideration, the whole policy is doomed to give rise, time and time again, to significant and highly vocal local objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Haylett (5144)</td>
<td>The answer is ‘no’ as the proposed development is not sustainable. Nor does it improve the social, economic and environmental conditions in the area because the extra traffic it would generate which would come through the village would damage our ancient buildings and the environment. Applying the ‘model policy’ would not give an outcome which is the right one for Long Wittenham. Long Wittenham should be able to have a say in the development within its parish boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Engbers (2092)</td>
<td>I would like to confirm that including the model policy would be an appropriate way to secure consistency with national policy. I have read the wording carefully and feel it appropriate to be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wessex Downs AONB (485)</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Williams (5843/6085)</td>
<td>Do not believe that the “Model Policy” should be included into the SODC Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Fowler (3740)</td>
<td>I must disagree with the policy as there is no definition of what &quot;Sustainable development&quot; actually means. In order for the model policy to work there must be an agreed definition of sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CgMs on behalf of Thames Properties Ltd (5635)</td>
<td>We would be content for the model policy noted within your letter to be incorporated within the Core Strategy and believe that this would be an appropriate way of securing consistency with the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcote Parish Council (816)</td>
<td>The comments from Woodcote Parish Council are broadly they support the policy, but point to a degree of concern balanced by policy restrain in any areas of AONB. Also they assume that Neighbourhood Plans will be taken into consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Anthony Wright (5099)</td>
<td>You quote a Model Policy. I have been well educated but, frankly, find it difficult to understand. It seems to me to be saying that you will always try to approve applications by assuming that any application is a good one and will be for the benefit of the area involved unless very strong reasons can be found to decline the application. This seems to be a Policy that will not necessarily work to the advantage of local residents. In this regard I have had discussions with several of my neighbours and we would like to remind you and your colleagues that Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty were given that status for very good reasons and we should be mindful to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
protect them at all costs. Once such an area has been built on we have lost it forever. We may have an immediate problem of housing a growing population but we should take the long term view that we need the bio diversity the countryside brings. Also, in years to come we may need that land for farming and food when countries overseas cease to sell us theirs given that they are also experiencing, in some cases to a greater degree than we are, the pressures of an ever expanding population. Planning is a complex business and my neighbours and I are not professionals. We, therefore, look to the likes of you to protect our interests and the areas in which we live. Most developers rarely take into account the wishes of local residents; they are almost solely driven by profits. Any policy that excessively favours developers is not, therefore, one that is likely to find favour with local residents.

Odette Moss (2224) See Annex 2

David Denham (5) on behalf of:
Darcliffe Homes
Country Estates Ltd
J Mould Property Ltd
Breedons Ltd

We support the wording of the Model Policy from the Planning Portal, except we are concerned about the words "unless material considerations indicate otherwise." This is too big a loophole for the Council to wriggle through. "Material considerations" should be clearly specified or they can apply to anything. Secondly "indicate otherwise" is too weak a criterion. What does "indicate" mean? It can mean you are not sure of something but the indications are that .... etc etc. Stronger words should be used, such as "clearly show that relevant planning objections outweigh any advantage" ... of the proposals. We shall be grateful if you would pass these comments on to the Inspector.

Jeremy P G Croxson (5190)

My principle concern is the wording of "material considerations indicate otherwise." Are these defined anywhere? Without a firm definition there could be augments as what these are. One persons idea of a material consideration may not agree with the some else’s idea - in particular the planning officers. The sentence is to vague and will lead to constant appeals.

Oxfordshire County Council (677)

Thank you for consulting Oxfordshire County Council on whether South Oxfordshire’s Core Strategy reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF. This Council has no comments to make on whether the Core Strategy reflects this or if it should contain the model policy; the district is best placed to assess.

Dr P A Cawse (2663)

I support the "Model Policy" text as given in your letter. It should certainly emphasise and ensure the validity of a development ie. That it will improve (or at least maintain) and not degrade the established economic, social and environmental conditions in a specific area, whether rural or urban.

Mr R Harrington (861) See Annex 3
R W G Lewis (3887) See Annex 4
Mrs C Jarvis (3091) See Annex 5
Mrs Barklie (5262) See Annex 6
Mrs Rubinstein (1987) See Annex 7
1. The inclusion of the model policy is not in itself going to make the whole Core Strategy NPPF compliant. The model policy is really referring to “decision-taking” and makes no reference to the section on “plan making” which also exists within paragraph 14 of the NPPF. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF does not intend to implement a “presumption in favour of sustainable development” in all locations. It actually states that “Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:” and the second consideration given states that “specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted” at which point footnote 9 is referred to. Footnote 9 states “For example, those policies relating to sites protected…and/or designated as SSSIs; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty…”. Therefore, there needs to be a stage before this model policy where there is an understanding and identification within the Core Strategy where development might be “restricted”.

2. Within the Core Planning Principles (paragraph 17) of the NPPF one of the principles states that planning should “contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this framework..” The need to “conserve and enhance” is a cross reference of the text from Section 82 of the CRoW Act 2000 in relation to AONB designations. The NPPF also vitally highlights the need for Councils to differentiate between land of the highest environmental quality and that not and to allocate development accordingly to areas of lesser environmental value. This is an important principle that needs consideration as part of the Core Strategy allocations process and again cannot in itself be confined to a model policy on development proposals.

3. There are of course specific policies in the NPPF that do indicate that development should be restricted with AONBs. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.” The NPPF continues at paragraph 116 stating that “Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest.” Although considerations are given to when exceptions may be given for planning applications, there is no indication or support given to the need for major development to be actually allocated within designated areas.

4. In conclusion, the model policy is a helpful summary of some of the key points of the NPPF in the decision taking process. However, the NPPF also confirms various principles for the plan making process, including identifying where development may be restricted, the location of allocations to land of lesser environmental value, and that great weight should be given to conserving AONBs. A Core Strategy to be sound therefore would also need to demonstrate these NPPF plan making principles have been incorporated within the Plan.
Programme Manager
Mrs H Wilson
32 Penneyford Close
Brockhill
Redditch
Worcestershire
B97 6TW

4th May 2012

Dear Madam,

It is with dismay I try to answer the letter received on the 23rd of April.
As I live in a small village which has a Parish council consisting of 5 councillors and
one clerk I feel concerned about the future representation I can make about planning
and the location of housing in our village and the necessary support
that will be required.
The parish council has no representation under the localism act which appears to have
superseded the NPPF unless we join in with our nearest town’s development plan
which obviously will want housing built outside the confines of the Town.
I had understood under the NPPF framework small villages would not be saturated
with housing particularly if they had no facilities such as schools and very narrow
roads unsuitable for HGV’s with no passing places.
As I understand it I am asked to comment under the following headings whether the
Localisation plan ( Neighbourhood Plan) supports the NPPF framework.

1. Economic ( as envisaged in the NPPF framework)

A Infra structure should occur before houses are built, but I suggest this will not be
occur ,as in the case of Henley on Thames my nearest town. The infra
structure to support the 400 houses recommended will be massive. The principal
difficulty being roads and traffic circulation.
This will be costly who meets the cost?
I believe highway departments in Oxfordshire are already short of finances in
the present financial climate and can not maintain roads at present.
It is debatable whether future governments will support the infra structure to
support housing in towns and villages.

B Developers will buy the land if banks will accommodate loans required
and may provide some infra structure.

C There is very little full time employment in Henley.
2. Social
A Communication is poor in my village, there is no signal for a mobile phone
And broadband is very slow.

B All services will need to be strengthened in towns and surrounding villages
Police, social services, Dr’s surgeries, schools, youth and elderly services.
The fire department is voluntary in Henley.
These costs will be ongoing and borne by a number of different agencies.
All the organisations will have to see if their contribution to the neighbourhood plan is possible and supportive.

Note
It is interesting to note that Henley on Thames has been trying for 20 years
to sustain its population with an adequate hospital, plans are still not finalised
because of protests over traffic problems.

C There are many sporting clubs in Henley and all types of cultural entertainment
Theatre and cinema.
The river is sacrosanct to rowers as this is the home of these athletes and
and overcrowding of their training areas might cause friction.

3 Environment
A. I understood the ANOB was to be protected under THE NPPF as emphasised
by the Inspectors notes written for the explanatory meeting in May. He stated
the ANOB which like National Parks has the highest status of protection in
relation to landscape and beauty.

B I am not convinced the new localism plan takes in the concepts of the NPPF.
In my village the local district council has highlighted 3 sites in my village
suitable for housing.
All in the ANOB and a fourth overlooking the ANOB. Two of the sites have
been refused planning permission in the past because the ANOB is protected.

C The implications for small villages as regards traffic such as my village with very
narrow single track roads with no passing places and for all entrances to Henley
Town will need an environmental assessment plan.

In conclusion I believe the localism plan will not assist rural villages to protect The
ANOB or provide the infrastructure to design an environment which is safe and
pleasant for young families to enjoy.
I had the impression when the NPPF was produced only large villages with infra
structure such as railway stations, bus services, schools, shops and land would be
Targeted so far the areas highlighted by the local district council are in a small village
with no school or facilities. A large village with some infra structure would be
Economical in the short term.

Yours sincerely

Odette M Moss
8 May 2012

Dear Mrs Wilson,

At your request, what follows are my comments arising from your letter of 23 April, enquiring about the model planning policy.

Firstly, where did this completely out of context word "sustainable" come from? What is "sustainable development"?

Development is development. Which ever way you look at it, it means digging up fields and building houses. The developer may plant a few trees and build some cycle paths etc., I presume this makes it sustainable?

"Presumption in favour of development?" This is just a steamroller for developers who will presume it is permissive for them to build where, what and when they want, outside of A.O.N.B.'s. This flies in the face of the government's policies on "Localism". If local people do not feel a development is, required, or suitable, or is too large, or is not for local people, surely they can say so!

In South Oxfordshire we have for some considerable time been discussed through local council and public meetings the care strategy. Most local people think it adequate for our needs. A Inspector, Mr Foster, is trying to
make huge changes to our core strategy (I think very wrongly). He does not really understand our local concerns and requirements, but he does know that sometime in the past he was told he was an expert. Maybe he knows better than our local, and town council also most people in the area.

One of the big problems with "The presumption in favour of development" statement is this.

Developers can sell houses in our Oxfordshire area at 3 or 4 times the price they can north of The Wash. If you were a developer where would press home the 'Presumption Factor'?

This is where the policy is flawed and will eventually lead to gross overdevelopment in Southern England. The transport and water supply problems this will bring, along with the complete destruction of quality of life, will truly bring the "Sustainability" quotation to an abrupt end.

Yours Faithfully

Mr Robert Harrington,
29th April 2012

Mrs. Helen Wilson,
Programme Officer, SODC,
Redditch B97 6TW

Dear Madam,

CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

I refer to your letter of 23 April. I consider 'the presumption in favour of sustainable development' to be a thoroughly irritating phrase. It is so vague as to be almost meaningless and yet dangerous in that it could be used to support inadvisable schemes.

With that in mind I find it almost impossible to directly answer the query raised in your letter. My observations would be:

1. The model policy does not seem to reflect the rewriting of the National Planning Policy Framework to include new protections for the countryside.
2. I would be fearful of applications that accord with the policies in the Local Plan being approved without delay. It seems to me that the Local Plan for Henley has been prepared without sufficient consideration being given to the overall impact of the proposed developments. The suggested sites in the Harpsden area cannot be considered without looking at the impact on the local infrastructure, particularly the roads/lanes and also the impact on the environment much of which is in an area of outstanding natural beauty.
3. I understand that consideration is being given to developing a neighbourhood plan for Henley. I would hope that if this is adopted more forward thinking and ingenuity would be used along the lines of the plan suggested by the Chairman of Harpsden Parish Council in his letter to the Henley Standard of 27th April.

In summary, I would reiterate that I do not fully understand the detail of your letter but I cannot agree that the inclusion of the model policy would provide consistency with national policy which requires additional protection for the countryside.

I presume that you have written to me as a result of my letter of 20th March but to reiterate my comments I include a copy of that letter.

Yours faithfully,

R.W.G. Lewis BSc (Econ) FCA
Dear Mrs Wilson,

With reference to your letter dated the 23rd of April.

It is very difficult to comment on a National Planning Policy that is being forced upon us. We have already given our opinions on the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy.

Over the last twenty plus years vast amounts of homes have been built in our area in the neighbouring County of Berkshire and part of South Oxfordshire (Didcot).

Statistically due to our open door immigration policy and natural population increase, we will need three Cities the size of Birmingham in approximately twenty years time to house our growing population!

Do agree with tagging on to existing towns, especially small Country Market towns which have small narrow roads and poor infrastructure which will be
unable to cope with a huge population increase?; the answer to this question is No!

I attended a Town Conference at the Henley Town Council Offices on the 30th of April. Most of the questions being asked were some of the points I put forward when replying to the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy. One younger Gentleman stood up and asked a very sensible question. What will happen when the housing developments are completed, will I find myself here in another fifteen years discussing additional housing developments for the next fifteen years?" A deadly silence fell upon the conference, the reply finally came from one of the four panels; Mr Chris Bowden, Navique Planning. The answer being "possibly, yes".

I personally think Government Planning should go back to the drawing board and find three areas in the United Kingdom where they can build new towns from scratch with the scope to expand, with water storage/reservoirs. Unfortunately this will not happen!

Yours Sincerely

MRS V. Y. Jarvis
Dear Mrs Wilson,

Thank you for your letter of the 23rd of April 2012 which I received by post.

As a resident of Werrington with no detailed knowledge of the implications of the National Planning Policy Framework either as a town or district councillor or as a developer, my concern is not only for the intrinsic preservation of but also the coordinated development of our market towns and villages in keeping with their rural nature integral to the surrounding countryside.

I fear that negotiations between developers, eager to build as many homes as possible usually on green land on the outskirts of our towns and local councillors or other landowners requiring money for alternative amenities, may not result in the best decisions for the inhabitants as a whole.

In these austere times of high housing costs as well as commuting costs and few long term
employment opportunities, I should like to be
convinced that the NPPF would ensure the use
of brownfield and town centre infill to house
key workers and future young people who wish
to settle at comparatively low cost where they have
family connections.

We are privileged in this small country
to have such a variety of landscapes from
north to south, each with its distinctive rural architecture. It is the delight and envy
of our many tourist visitors from all over the
world and as such it is good for our
economy. My trust is that the powers
within the NPPF can safeguard this situation
for future generations.

My apologies for this rather late reply.
I confess to a cold and a rather lousy April
dullifying me but I appreciate the importance
of this issue for South Oxfordshire, its councillors
and its inhabitants.

Yours faithfully,

ELIZABETH BARKLIE (Mrs)
MRS. VIVYENNE RUBINSTEIN MA FRSA

11th May 2012

[450x760]

Core Strategy Examination-SOJC
Henley Free

Dear Madam,

In order for the SOJC Core Strategy to be consistent with the NPPF it must clearly reflect, not only the general NPPF policy, but also the situations in which development should not automatically be granted. It is my understanding that the NPPF specifically protects the AONB, as well as other areas of valued countryside, and also requires the existence of adequate infrastructure. The model policy quoted in your letter of 24.4.12 refers in general terms to these specific exclusions without spelling them out, and therefore, in my view is inadequate in reflecting the NPPF.

As the general case, what concerns me most is that at least all these planned words - a lawyer's procedure - the actual allocation of sites being put forward by SOJC for the Henley area are in direct conflict with these specific restrictions as they would:

a) Damage the AONB - especially at Tree Top, which would be visible from all the public footpaths on the S side of the Thames Valley and from the many other higher viewpoints in the valley, both roads and walkes.

b) they would lack sustainability due to the absence of adequate infrastructure - local schools are full, Gillets Lane is unsafe, the highways authority are very concerned about access at various points in Henley, there are also potential over-water supply, and so on.

What has become of the Inspector's view, expressed in his guidance for May 2011, of the need to

"be sure that the requirement placed on the SADPO to allocate new sites for some 400 new homes will not place inappropriate stress on the nationally protected landscape of the AONB which (like National Parks) has the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty?"

Yours faithfully,

(Past Chair of Henley PC)

cc SOJC Planning Dept.