

Oxfordshire Youth COMMENT	Support for community hub and benefits it will offer youth.			
Highways England COMMENT	Have reviewed the NDP and supporting documents and have no comments.			
Didcot Town Council COMMENT	Support.			
Mike Duff	Suggests that the NDP should focus on small sites in line with NPPF 68 so that the two large sites (hub and Fieldside) are not so large/homogeneous as to alter the character of the village.			
COMMENT	The Fieldside site was put forward because it had been allowed on appeal. The hub site was chosen because it was felt that the proposal should best be delivered on one site (see arguement in site assessment). No change proposed.			
Jeremy Croxon COMMENT	Pointed out typos etc. changes made accordingly.			
Gill Nichol	Suggests that footpaths will not lead to public transport connections in Clifton Hampden. Suggests that children will not attend the local primary school.			
COMMENT	There is no bus service to CH but there is a train station at Culham. Must assume that children will use their local primary school.			
Julia Carberry COMMENT	NDP will help relieve congestion on high street. Will bring new customers to local inn.			
Dominic Jarman	Hub allocation is larger site than originally put to the community and therefore he objects.			
COMMENT	The reasons for the site selection are set out in the site allocation document. Response sent. Need to indicate that land for playing fields is meant for that purpose and not housing.			
Graham Neil	Hub site is larger than site originally put to the community. Danger of development in the view corridor - need to keep this land open. Ensure that additional land allocation is not used for housing. Objects to plan because of "creeping development" and children will not use the school. Should abandon the project.			
COMMENT	The reasons for the site selection are set out in the site allocation document. Response sent. Need to indicate that land for playing fields is meant for that purpose and not housing.			
Julian Gtsham representing Wittenham Against Overdevelopment	Poor English; need glossary, references not clear; should use the defined village boundary, poor diagrams, review site 9 in light of recent planning history;			
COMMENT	WAO has submitted tracked changes which will be considered individually.			
Charlotte Treacy Ben Loxton-Edwards	Object to size of hub allocation because of impacts on views of Wittenham Clumps. Land near village should not be developed for housing.			
COMMENT	Illustrate on allocation that views will be preserved. Clarify on plans where built and open land is expected and refer to preservation of views.			
Reading University COMMENT	Response prepared by Barton Willmore. They make reference to NPPF 2018. See detailed response.	Does not incorporate sufficient flexibility to consider alternatives sites for a community hub if the scenario under LW1 fails to be delivered. See detailed response.	Consider that the draft policy is not supported by national or local planning policy and is contrary to the long-term development objectives for Didcot Garden Town. Policy should be removed. See detailed response.	Policy is incorrectly worded and refers to views that do not require protection. See detailed response.

POLICY LW4 - GREEN GAP

Figure 8 does not relate to field boundaries and does not relate to landscape features

NPPF does not support Green Gaps (170)

SO Local Plan and Oxon Core Strategy do not contain policies on green gaps

Not supported by local policy, therefore does not meet basic conditions

Map has been redrawn to be more indicative, less specific
changed emphasis on Green Gap designation

changed emphasis on Green Gap designation
Didcot Market Town policies support the green gap as set out in evidence.

Note: the evidence paper has been extensively rewritten (supporting text and policy) in response to all comments received and the references to the Reg 14 version no longer apply to the submission version.

Objective A -

The viewing corridor is not protected by the green gap

This was identified in the original NDP. Objective A does not refer to this view which is discussed under Objective K.

The character assessment does not identify "key views" between southern and western extent of village. The views from Didcot are obscured by various landscape features. There are no key views that require protection.

Figure 13 is incorrect re. Sire's Hill (which is referred to as Shires Hill in the text)

There has been no visual assessment to support protection of views from Didcot towards Long Wittenham and Appleford as needing special protection.

The character assessment was prepared for the original NDP. This is a review and additional evidence for the additional views has been provided in the evidence paper which updates the character assessment. With regard to the view from Didcot towards the parish of Long Wittenham the RU comment is correct and reference to views from Didcot have been removed.

Corrected typo

The view is shown in the Photo Location 1. Reference to view from Didcot has been removed.

Objective B -

The Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan seeks to deliver growth

But within its own settlement and at specified locations that do not include Long Wittenham. The new Thames Road crossing has been discussed in the evidence paper.

The delivery plan does not support "green gaps" but rather "green buffers" surrounding the "necklace of villages" - supporting text indicates that this is a broad-brushed approach that should be mapped and evaluated. NDP does not have not been mapped and evaluated.

There has been no assessment of the function of the landscape within the green gap but rather a broad brushed approach. However, this does not extend to protect the landscape to the south and east of the village, and therefore not comprehensive, reasoned or justifiable.

The Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan uses the term "green gap" in its figure 8.7. It is beyond the scope of the NDP resources to map and evaluate all land within the parish and so relies upon the Landscape Character Assessment which supports the Didcot delivery plan. There has been extensive landscape evaluation supporting the garden town delivery plan which has been added to the evidence paper. It will be up to applicants to provide evidence how this development principle has been addressed in the proposal. There has been extensive landscape evaluation supporting the garden town delivery plan which has been added to the evidence paper. It will be up to applicants to provide evidence how this development principle has been addressed in the proposal.

Objective C

ENV1 already protects against inappropriate development

The purpose of this objective to to add local justification why this policy is necessary and how it should be supported in the Long Wittenhan context. It therefore supports ENV1.

CSEN1 also offers protection.

The purpose of this objective to to add local justification why this policy is necessary and how it should be supported in the Long Wittenhan context. It therefore supports CSEN1. The safeguarded area is of strategic importance and would override this policy. However, in the interest of clarity, point C will be modified to include reference to "strategic infrastructure".

New River Thames crossing assists in promoting new development for Didcot Garden Town - the safeguarded land lies within the Green Gap. This is contrary to Didcot GT objectives

Objective D

The land between Didcot and Long Wittenham village is intensively farmed. The Didcot GT delivery plan seeks to improve this landscape. The principle would not allow development that might further this objective.

The policy clearly refers to development that would be allowed in the green gap, all of which have the potential to improve landscape quality through careful design.

Objective E

The AONB position statement does not seek to restrict development entirely. The Green Gap policy is more onerous than required.

Core Strategy CSEN1 and CSEN2 and emerging policy ENV1 seek to preserve the setting of the AONB. The setting of the AONB is a constraint which, added to other constraints for development in the Green Gap, adds weight to the need to restrict certain forms of development there.

Objective F

The Green Belt is visually separated from Long Wittenham by the River, intervening vegetation and the village. The Green Belt could add development pressure to Didcot and Long Wittenham.

Objective F relates to the River Thames Corridor in policy CSEN1iii. This comment does not relate to the stated policy. However, if it in error referred to Objective F, the reference in the policy to Green Belt has been removed on advice from the local planning authority.

Objective G

Development plan policies regarding River Thames Corridor do not refer to green gaps.

This appears to refer to Objective F which refers to the River Thames. The policy should be read in its totality - the development plan policies regarding the River Thames Corridor add weight to the need to restrict certain forms of development there.

Objective H

The NDP does not allow flexibility in the route of the proposed Garden Line.

This has been addressed above with regard to Objective C.

Objective I

It is the role of the relevant Local Authority and the Environment Agency to determine effects of development in areas subject to flooding.

The reference to flooding has been removed from the NDP policy though it was present in an earlier version.

Objective J

The methodology for assessment in the Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan identified the need to evaluate heritage assets, map conservation areas and listed buildings and historic landscape features (etc) to inform the extent of green buffers.

There is no Objective J so it is assumed that this comment refers to Objective G (urban fringe). See response to Objective B.

Objective K

Repetition of Objective A

See response to Objective A

Conclusion on policy LW4

the policy fails to comply with the basic conditions and should be removed from the LWNDP

For the reasons stated above, the policy does comply with basic conditions. However, wording of the supporting text will be modified to make clear that the objectives should be read in their totality.

LW1

The policy lacks flexibility if the community hub proposal fails to proceed. Additional wording is suggested that alternative sites will be considered.

It is correct to state that the policy lacks flexibility. The policy is for the community hub proposal on the allocated site on Didcot Road. Clause C ensures that if the proposal fails, i.e. provisions Ba-f are not delivered, then housing development will also not be delivered. The fall back position is the existing land use across the village. An alternative site is not required at this time because if the hub scheme fails, it will by definition not proceed, and there will be no need for an alternative site. In this eventuality, the Parish Council will need to consider alternatives as a whole, not merely related to land, and this will need to be addressed in the next review of the NDP.

LW8

Consider that Ad is too restrictive and the view was not identified in the Character Assessment 2016. The policy should be removed due to lack of detailed landscape assessment.

LW10

The policy is at odds with Oxon County Council parking standards and the wording should be revised with new wording.

As the comment makes clear, it is expected that applicants will formally assess the impact of their development on the view from Didcot towards Long Wittenham and Appleford Villages. The wording to this policy has been modified on advice from the planning authority. The landscape assessment supporting the Didcot Garden Town delivery plan has been added to the Countryside evidence paper.

The planning authority has recommended changes to this policy which make reference to the adopted parking standards.