



Comment form Joint Local Plan in a Nutshell Consultation

A Local Plan looks ahead fifteen years and plans how much development is needed in an area, like new homes, jobs, roads and schools, and where they should go. South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils are working together to produce a new Joint Local Plan.

This plan will be different from the last Local Plans for our area, in particular it doesn't need to plan for the same scale of growth as last time. Our focus will be to continue to build out most of the sites already planned, consider development on new brownfield sites, and make sure the new policies are stronger on zero carbon development, nature recovery, protecting the countryside and providing facilities for communities.



Our vision for the Joint Local Plan is...

For **carbon neutral** districts, for current and future generations.

For this to be a place where **nature** is thriving, and nature reserves are no longer isolated pockets. A place where **history** is still visible, where heritage and landscape character are safeguarded and valued, and the beauty and the distinctive local identity of our countryside, towns and villages have been enhanced.

A place where **people can thrive**. Where people have housing choices they can afford, where villages, market towns and garden communities are diverse and inclusive places where people of all ages and backgrounds can live together.

A place where residents can reach the **facilities** they need for everyday living on foot, bicycle, wheeling, public transport or by zero-emission and low carbon **transport choices**.

Where residents and visitors can live **healthy lifestyles** and access greenspace.

Where **people are safe** from pollution, flooding, and the effects of climate change.

Where there are valuable and rewarding **jobs**, embracing clean technologies and growing the opportunities in Science Vale for the districts to contribute on a national and international scale to solving pressing global issues.

We are also striving to listen to residents and make it easier for people to contribute their ideas.

To help, this *Joint Local Plan in a Nutshell* is a short summary of what's in the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation document (available to view alongside this comment form) with quickfire questions. You can answer as many or as few questions as you like.

If you want to tell us about particular policy topics or draft plan text, there's also the option of reading the full detail and giving us in depth feedback via the Joint Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation form, available alongside this comment form.

Whichever you choose, we're really grateful for your time, your comments help shape the local plan.

This consultation ran from 10 January - 26 February 2024.

If you have any questions on the comment form or require it in an alternative format (for example large print, Braille, audio, email, Easy Read and alternative languages) please email jointheconversation@southandvale.gov.uk or call **01235 422425**.

Personal details?

If you submit a comment on the Joint Local Plan Preferred Options consultation (or a comment is submitted on your behalf), it may be published in full or as a summary alongside your name (where provided). Comments submitted by businesses or organisations may be made public (including online publication) alongside the name of the business or organisation provided. If you submit a comment on behalf of a business/organisation or client, it may be published in full or as a summary alongside your name and the name of the business/organisation/client it is on behalf of (where details are provided). No other personal contact details will be published. If your comment relates to matters outside the scope of planning but falls within the remit of another team at the councils, we may share your comments with these internal teams where relevant.

To find out how your personal data is used for these consultations and for information on how the council holds, uses and stores your personal data, please refer to our Privacy Policy available at deposit locations or on our websites at

**southoxon.gov.uk/jointheconversation or
whitehorsedc.gov.uk/jointheconversation**

Your contact details

1. Are you responding as a:

- Member of the public
- Agent, developer or landowner
- District, county or town/parish councillor
- Town/parish council
- Neighbourhood Planning Group
- Community or interest group
- Statutory body (Environment Agency, National Highways, Natural England etc.)
- Utility company or infrastructure provider
- Business/organisation
- Another planning authority
- Other (please specify below):

.....

2. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, what is the name of that organisation?

3. If you live in the districts, what is your postcode?

Section 1: How many new homes



The existing Local Plans for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse (southoxon.gov.uk/localplan or whitehorsedc.gov.uk/localplan2031) contain historically high housing targets for the districts because of:

- The Housing and Growth Deal (gov.uk/government/publications/oxfordshire-housing-deal), which granted councils in Oxfordshire extra funding for infrastructure and affordable housing provided they planned to build the 100,000 homes that a growth needs assessment had identified were needed
- All district councils agreeing to cover unmet housing need from Oxford City, which led to a higher level of house building in their areas.

In this Local Plan we propose a lower annual level of new housing for our need, which is calculated by using the standard formula set out in the Government's planning guidance.

4. How far do you agree or disagree with the principle of reducing the housing target in the new Joint Local Plan?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

5. If you have any comments on this proposal, please provide them below.

Section 2: Large sites for housebuilding



Because of the large amount of housing already planned, there is a lot in the pipeline still to be built.



This means that the Joint Local Plan won't need to identify a lot of land for housing.

6. Our preferred option does not include significant new sites for large scale housebuilding beyond the sites already identified for development in the last local plans. How far do you agree or disagree with this approach?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

7. If you have any comments on this proposal, please provide them below.

Section 3: Net zero-carbon development



We'd like to raise standards of development so that future new buildings use less energy, are more climate-change friendly and cheaper to run. This is likely to mean that new buildings are built to be highly energy-efficient and include renewable energy technology like solar panels and heat pumps.

Our current South Oxfordshire local plan policy goes beyond the requirements set out in Building Regulations. The plan gives dates for when carbon reduction standards increase, until reaching zero carbon development in 2030. Our current Vale of White Horse local plan doesn't set any carbon reduction standards.

We want to go further than our current plans and deliver new development that is truly net zero across both districts. Reducing carbon emissions against those set out in Building Regulations has its flaws, because Building Regulations only count regulated energy (fixed building services, such as heating), which only accounts for 50% of the carbon emissions of a building. Unregulated energy (energy from plug-in appliances) is not covered by the current Building Regulations, nor is the carbon associated with the processes and materials used to construct those buildings, known as embodied carbon. As our current policy approach doesn't cover unregulated energy or embodied carbon, it won't achieve truly net zero carbon buildings.

Therefore, we want to introduce a policy that deals with all of the carbon associated with new buildings, setting the highest standards possible to deliver true net zero carbon buildings, while not making it too expensive for development to go ahead¹.

¹ We will review our approach in the light of the Written Ministerial Statement entitled 'Planning - Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update' dated 13 December 2023

8. How far do you agree or disagree with the Joint Local Plan raising standards to achieve net zero carbon development across South and Vale?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

9. If you have any comments on this proposal, please provide them below.

Section 4: Affordable homes

We know that house prices are higher than the national average across our districts, especially in some hotspots. This makes it difficult for many people to get on to the housing ladder or to find accommodation they can afford locally. The main way planning can help with this is to require developers to provide a proportion of 'affordable homes' when they build homes for sale. These affordable homes are homes that cost less than normal to rent, buy or part-buy (known as shared ownership). People can qualify for these new affordable homes if they are on the Council's housing register (southoxon.gov.uk/housing-register or whitehorsedc.gov.uk/housing-register) are first time buyers, for example.

Current policy for South Oxfordshire is that 40% of homes on larger sites should be affordable (or 50% on sites at the edge of Oxford), and in Vale of White Horse this is 35%. In the Joint Local Plan we plan to raise this to 50% everywhere. This is so we can help more people who need an affordable home, without increasing the total number of homes being built. This policy, along with all the other policies, will need testing to ensure development can still happen, this is called a viability assessment.

10. How far do you agree or disagree with the Affordable Housing percentages?


	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	I don't know
South Oxfordshire (50%)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vale of White Horse (50%)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. If you selected disagree or strongly disagree, what percentage of Affordable Housing would you propose?

	More than 50%	Less than 50%	Keep existing percentage
South Oxfordshire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vale of White Horse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. If you have any comments on this proposal, please provide them below.

Section 5: Jobs



Our districts have strong local economies. Our towns and villages are home to many small and medium sized businesses, which, along with rural enterprises, provide jobs and vital services. We are also home to regionally, nationally and globally important employment areas, including Culham Science Centre, Milton Park and Harwell Campus. The area in our districts where these significant employment parks are located is known as ‘Science Vale’.

Our evidence shows that we need to provide around 26 hectares of employment land in South Oxfordshire and around 113 hectares of employment land in Vale of White Horse over the plan period. This is less than we planned for in the current South and Vale local plans.

We have enough available land on our existing employment sites, and enough employment land coming forward through approved planning applications, so we don’t need to find any new employment sites in the Joint Local Plan to meet our needs up to 2041.

Our preference is therefore to meet our employment land needs on the land we’ve already identified for employment. We will also support employment development on our existing employment sites and on brownfield sites within settlements.

13. How far do you agree or disagree with our approach to employment land?


- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

14. If you selected disagree or strongly disagree, what would you propose?

- Plan for less
- Plan for more
- I don't know

15. If you have any comments on this proposal, please provide them below.

Section 6: Where development will go







Our spatial strategy is an important policy at the heart of the Joint Local Plan. It sets out clearly where new development like housing and employment will be supported and where it will be limited so that it meets the objectives of the plan, like encouraging sustainable travel and protecting our communities and the environment.

In this plan we propose to deliver development planned in Science Vale, at our Garden Communities (Didcot Garden Town, Berinsfield Garden Village and Dalton Barracks Garden Village) and at settlements at the highest tiers of our settlement hierarchy with the best and biggest range of facilities. We've updated our settlement hierarchy to direct development to a smaller number of settlements.

In practice this means simply delivering the growth already planned in the adopted local plans and neighbourhood plans, we don't need to add more greenfield development beyond that at our towns and villages in order to meet housing targets.

However we will support new development on two new potential brownfield site allocations at Dalton Barracks and Crowmarsh Gifford (we ask you about these details later on at Section 14)

<p>Existing planned and new brownfield development at Science Vale, Garden Communities and Tiers 1, 2 and 3 of the settlement hierarchy (see map) (our preferred approach)</p>	
<p>Greenfield expansion at the towns and larger villages</p>	
<p>Co-location of housing and employment, including development on greenfield sites</p>	
<p>A dispersed pattern of development including more at smaller villages</p>	

16. What kind of spatial strategy do you think we should adopt? Please rank from 1 to 4, with 1 being your preferred approach and 4 being your least preferred.

Existing planned and new brownfield development at Science Vale, Garden Communities and Tiers 1, 2 and 3 of the settlement hierarchy (see map) (our preferred approach)

Greenfield expansion at the towns and larger villages

Co-location of housing and employment, including development on greenfield sites

A dispersed pattern of development including more at smaller villages

17. If you have any comments, please provide them below.

Consultation now closed

Section 7: Neighbourhood plans

Our Councils are big proponents of neighbourhood planning. We have over fifty completed neighbourhood plans and many more on the way, this is higher coverage than in most areas of the country. You can see these and link through to the plans via our neighbourhood plan maps (southoxon.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plans or whitehorsedc.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plans/).

In the last South Oxfordshire Local Plan, we gave neighbourhood plans a housing target to work to and invited communities to make decisions locally on which sites should be developed for housing and other uses like employment. Many communities took up this challenge and have used neighbourhood planning to take control of their destinies, and also protect land by, for example, designating Local Green Space, which gives the same level of protection as Green Belt.

This time we don't have housing requirements to delegate to neighbourhood plans in South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse. But we want to support the preparation of new Neighbourhood Plans, and encourage ambitious projects if Parish or Town Councils want to deliver more.

18. If a Town or Parish Council wanted to deliver more homes as part of their neighbourhood plan, how far do you agree or disagree with the Joint Local Plan including a strategy allowing allocation for further land for development?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

19. If you have any comments on this proposal, please provide them below.

Section 8: Transport and travel



We're aiming for a plan that moves us towards a more sustainable transport system, where people don't need to drive everywhere by private car and can choose sustainable transport options like walking and cycling, public and shared transport for more of their journeys, as well as less polluting, electric and alternative fuel cars. To do this we're making sure appropriate locations are chosen for development so that residents can access their daily needs without driving, and that travel infrastructure like cycle lanes and electric vehicle charging points are put in place to support sustainable travel, cleaner air and healthy living. We're planning for enhanced public transport including protecting land for a new Wantage and Grove train station.

20. How far do you agree or disagree with the Joint Local Plan encouraging walking, cycling, buses and trains when planning for future travel?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

21. If you have any comments on this proposal, please provide them below.

Section 9: Community infrastructure



We'll need new and improved community infrastructure like schools, community halls, sport and leisure facilities, health care facilities and green spaces to go with the new homes and jobs already planned (and in some cases already delivered). These improvements are likely to be in or near areas where new development is planned, rather than where there's less development. In a refresh of our Infrastructure Delivery Plan, we will identify what's needed where to support planned development, and we'd value your views on this. The Joint Local Plan will include policies to ensure that developers contribute a fair share of the cost of new infrastructure.

22. What type of community infrastructure would you like to comment on?

- Schools
- Community halls
- Sport and leisure facilities
- Health care facilities
- Public greenspaces / Local Green Spaces
- Allotments
- Other (please specify below)

.....

23. Please tell us if you have any comments on our district's infrastructure needs, including any ideas you have about what is needed to support new development in our area or anything else you think we should consider.

Consultation now closed

Section 10: Water quality and wastewater infrastructure



Wastewater (including waste from toilets) may be released directly into rivers and streams with no or minimal treatment when there is insufficient sewage infrastructure capacity. This potentially causes significant harm to human health and to nature. The councils are extremely concerned about how often and how long storm overflows are currently being used and are actively engaging with Thames Water on this issue.

Our policy approach is to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to serve new development to avoid the use of storm overflows moving forward. Where wastewater infrastructure capacity issues are identified, our policy will be that no development takes place until we have suitable wastewater upgrades planned and agreed. In addition, to protect water quality we are willing to use a special type of planning condition (called a Grampian condition) to ensure that people cannot move into new homes until the necessary infrastructure upgrades have been completed.

24. How far do you agree or disagree with our proposed policy approach to wastewater infrastructure?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

25. If you have any comments on this proposal, please provide them below.

Section 11: Nature recovery

Biodiversity net gain is an approach to development that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was before. Under the Environment Act 2021, when developers build, there must be a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. In the Joint Local Plan, alongside protecting ecological networks and incorporating features to support wildlife, we propose setting a higher level of biodiversity net gain between 11-25%, as long as the level doesn't make development too expensive to go ahead.

26. How far do you agree or disagree with the Joint Local Plan requiring developers to provide a higher level of biodiversity than in the Environment Act?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

27. If you have any comments on this proposal, please let us know below.

Section 12: Valuing the landscape


In the first consultation we ran on the Joint Local Plan last summer, people told us that protecting our countryside was their number one issue. We have always had planning policies to protect the landscape, but this time we are incorporating some extra policies. As well as recognising nationally protected landscapes like our two National Landscapes (formerly Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty), we've also commissioned research on valued landscapes, so that we recognise and protect areas that may not be nationally designated but are nevertheless special and locally important to communities. We've also commissioned a map showing the tranquillity of all parts of the districts, and a map showing light pollution and where our darkest skies are. We're proposing new policies we've not had before to go with the maps so that we can protect valued landscapes, tranquil places and dark skies better.

28. How far do you agree or disagree with adding these additional policies to protect the landscape in the Joint Local Plan?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

29. If you have any comments on this proposal, please let us know below.

Section 13: Homes already planned in existing local plans



The existing local plans approved in 2016, 2019 and 2020 identified a large number of sites for housebuilding. Some of these allocated sites have now been developed, others have planning permission, but there are significant numbers that are still to gain planning permission and be built. This provides an important pipeline of new homes and jobs for the 2020s and 2030s.

What we can do now in the Joint Local Plan is review the existing allocated sites which do not yet have planning permission, to see if there's a need to update or refresh the policy wording. In simple terms we have looked at whether to keep, tweak or delete these allocations. The types of tweaks we have suggested include increasing or decreasing the number of homes, varying the layout or updating what's needed to go with the development.

From this review we are proposing:


Existing allocated site name	Number of homes planned for Joint Local Plan	Outcome of our review
South Oxfordshire		
a. Land at Berinsfield Garden Village	1700	Tweak – minor changes
b. Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre	3500	Tweak – minor changes
c. Land south of Grenoble Road	3000	Tweak – minor changes
d. Land at Northfield	1800	Tweak – minor changes
e. Land north of Bayswater Brook	1100	Tweak, keep main site, but delete the parcel of land at Sandhills
f. Orchard Centre Phase 2	100	Tweak, reduce the site area to exclude the Orchard Centre, rename to “Rich’s Sidings and Broadway”, and fewer homes
g. Didcot Gateway	200	Tweak, fewer homes
h. Vauxhall Barracks	300	Keep
i. West of Priests Close, Nettlebed	0	Delete the allocation
j. Land south of Nettlebed Service Station	0	Delete the allocation
k. Land at Chalgrove Airfield	0	Delete the allocation
Vale of White Horse		
l. North West of Abingdon-on-Thames	200	Keep, as part of the site does not have planning permission.
m. North West of Grove	600	Tweak, higher number of homes to cover the new plan period, but no extra overall
n. North-West Valley Park	800	Tweak – minor changes
o. Dalton Barracks*	2750	Tweak, extend the site area and increase number of homes

*We ask more about Dalton Barracks in section 14.

30. Which site would you like to comment on? Please tick all that apply and then go to the question numbers provided.

- Land at Berinsfield Garden Village (**go to question number 31**)
- Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre (**go to question number 33**)
- Land south of Grenoble Road (**go to question number 35**)
- Land at Northfield (**go to question number 37**)
- Land north of Bayswater Brook (**go to question number 39**)
- Orchard Centre Phase 2 (**go to question number 41**)
- Didcot Gateway (**go to question number 43**)
- Vauxhall Barracks (**go to question number 45**)
- West of Priests Close, Nettlebed (**go to question number 47**)
- Land south of Nettlebed Service Station (**go to question number 49**)
- Land at Chalgrove Airfield (**go to question number 51**)
- North West of Abingdon-on-Thames (**go to question number 53**)
- North West of Grove (**go to question number 55**)
- North-West Valley Park (**go to question number 57**)
- Dalton Barracks (**go to question number 59**)

Land at Berinsfield Garden Village




31. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking (minor changes) the Land at Berinsfield Garden Village site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

32. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site, and any comments you have on the indicative concept plan.

Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre



- | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Higher density development | Green Infrastructure | AS11 Employment Allocation |
| Medium density development | Local Centre | Employment |
| Lower density development | Railway Safeguard | Green Belt Reinforcement |
| | Green Links | |

33. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking (minor changes) the Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre site allocation?





- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

34. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site, and any comments you have on the indicative concept plan.

Land south of Grenoble Road



- | | | |
|--|--|--|
|  Higher density development |  Green Infrastructure |  Safeguard mobility hub |
|  Medium density development |  Local Centre |  Indicative Road links |
|  Lower density development |  Science park extension |  Green Belt Reinforcement |

35. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking (minor changes) the Land south of Grenoble Road site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

36. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site, and any comments you have on the indicative concept plan.

Land at Northfield



37. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking (minor changes) the land at Northfield site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

38. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site, and any comments you have on the indicative concept plan.

Land North of Bayswater Brook



39. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking (keep main site, but delete the parcel of land at Sandhills) land at North Bayswater Brook site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

40. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site, and any comments you have on the indicative concept plan.

Orchard Centre Phase 2

41. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking the Orchard Centre Phase 2 site allocation (to reduce the site area to exclude the Orchard Centre, rename to “Rich’s Sidings and Broadway”, and fewer homes)

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don’t know

42. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site.

Didcot Gateway

43. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking (fewer homes) the Didcot Gateway site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

44. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site.

Vauxhall Barracks

45. How far do you agree or disagree with keeping the Vauxhall Barracks site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

46. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site.

West of Priests Close, Nettlebed

47. How far do you agree or disagree with deleting West of Priests Close, Nettlebed site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

48. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Consultation now closed

Land south of Nettlebed Service Station

49. How far do you agree or disagree with deleting the land south of Nettlebed Service Station site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

50. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Consultation now closed

Land at Chalgrove Airfield

51. How far do you agree or disagree with deleting the land at Chalgrove Airfield site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

52. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Consultation now closed

North West of Abingdon-on-Thames


53. How far do you agree or disagree with keeping (as part of the site does not have planning permission) the North West of Abingdon-on-Thames site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

54. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site.

North West Grove



55. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking (higher number of homes to cover the new plan period, but no extra overall) the North West Grove site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

56. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site, and any comments you have on the indicative concept plan.

North West Valley Park




57. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking (minor changes) the North West Valley Park site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

58. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site, and any comments you have on the indicative concept plan.

Land at Dalton Barracks



59. How far do you agree or disagree with tweaking (extend the site area and increasing the number of homes) the Dalton Barracks site allocation?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- I don't know

60. If you have any comments on this site, please provide them below.

Where the outcome of our review is to keep or tweak the allocation, we welcome your feedback on the mix of uses (new housing, employment, shops, public open space etc), the layout or types of community and transport facilities needed for the site, and any comments you have on the indicative concept plan.

Section 14: Planning for brownfield sites

Although the Councils do not need to make any new housing allocations to meet the housing numbers, and do not plan to make any new greenfield allocations in this local plan, where there are brownfield sites in sustainable locations which could be regenerated or re-used, we propose to allocate these to help them find a new future. Brownfield sites are pieces of land which have previously been developed, so could include old office and industrial buildings, or car parks, for example. In 2021 we asked people to suggest suitable sites in our Call for Land and Buildings Available for Change. You can see the results by searching the following link: **southandvale.gov.uk/call-for-land-and-buildings**

So far we have identified two brownfield sites we propose to allocate: the barracks area at Dalton Barracks (in Vale of White Horse), and the site where the former Council offices stood at Crowmarsh Gifford (in South Oxfordshire).

Consultation now closed

Brownfield land at Dalton Barracks



© Crown copyright and database all rights reserved. South Oxfordshire District Council 2023 OS 100018668. Vale of White Horse District Council 2023 OS 100019525.

61. What do you think are the best use(s) of the Dalton Barracks brownfield site? Please tick as many as you like:

- Building new homes
- Employment development
- Specialist housing for the elderly and/or a care home
- Community facilities like schools, health, leisure facilities (please state below)
- Prefer to leave as it is
- Not sure
- I don't have a view
- Other idea (please tell us below)

62. This brownfield site is likely to see change over the next 15 years - what things would make this a great place? You could tell us for example your suggestions for the mix of uses, the layout, space for nature, or the types of community and transport facilities needed for this site?

Brownfield land at Crowmarsh Gifford



© Crown copyright and database all rights reserved. South Oxfordshire District Council 2023 OS 100018668. Vale of White Horse District Council 2023 OS 100019525.

**63. What do you think are the best use(s) of the Crowmarsh Gifford site?
Please tick as many as you like:**

- Building new homes
- Employment development
- Specialist housing for the elderly and/or a care home
- Community facilities like schools, health, leisure facilities (please state below)
- Prefer to leave as it is
- Not sure
- I don't have a view
- Other idea (please tell us below)

64. This brownfield site is likely to see change over the next 15 years - what things would make this a great place? You could tell us for example your suggestions for the mix of uses, the layout, space for nature, or the types of community and transport facilities needed for this site?

65. Can you suggest any other brownfield sites in sustainable locations that we should consider?

Please let us know the location of the site(s) below.

Section 15: Anything else you want to tell us?

66. Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

67. Is there anything else you would like to see in the Joint Local Plan that hasn't been covered already?

68. Do you want to be notified when we consult on the draft plan (also known as the pre-submission draft), when the plan is submitted for Examination and when the Plan is adopted?

For further information about how we use your data below, please refer to our privacy policy (available alongside this comment form), which also explains how to exercise your rights over your personal data.

- Yes
 No (go to question 70)

69. If yes, please provide your contact details below

First name

Last name

Name of your business/organisation name (if relevant)

Name of the business or organisation you're representing (if relevant)

Email address

Postal address

Address line 1

Address line 2

Address line 3

Postal town

Postcode

Your experience of this consultation

We would like to get your feedback on your experience of this consultation. Please answer the following questions below.

70. Is this the first time you have taken part in a Local Plan consultation?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

71. Now that you have taken part in the Joint Local Plan consultation, how would you rate your experience?

- Excellent
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Extremely poor
- I don't know

72. Based on your experience of taking part in this Joint Local Plan consultation, how likely are you to take part in a future consultation?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Neutral
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely
- I don't know

73. If you have any other comments about your experience, please provide them below.

74. How did you hear about the Joint Local Plan consultation? Tick all that apply.

- District Council social media accounts (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram)
- Other social media accounts
- Poster
- Newsletter
- Email
- Letter
- Our website
- Another website
- Word of mouth
- Radio/TV
- Read it in the newspaper
- Parish Council
- Other (please specify):

.....

Consultation now closed

Our commitment to equal access for all

We are committed to making sure that residents have equal access to all council services. Please help us to keep track of how successfully we are achieving this by ticking the appropriate boxes below.

All questions are optional. All information is confidential and will only be used to help us monitor whether views differ across the community.

75. What is your sex?

- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say

76. Is the gender you identify with the same as your sex registered at birth?

- Yes
- No (please specify below)
- Prefer not to say

If no, please specify below.

77. How old are you?

- Under 16
- 16-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75+
- Prefer not to say

78. What is your ethnic group?

Prefer not to say

White

- English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British
- Irish
- Gypsy or Irish Traveller
- Roma
- Any other White background

Asian or Asian British

- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Chinese
- Any other Asian background

Black, Black British, Caribbean or African

- Caribbean
- African
- Any other Black, Black British or Caribbean background

Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups

- White and Black Caribbean
- White and Black African
- White and Asian
- Any other Mixed or Multiple background

Other Ethnic Group

- Arab
- Other (please specify):

79. Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illness lasting or expecting to last 12 months or more?

- Yes
- No **(skip question 80)**
- Prefer not to say **(skip question 80)**

80. Do any of your conditions or illnesses reduce your ability to carry out day to day activities?

- Yes, a lot
- Yes, a little
- Not at all

Thank you for your comments.

What happens next

We'll review all the comments we receive and summarise them in a consultation statement. Your views will help shape the draft of the Joint Local Plan for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse. In Autumn 2024, we expect to publish a full draft of our Joint Local Plan (the Proposed Submission Joint Local Plan) for a further stage of public comments. After this we will submit the draft plan and those comments for an independent planning inspector to examine the plan.

