

Changes in **bold & underlined****Chalgrove Airfield**

In the questions raised by the inspector for the specific sites hearings, the question reproduced below was included in the matter of Chalgrove Airfield. Subsequently, at the time of the hearing, the inspector then specifically ruled out any discussion on this concerning viability which meant that question was never discussed or answered by Homes England. Great Haseley Parish Council had considerable doubts as to the whether the viability assessment was robust, as it had identified that many costs were missing, including those mentioned in the Inspector's questions that were not included. The fact that no test on this was applied, puts into question whether the inspection fully examined the strategic site of Chalgrove Airfield for soundness.

11.5 In respect of the suggested relocated runway and future operations for the Martin-Baker Aircraft Company, what are the anticipated timings for obtaining agreements, approvals, licences and permissions from the Civil Aviation Authority, RAF Benson, the Health and Safety Executive and the local authority? Have the costs of relocation, including any CPO and compensatory provision, been factored into the overall development's viability assessment?

Main Mod. No.	Para / Section	Page No.	Main Modification	Comments
MM2	Objective 8.2	23	Minimise carbon emissions and other pollution such as water, air, noise and light, and increase our resilience to the likely impact of climate change, especially flooding. <u>Lower energy use and support an increase in renewable energy use. Support growth in locations that help reduce the need to travel</u>	Support, this underpins the Climate change emergency, but the allocation of Chalgrove Airfield directly contradicts this policy due to not being close to the recognised employment areas.
MM4	n/a	28	New paragraph following 4.10 - <u>The spatial strategy supports growth in locations that help reduce the need to travel such as the focus at Science Vale, Towns and larger villages as well as allocations adjacent to the City of Oxford. Appendix 16 of the Local Plan highlights all elements of the Local Plan where the Plan helps to minimise carbon emissions, lower energy use and help to reduce the need to travel.</u>	Support. Again Chalgrove Airfield as a strategic site fails to meet the criteria to minimise carbon energy use and help reduce the need to travel, by being a car based settlement away from employment and with minimal public transport provision
MM7	5(ix) [new]	40	New criterion: <u>ix) a statement of how it is intended to achieve low carbon emissions and facilitate renewable energy generation</u>	Support, but suggest additional point, x) a statement of how carbon emissions will be minimised during the construction phase for both vehicles and the building process

MM9	2	43	<p>N2. The Green Belt boundary has been altered to accommodate strategic allocations at STRAT8, STRAT9, STRAT10, STRAT11, STRAT12, STRAT13 and STRAT14, <u>where the development should deliver compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of the remaining Green Belt land, with measures supported by evidence of landscape, biodiversity or recreational needs and opportunities.</u> The boundaries of the reviewed Green Belt are identified on the proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary maps (see Appendix 4).</p>	<p>At inspection, every site in the Green Belt was subject to the same question: ‘Is the plan effective in terms of mitigation and compensatory provision’ Bearing in mind the Green Belt boundary has been changed in these 6 cases, resulting in a significant reduction in Green Belt land around Oxford, bearing in mind the constraints on providing compensatory and mitigation on the sites themselves, it is surely an omission not to have considered adding additional compensatory land to the green Belt.</p>
MM9	n/a	43	<p>4.59 The plan proposes <u>has made</u> alterations to the Green Belt to accommodate our strategic allocations at Culham, Berinsfield, Grenoble Road, Northfield, and Land north of Bayswater brook, <u>and</u> Wheatley. These proposals <u>alterations</u> are included <u>shown</u> at Appendix 4. The individual sections within the plan, which are relevant to each of these strategic allocations, provide specific detail on the approach for its release <u>and mitigation. The Policy requires compensatory measures to be delivered to remediate for the removal of land from the Green Belt. This is required by the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 138. Each relevant strategic allocation policy where Green Belt has been altered sets out requirements for the site and some of these measures could be considered as compensatory measures. Evidence on landscape, biodiversity or recreational needs with site specific recommendations and opportunities will also provide recommendations for enhancements that would deliver compensatory improvements on remaining Green Belt. The compensatory gain would be expected to be demonstrated through the individual site masterplans and secured through developer contributions if these enhancements are outside of the red line boundary of a planning application.</u></p>	<p>The NPPF paragraph 135 states ‘new green belt should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban expansions’ The quantum of Green Belt land around Oxford that has been allocated to strategic sites mean that consideration should be included in the Local Plan as a strategic policy for some compensatory land to be established as Green Belt to the south of Oxford.</p>

MM10	2(viii)	47	viii) provision of convenience and comparison floorspace that to meets the day-today needs of Chalgrove and the wider local community only without impacting on the vitality and viability of existing centres in accordance with Policy TC2 – Retail Hierarchy;	<p>Strongly object to this change. This fundamental change is unsound, by removing the protection for the existing retail provision at centres; there will be an adverse effect on the vitality and viability of those centres such as Watlington, Thame and Wallingford. Additionally by setting up Chalgrove as a retail centre for the wider local community, additional traffic will be accessing Chalgrove, which has not been accounted for in any of the traffic models; therefore the traffic models will have to be repeated with the additional traffic numbers accounted for. For sites such as Berinsfield, the wording states: v) provision of convenience floorspace that meets the day-today needs of the local community only without impacting on the vitality and viability of existing centres in accordance with Policy TC2 – Retail Hierarchy; why is this appropriate for Berinsfield, and not Chalgrove?</p> <p>Para 121 of the NPPF permits new shopping centres “provided this would not undermine key economic sectors or sites or the vitality and viability of town centres”. This change contradicts the NPPF, and SODC Policy TC1, and should be removed.</p>
MM10	2(ix)c	47	c. improvements to the Public Transport network through significant contributions to new or improved services to include but not limited to increased frequency on the Chalgrove to Oxford bus route of up to 4 buses per hour to be supported by highway improvements on the B480 corridor, and support for an east west bus service linking Chalgrove to Didcot (and where appropriate feasible other significant employment and growth areas) with a target frequency of 2 buses per hour	<p>Object. The delivery of this is unrealistic It must also be a requirement that the cost of this service must be clarified, in terms of who pays for it, for how long, and at what cost. It is clear from the response to the Chalgrove Planning Application Consultation from the Oxford Bus Company and Thames Travel and Stagecoach in Oxfordshire that the operators of the service have not been properly consulted or included in the early planning process. They unequivocally believe that the proposals are unsustainable. have stated that this site is not for the Oxford unmet housing need, it is for the rest of the District. It must therefore be a requirement that bus travel is required from the outset to the other Market Towns such as Wallingford, Thame, and Henley. The inspector questioned how bus services could be assured in perpetuity, which appears highly unlikely.</p>

MM10	3(vii)[new]	48	<p>New criterion - vii) a layout that delivers higher density development (a minimum of 50 dph) in and around the local centre and along key public transport routes. Density should then gradually reduce from these locations outwards to provide a transition across the site, with lower density development located on the edges of the site, to minimise the landscape and heritage impact of the development and support the integration of the development with the existing settlement. The average density for the whole site will be between 35 and 50 dph;</p>	<p>Strongly object. Firstly to the word ‘minimum’ and secondly to the 50dph density which is completely inappropriate for a development sitting in what is relatively flat area of rural countryside and completely at odds with the setting Chalgrove village. In order to achieve those densities it will involve high rise buildings.</p>
MM10	3(x) [new]	48	<p>New criterion: x)a net gain in biodiversity which is integrated into the masterplan through the creation of priority habitats, and significant native tree planting, with any residual impacts offset through the ecological improvement of a named site in South Oxfordshire under the promoter’s control in line with an agreed management plan or a recognised biodiversity offsetting scheme.</p>	<p>Object, The net gain in biodiversity is welcomed, however “significant native tree planting” looks incompatible with the adjacent airfield operation. The “priority habitats” will surely need to be open grassland as that is what is currently there. The offset scheme wording is vague, and the Planning Application states that the current biodiversity loss will be approx. 90%? The “named site” , needs identifying.</p>
MM23	n/a	86	<p>T 3. Housing Residential development on sites not allocated in the development plan will only be permitted where:</p> <p>i. it is for affordable housing on a rural exception site or entry level housing scheme in accordance with Policy H10; or</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Proposal for amendment – there is no mention of social housing, which is badly needed; this should be a specific to be added. There should be a definition of an entry level housing scheme.</p>
MM33	n/a	113	<p>1. Proposals for housing on sites within the built-up areas of the towns and larger villages will be supported permitted. Within smaller villages and other villages, development should be limited to infill and the redevelopment of previously developed land or buildings. provided that:</p> <p>1) an important open space of public, environmental, historical or ecological value is not lost, nor an important public view harmed;</p>	<p>Object to 1) being removed from the policy, this paragraph to prevent the loss of important open space, etc is a vital protection of the character of rural villages. This should be re-instated</p>

Appendix A		144	Amendment to concept plan Strat 7 – Land at Chalgrove Airfield	The plan continues to show the current Chalgrove bypass road being re-routed through the centre of the development, in close proximity to the highest density housing, schools and retail outlets. This, as a concept, is highly ill-considered, having significant disadvantages in terms of pedestrian safety, air quality and traffic flows, with a significant and similar adverse effect on Chalgrove village which will become a ‘rat run’ as traffic seeks the fastest route from the Watlington edge road to the Stadhampton bypass, when the existing Chalgrove bypass is removed. It would seem appropriate for the modification to the plan to include an instruction to “Examine the practicality of the current road-plan and actively consider alternative options which may provide significant benefits”.
Sustainability Appraisal Addendum	STRAT7 – 6	265	√Site would reduce need for travel (e.g. new development is within 800m of one or more services) OR The policy/Site would encourage the use of sustainable travel/transport of people/goods	There is no bus service to Wallingford, or any of the other nearby Market Towns. The Oxford Bus Company has expressed concerns about the viability, and this concern has been amplified in their response to the Planning Application P20/S2134/O where it is made clear that the provisions in the plan are completely unrealistic This must be considered a negative as the site will significantly increase the need for travel as there will be insufficient services and employment, and on the site. The scale of road infrastructure required to support this site is a major negative effect
Sustainability Appraisal Addendum	STRAT7 – 8	266/ 267	The development of this site would result in the considerable redevelopment of a large amount of brownfield land (significant positive).	The site is not brownfield. It is an active airfield, and as such should not be considered brownfield. The site is not in the SODC Brownfield register.